

# HYPERBOREA: THE ARCTIC MYTH OF CONTEMPORARY RUSSIAN RADICAL NATIONALISTS

VICTOR SHNIRELMAN

PhD, Senior Research Fellow

Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology

Russian Academy of Sciences

Leninsky prospect, 32-A, 119991 Moscow, Russia

e-mail: shnirv@mail.ru

## ABSTRACT\*

After the disintegration of the Soviet Union Russians had to search for a new identity. This was viewed as an urgent task by ethnic Russian nationalists, who were dreaming of a 'pure Russian country', or at least of the privileged status of ethnic Russians within the Russian state. To mobilise people they picked up the obsolete Aryan myth rooted in both occult teachings and Nazi ideology and practice. I will analyse the main features of the contemporary Russian Aryan myth developed by radical Russian intellectuals. While rejecting medieval and more recent Russian history as one of oppression implemented by 'aliens', the advocates of the Aryan myth are searching for a Golden Age in earlier epochs. They divide history into two periods: initially the great Aryan civilisation and civilising activity successfully developed throughout the world, after which a period of decline began. An agent of this decline is identified as the Jews, or 'Semites', who deprived the Aryans of their great achievements and pushed them northwards. The Aryans are identified as the Slavs or Russians, who suffer from alien treachery and misdeeds. The myth seeks to replace former Marxism with racism and contributes to contemporary xenophobia.

KEYWORDS: Russia • usable past • the Aryan myth • radical ideologies • racism • anti-Semitism

The disintegration of the Soviet Union by late 1991 dealt a heavy blow to ethnic Russian consciousness that evoked nostalgia for the imperial past. Hence, a rich mythology developed dealing with the greatness of the Russian remote past as though it pre-determined a splendid future. I will discuss the development and the main characteristics of the myth, which was built up by Russian radicals over the last twenty-five years or so. I will show that it is too early to conclude that "the swastika has been forever sullied: it

\* This research was supported by the Russian Foundation for Humanities, project No. 12-01-00312 titled Contemporary Religiousness – Tolerance or Radicalism? A shortened version of the article was delivered as a paper at the Arctic Workshop organised by the Department of Ethnology at the University of Tartu, Estonia on June 1–2, 2012. An earlier version of this article was delivered at the 15th Annual World Convention of the Association for the Study of Nationalities (ASN), Nations and States: On the Map and in the Mind, held by Columbia University in New York, on April 15–17, 2010.

can never be used again without arousing memories of the most uncomfortable kind" (Godwin 1993: 51). Unfortunately, contemporary reality is more complicated, and dangerous Aryan ideas do not want to leave public discourse.

#### IN SEARCH OF A NEW IDEOLOGY

Parting with the Soviet past still causes paradoxical and unexpected outcomes. The fall of the Soviet regime was accompanied by a discrediting of not only the official Marxist-Leninist ideology but also Soviet humanitarian knowledge in general. In the last years of perestroika and at the beginning of the post-Soviet period the general public was infused with an idea that serving state ideology was the major, if not the only, task of Soviet historians. This attitude was cultivated by numerous publicists as well as amateur authors, who occupied themselves with the production of alternative history.

To be sure, Soviet historians were at the service of the state and their production had to meet its demands. Yet, at the same time, development of scholarly knowledge was only partly determined by political factors; it also partly followed its own logic. Indeed, not all the scholars (and not in all the historical fields) served the current politics. There were various scholars in the Soviet Union, and many of them focused on issues that were less connected with urgent political goals. And not all the Soviet ideas were bad; for example, the ideas of internationalism, social justice and anti-colonialism were noble.<sup>1</sup> Soviet internal policy was also less consistent and from time to time drastically changed its course, causing respective changes in scholarly paradigms. This is why one can find in the Soviet historiography various, and sometimes opposite, interpretations of the same historical events.

Yet, the general public was less sensitive towards the complex nature of historiography. At the same time, since the late 1980s a one-dimensional negative attitude towards professional historians and their works was fostered by popular publications and the mass media. This approach was enthusiastically followed by lay authors (writers, journalists, artists and scientists) who wanted to avoid competition with professional scholars; this is why they applauded their discrediting. Meanwhile, the Soviet identity crisis and a gradual shift to Russian (*Rossiiskaya*) identity encouraged public interest in Russian history because, historically, images of the past served and still serve as very important components of identity in Russia.

While rejecting the Soviet views of the past, the general public was by no means open to the non-preconceived perception of the Western historical knowledge. People suspected that many Western historians were in the service of hostile anti-Russian politics. These attitudes emerged within an anti-Western stance that grew up after the mid-1990s.

This was especially characteristic of ethnic Russian nationalists, who manifested radical views. They were mainly educated urban dwellers, trained in natural sciences or philology and journalism, who presented themselves as the champions of the Russian people's interests. They were less satisfied with both the Soviet and Western views of history. And, since there were almost no professional historians among them and they were not trained to analyse historical documents, they had no choice but to address pre-revolutionary literature, which met their xenophobic demands.<sup>2</sup> It was very easy

to do just that after censorship was abolished and Russian radicals gained access to pre-revolutionary and émigré chauvinist literature which earlier had been classified. In addition, the former atheism was replaced by a revival of public interest in religion. Non-traditional esoteric teaching became popular,<sup>3</sup> which inherited racial views including an idea of polygeny from the nineteenth century, and these books were extensively republished in post-Soviet Russia.

Finally, a spiritual and ideological heritage from Nazi Germany enjoyed high interest in post-Soviet Russia. On the one hand, the interest was encouraged by the fact that this information was less accessible in the previous period. On the other hand, while suspecting that Soviet scholars distorted historical data for ideological reasons, people wanted to know the 'truth' from independent sources. On the other hand, Nazi practice suggested its own solution to the 'national issue', this being very sensitive in post-Soviet Russia with its numerous ethnic problems. Xenophobia grew quickly in Russia from the mid-1990s, and more and more ethnic Russians were displeased with what they viewed as the excessive activity of ethnic minorities, who allegedly occupied important positions in power structures and businesses (Shnirelman 2011: 239–336).<sup>4</sup> From this point of view, the Nazi experience was appreciated by some radical politicians and ideologists as useful and even attractive.

The Nazi experience fascinated the radical Russian nationalists most of all. Some of them openly demonstrated their admiration of Hitler, and some others, while disliking him, were open to Nazi racist ideology and practice. It is noteworthy that their negative attitude was rooted in the fact that, while having attacked the Soviet Union, Hitler, in their view, undermined racial solidarity and betrayed 'white people's' interests. At the same time, they did not object to discrimination or even genocide.<sup>5</sup>

The Russian nationalists admired the Aryan myth most of all.<sup>6</sup> Being anxious about both the identity crisis and the shaping of the Russian nation, they understood the importance of the Grand Narrative of the past, which might forge psychological and ideological basics for ethnic cohesion.<sup>7</sup> The more dramatic was the social and political crisis, the more a grand myth was in demand. In the late 1980s and early 1990s both liberal media and pop-literature convinced people that the Russian historical project had entirely collapsed. The Russian historical route was presented as a deadlock that had pushed Russians away from the major line of human development. This concerned all of Russia's past rather than only the Soviet period. Ancestors' lives under both autocratic and totalitarian regimes looked by no means great; certainly one could find nothing to be proud of such a past (Lakshin 1993). This view was encouraged by numerous unmasking articles as well as alternative histories that deprived well-known historical actors of their former positive images. All of this fostered public frustration, apathy and low spirits, and blocked creative activity. To put it other way, the recent and not-so-recent past did not attract people any longer.

These attitudes nourished new myths of the Slavic remote past that were built up with respect to the well-known post-colonial model. Whereas the Soviet ideology dwelt on the theory of progress and predicted a happy future, the Russian radical myth argues that the Russian people lived under colonial conditions and were heavily exploited by 'aliens' who ran the country for centuries.<sup>8</sup> From this point of view, the Russian radicals see both Soviet history, the history of the Russian Empire and even Medieval Russian history as a disaster. This long period is depicted as one of colonial dependency during which power was appropriated by 'aliens' who oppressed the Russians.

The aforementioned attitudes are based on the social memory of former peasants. Indeed, until recently Russia was a peasant country, and today the peasants' descendants view the elite, which ran the country for centuries, as 'alien people'. This reminds us of the well-known myth of the struggle between the Gauls and the Franks, popular in the 18th century and especially at the time of the French Revolution (Barzun 1966: 138–147, 247–248). Historically, the elite in Russia were of various origins. Therefore, they are often perceived by contemporary Russian radicals as the hateful 'International'. The radicals accuse these elites of all the misfortunes and injustices in Russia throughout the centuries, and argue that everything would immediately improve if ethnic Russians replaced the former elites. Noteworthy in this context, Russianness is treated in biological terms and explicitly associated with 'pure blood'.

In addition, whereas the postcolonial model associates a decline with colonial oppression, the Russian myth points to the baptism of Rus'. The myth views Christianity as an alien ideology that was developed by malicious agents in order to enslave the 'Slavic Aryans' spiritually. The Christian period is associated with the dark ages of the Piscean era and presented as a time in which genuine Russian traditions were persecuted. A reference to the Piscean era reminds us of the esoteric teaching that informs the myth in question. Evidently, an in-group–out-group opposition plays a crucial role in this discourse. 'Alien' is presented in ethnic terms and employs such negative connotations as bad, hostile, scary, vile, and unacceptable.<sup>9</sup>

#### THE RETURN OF THE ARYAN MYTH

The more the modern period is cast unfavourably, the greater is the aspiration to oppose it with some splendid antediluvian past associated with the Golden Age. Ancient people are viewed as robust, noble, reliable, truthful, courageous, generous, skilful, knowledgeable and wise. They developed a grand culture and built up a high civilisation on a northern island named Arctida, or Hyperborea, situated in the Polar region. According to the myth, the inhabitants were "white people, the Aryans". Allegedly they enjoyed a mild sub-tropical climate in the primordial period and felt as though they lived in Paradise. Later on, because of a natural catastrophe, they had to move southwards. On the one hand, they brought higher culture with them, while on the other, they became victim to a miscegenation that led to decline and degradation.

This myth is based on occult beliefs that are rooted in Helene Blavatsky's Theosophy.<sup>10</sup> Blavatsky argued that the first three "root-races" had ethereal shape, and only beginning with the fourth did humanity obtain physical bodies. Blavatsky placed the Second Race on the continent of Hyperborea, which allegedly existed somewhere near the North Pole. She found the Third Race in a southern continent named Lemuria, and the Fourth Race (the "Lemurian-Atlanteans") was associated with the first historical land of Atlantis, thought to have sunk 12,000 years ago. It was there that humanity obtained physical bodies. At the same time, Blavatsky depicted the Paleolithic inhabitants of Europe as Atlanteans who preserved their "pure blood". (Blavatskaya 1991: 5–9, 192)

Every new race emerged within the previous one. In this way, the most evolved, Lemurian, race gave birth to the Aryans, called the Fifth Race by Blavatsky, who argued

that they accounted for the great bulk of contemporary humanity. She also maintained that Europe was their homeland. In her view, what remained from the previous race mixed with the new one, and it is in this way that the diversity of human physical types emerged. Blavatsky identified the Fourth Race as the “sons of Giants”, and the Fifth as the “sons of Gods” (Blavatskaya 1991: 278–280). She argued that they waged bloody wars with each other (an idea borrowed from the French occult author Fabre d’Olivet). Sometimes she defined race by skin colour, according to which the “sons of Giants” proved to be “black” and the “sons of Gods” “yellow”. Moreover, while emphasising the great role of spirituality, she ascribed certain distinct moral and behavioural characteristics to every race. For example, the “Lemurian-Atlanteans” proved to be “malicious sorcerers”, whereas the Aryans had noble moral features. Noteworthy, according to Blavatsky, was that the “early Aryans” enjoyed the “Vedic faith”, which they imposed on the “remnants of the Lemurian-Atlantean peoples”. Allegedly those beliefs made up the basis of all contemporary world religions including “Judeo-Christianity”. (Blavatskaya 1992: 606) Thus, Blavatsky’s concept contained a messianic idea as well as an idea of a master race (if only embryonic), although at the same time it called for universal brotherhood. This concept also included eschatology, with a transition from one race epoch to another inevitably accompanied by a terrible natural cataclysm.

Blavatsky’s concept was informed by the European esoteric tradition that was shaped partly by ‘astral visions’ and partly by interpretation of various archaic myths. It also incorporated a teaching of the succession of the four races (Red, Black, White and Yellow) closely connected with certain continents and epochs (Lemurian, Atlantean, Ethiopian and White). According to occult views, every race built up and ruled a huge empire with numerous colonies. Each rule lasted for 12,500 years and finished with a natural catastrophe, after which a new cycle began and was associated with a new race. Allegedly, this development was under the control of higher powers (teachers). Thus, all the major historical events were predetermined, and various peoples developed according to well-established rules.

Certain occult authors argued that the White Race was the youngest on Earth. It emerged in the White Sea area - the homeland of its ancestor the Hyperboreans. Allegedly, the Black Race ruled during that epoch, when it expanded northwards up to southern Europe, including southern Russia, and subjugated both White and Yellow Races. Later on, the Whites became stronger and, under Rama’s rule, pushed the Blacks back to the south. After that, Rama built up a huge empire embracing all the lands between North Africa and Japan. Some Whites resettled in Asia Minor and Western Europe, and gave birth to the Aryans. Notably, the term Aryans was also used by occult authors for all Whites in general. They argued that a racial miscegenation led to degradation and degeneration that was a common trend in human history (Papus 1912–1913; Shure 1914). An idea about the lethal results of miscegenation was borrowed from racial theory, which was popular in the late 19th century.

In many respects the myth in question reminds us of the Nazi Aryan myth (Cecil 1972). It is well known that the Nazi Party grew out of the occult Thule Society, and when in power the Nazis made strenuous efforts to make scholars confirm the ‘Aryan idea’. Thus, many hybrid versions appeared that combined occult beliefs with scholarly and pseudo-scholarly concepts. This project failed to produce any consistent view of anthropogenesis and ethnogenesis. Yet, in due course, ‘Nordic Man’ has forced ‘Aryan

Man' to the margins of mythology. In addition, whereas initially when talking of race wars the occult myth was based on colonial reality and created opposition between Aryans, i.e. Whites, and Blacks, the Nazis made an allegedly eternal struggle between Aryans and Semites the core idea of the myth.<sup>11</sup> In addition to the race war, another universal factor in human history was identified as endless migrations as though they could explain all cultural changes. This obsolete reductionist view of historical process is still inherent in the myth.

In the late 20th century the Aryan myth was revived in Russia by occult scientists, Neo-Pagans and radical Russian nationalists, who did their best to make it the basis of the 'national idea' in order to consolidate the Russian people, to awake them from apathy and to provide them a new admirable rationality. One of the influential leaders of this ideological current was an 'Aryan astrologist' Pavel Globa (1995), who had already proved to be a zealous advocate of esoteric teaching in the 1980s. And, whereas between the 1970s and 1980s Russian radicals were searching for the Aryan homeland in the Eurasian steppe, in the Balkans, in Asia Minor,<sup>12</sup> and even in Arabia (Kandyba, Kandyba 1988: 12), from 1991 onwards they were attracted to the idea of the Northern Motherland, Hyperborea-Arctida. Evidently, they were shocked with the dissolution of the Soviet Union and dissociated themselves from the 'Southern Peoples' and turned to megalomania combined with the idea of the North.

Ever since the ideas of the 'Aryan nature' of the Slavs, a blooming Aryan Polar homeland and the emergence of the human civilisation during Aryan expansion from the North became unusually popular. The myth claims that the White People perfectly adapted to the changing natural environment during the last Ice Age, and that this made them superior with regard to the more specialised Yellow and Black people. Therefore, immediately after the retreat of the ice sheet the White people, who previously lived in northern Europe, began to spread out extensively southwards and eastwards where they brought their religion and writing system and established numerous civilisations.

Among those who have restored this myth were a professional Indologist, Natalia Guseva (1991: 3–27; 1994: 6–20; 1998), an engineer, Gennady Razumov (Razumov, Khasin 1991: 57–67), an Islamic traditionalist, Haydar Jemal' (1992), and Aleksander Dugin (1993),<sup>13</sup> a devoted admirer of Julius Evola and a zealous adherent of the New Right. Many contemporary Russian Neo-pagans also favour the myth.<sup>14</sup> The myth of the Aryan ancestors, who allegedly expanded from the heart of Eurasia and established ancient civilisations, was picked up by certain Russian politicians (Bakov, Dubichev 1995: 23–29), businessmen (Surov 2001: 146) and admirers of 'Russian civilisation', who ascribe "Hyperborean Aryan roots" to it (Mozhaiskova 2001: 464–485).

Contemporary Russian communists are also not indifferent towards the Aryan idea. In the late 1990s it was picked up by the pro-Communist newspaper *Patriot* (formerly *Soviet Patriot*). The myth of the 'Slavic Aryans' was presented in detail by Alexander Uvarov, then one of the leaders of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation (CPRF) faction in the State Duma and also a deputy chairman of the Executive Committee of the People's Patriotic Union of Russia run by the CPRF (Uvarov 1998; 2000). Former leader of the Russian Communists, Ivan Polozkov, also demonstrated his sympathy towards the Aryan myth (Polozkov 1998).

One can find other admirers of the Aryan myth among the members of the Russian Parliament as well. One of them was racial politician, Andrei Savelyev, who was elected

in 2003 as a member of the Rodina Party and for a few years was a deputy chairman of the Committee on the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] Affairs and Contacts with Compatriots. While occupying himself with building up the Great National Narrative, he referred to the “most ancient civilization” named Hyperborea as though it was developed by the White people in the Far North. He was upset with its collapse and claimed that the White people had to move southwards in order to fulfil their “civilizing mission”. He argued that the Russians managed to avoid miscegenation and maintain the genetic heritage they received from their Aryan ancestors. (Kolyev 2003: 364–368)

#### THE RUSSIAN ARYAN MYTH AND ITS GENERAL FEATURES

The Russian myth identifies Aryans with Slavs, or Russes, rather than with Germans. The Russes are presented as the forefathers of the White Race, and all the other ‘white people’ are viewed as their younger brothers. Sometimes the great majority of the contemporary peoples are identified as the descendants of the “one and the same proto-Russian ethnos”, and the Russian language as the human mother tongue (Kandyba 1995: 93, 107, 109, 125; Kandyba 1997: 4; Petukhov 2001; 2003). In some versions, the Russes are also related to the non-Russian peoples of Eurasia who belong to the Yellow Race (Danilov 1996; Kandyba 1997: 414–417; Asov 2008: 281–284). Or the argument is that migrants from Arctida found their first refuge in Siberia, from where the Siberian Rus’ emerged (Kandyba 1997; Gusev 2000: 174–175; Novgorodov 2006). In this way, the myth legitimates the Russian claim that all Eurasian territory between the Baltic Sea and the Kuril Islands is their historical heritage. The myth does not stop at that and points to the Slavic Aryan expansion into Europe, North Africa, the Middle East, India, China and even the Americas, as though the newcomers established civilisations and empires there in prehistoric times. Some authors argue that the prehistoric ‘Aryan empire’ encompassed about half the world. When conquering new lands, the Aryans waged wars against the Black Race. Indeed, according to the myth, the Blacks dominated on the Earth in the previous epoch and were destined to be forced out to Africa by the younger Aryan people. This is an evident borrowing from Theosophy. Yet, today some Russian radicals want to modernise this idea and claim that the Black Race deliberately went to America to be slaves there in order to take revenge upon the White Race today for defeat in the prehistoric past (Gusev 2000: 260).

The Aryan myth is still based on the idea of polygeny, and many of its advocates view human races as separate biological species. For example, according to the occult scientist Viktor Kandyba, there were two different centres of anthropogenesis: the southern or African, where the Black Race emerged, and the northern or Arctic, which was a homeland of the Yellow Race. He argued that the Black Race emerged many millions of years later than the Yellow and was of no value for humanity. Human evolution is identified with an extensive expansion of the Yellow Race, who, firstly, pushed the Black Race far to the south, and secondly, gave birth to the White Race in Europe. In due course Kandyba began to present the “earliest Russes” as White rather than Yellow. As a result, it became unclear where the representatives of Yellow Race were from, although they looked friendly and, in contrast to the Black Race, the Russes did not force them out of their lands. (Kandyba 1997: 3, 13, 15; Kandyba, Zolin 1997: 18, 21, 24)

Yet, a struggle between the White and Black Races proves to be a subsidiary theme to the myth in question and does not play any great role. In contrast, a confrontation between the Aryans and the Semites is emphasised, which makes the contemporary Russian Aryan myth much closer to the Nazi one. The myth depicts the Aryans and the Semites as not only different in culture but radically different in origin because they are associated with different races. In addition, the conflict has changed its spatial dimensions: what was looked at as a West vs. East opposition during the colonial epoch is depicted today in terms of North vs. South. Russia feels itself to be more comfortable within this paradigm. Indeed, it does not focus on the suffering caused by its ambiguous position between West and East, but is identified precisely with the North, which means with a genuine primordial North. Today it is in the Russian Polar areas that enthusiasts are searching for the traces of Arctida-Hyperborea and its perished first civilisation. The myth builders believe that the homeland of the legendary Aryans was situated in Russia, and argue proudly that refugees of this race began their great movement in Russian territory.<sup>15</sup> It is in this way that Russia becomes a cradle of both the White Race and civilisation. In the view of Russian radicals and occult thinkers, this makes Russia the vanguard of humanity, as though she will rescue the White Race from dying out.

The myth is based on the idea of cyclical time. The decline will end with a catastrophe, after which, in the Aquarian era, a new Golden Age will begin with the emergence of the new Sixth Race. Russian occult scientists teach people that the Aquarian era is associated with Russia. It is Russia that would collect 'White people' and rescue them from the coming world catastrophe, and it is there that the new race will shape itself and a new cycle of development begins.

How did the Aryans, who are depicted by the Russian radicals as the vanguard of humanity, get into this deep crisis? It is here that one is informed of the race struggle, which serves Russian radicals a universal explanation for all human history. And it is here that the Russian Aryan myth demonstrates its similarity with the Nazi myth. Indeed, both groups identify the major metaphysical enemy as the Jews or 'Semites', who are ascribed a racial nature. Some Russian authors make no distinctions between these populations, but some others argue that it is their difference that explains the very essence of history.

The Russian radicals view the Semites as another race distinct from the Whites and associate them with the perfidious and hateful South. They identify them with an evil agent who allegedly blocked the progressive development of the Aryans and their wonderful civilisations and began to push them northwards while appropriating all their achievements. They explain the so-called 'distinct characteristics' of the Semites with a reference to their mixed origins from the White and Black Races, as though that deprived them of creativity and made them occupy themselves with the appropriation of alien achievements. Yet certain radical authors put the Jews in a special category and argue that they were a product of some experiment carried out by Egyptian priests. They present them as an artificial population, or bio-robots. Thus, they deprive them of human nature and, especially, of positive moral qualities. Today, many Russian radicals believe that, while creating that group, the Egyptian priests had some special goals in mind. For example, radical writer Yuri Petukhov (2008) argued that the Jewish settlement in Palestine was a purposeful project of the priests, who wanted to build a durable shield against any expansion by "Asiatic barbarians".<sup>16</sup>

While reviving a scheme constructed by racist Houston Chamberlain at the end of the 19th century, the Russian radicals present all the major ancient civilisations of the Near East, beginning with Egypt and Sumer, as products of Aryan, Slavic or Russes' creative activity.<sup>17</sup> In this narrative, both the Egyptian pharaohs and the Israeli kings David and Solomon are depicted as Aryans. They are presented as great builders of ancient states and empires and producers of the outstanding cultural achievements (which is true, although they were not Aryan). The most ancient inhabitants of Palestine are identified as Indo-European, as though they were closely related to the Slavs; allegedly these ancient inhabitants included the Canaanites (whom scholars identify as Semites), and later even Jesus Christ. The authors in question are obsessed with the early Semitic or simply 'Jewish' invasions as encroachments on Indo-European (or even Slavic) territory. The invaders are depicted as either brutal aggressors (Bezverkhii 1993; Antonenko 1994; Kandyba 1997; Asov 1998), or peaceful traders and marginal impoverished ethnic groups that settled in the ancient cities and gradually forced the natives out (Petukhov 2008).<sup>18</sup> In either case Aryans suffered because of this and had to retreat northwards as their former territories had been settled by Semites and other 'aliens'. As a result, a genuine culture fell into decline, and ancient civilisations collapsed.

One can come across more extravagant versions of such a collision as well. For example, an esoteric Moscow philosopher, Valery Demin, interpreted an innocent Russian folk tale about a pockmarked hen as a recollection of the most ancient times, when Indo-Europeans fought to the death against the Semites. He located the battlefield in the Far North, where, he said, the "homeland of humankind" was situated. In his view, the Indo-European migration southward was a result of the defeat. Thus, a "Semitic assault" was dated to the Paleolithic era. (Demin 1997: 363–365; 1999: 108, 169, 296–298)

A more sophisticated version argues that a permanent expansion of the political arrangement – called either the Eurasian project (Shiropayev 2001) or the First Empire (Khomyakov 2003) – was introduced by the Semites rather than being a Semitic expansion itself. This arrangement was allegedly imposed by the Semites upon the naïve Aryans, who were less experienced in politics but who borrowed this system, causing endless misfortune. Therefore, in contrast to other Russian nationalists who are obsessed with Empire, the proponents of this view reject the contemporary state as Semitic heritage and call for the disintegration of Russia, if only to replace it with smaller purely ethnic Russian polities.

Certain radical authors represent the Jews as the Russes' younger brothers who lost their true way (Kandyba 1995: 144, 151, 157–160; Vashkevich 1996: 24, 38, 88, 225). For example, Viktor Kandyba (1997) reproduced the myth of the Kike-Masonic conspiracy as though it was rooted in King Solomon's reforms. He constructed irreconcilable conflict between the northern and southern Russes, the latter being identified with the Jews ('Rusalims') as though they persistently wanted to rule the world. Yet he focused mainly on the Christian period and accused the Jews of an introduction and dispersion of inhuman ideology, by which he meant Christianity.

Russian radicals tirelessly wage a symbolic war against the Jews and do not fail to argue that Slavic culture is much older and richer than Jewish culture. In this context, it is the Russians who are called the 'chosen people' while Jewish culture and history are permanently belittled. In particular, the radical authors argue that the Jews borrowed all their knowledge from the Russes-Aryans and that Judaism was shaped at the basis

of the old Vedic religion, which was the genuine Aryan heritage (Emelyanov 1979: 7, 25–27, 46; Vashkevich 1996: 24, 38, 88, 225; Petukhov 1998: 19; Istarkhov 2000: 12, 53–54, 132, 139). When accusing the Semites of an appropriation of the Russes' cultural heritage, these authors do not fail to appropriate foreign gods, ascribing them to the Slavic tradition. They also generously endow the early Slavs with alien territories and include various non-Slavic groups in their composition. In addition, they also borrow ideas, themes and even prayers from both Old and New Testaments.

These authors are passionately 'discovering' traces of allegedly persistent confrontation between the Aryans and the Semites in order to confirm the racial view of history. Indeed, they interpret contemporary development as a direct result of the same 'Semitic expansion'. One of them goes so far as to paraphrase Stalin's argument on the aggravation of the class war with a transition to socialism. He claims that, "the war of Gods aggravates with a transition to the New Age [of Aquarius]" (Istarkhov 2000: 319). He calls for a Russian revolt against the Jews and presents Russian Paganism as the main weapon of the struggle.<sup>19</sup>

Russian radicals represent immigrants as the forerunners of decline and collapse as though the immigrants want to force out native inhabitants, to appropriate their vital resources, deprive them of all their cultural achievements and establish a new order. In brief, these radicals are informed by the well-known xenophobic anti-immigrant myth (Shnirelman 2008), although they provide it with a universal meaning and push it back into the remote past. For example, a Neo-Pagan leader Alexander Belov (2000; 2003: 35–46) discovered similar processes in the most ancient "Aryan past" and even in the "Aryan homeland". And Yuri Petukhov (2008: 204–205; 2009: 258–259, 271, 305, 313) referred to this argument to explain a decline in all ancient civilisations in the Near East.

It is in this way that the Russian radicals actively use Aesopian language: when describing what has allegedly happened in the remote past, actually they point to the contemporary social issues that alarm them. Moreover, they suggest their own solutions to these problems. For example, Belov (2000) argues that, to survive, one has to consolidate people, to build up a cohesive community, to elect a chief and to develop extensive knowledge. And for the chief to be out of reach of any criticism one has to proclaim him God.

Whereas nationalists of the 19th century were happy with an image of the medieval ancestors, contemporary Russian radicals are obsessed with the prehistoric past and refer to contemporary achievements in archaeology and comparative linguistics.<sup>20</sup> Their point of departure is the origins of *Homo sapiens* and particular human races, rather than the origins of state or an emergence of civilisation. Moreover, they make great efforts to identify the Palaeolithic Cro-Magnon people with the Russes. For that the Russes are represented as the very root of the White Race as well as the forefathers of all other European peoples. They are also depicted as both the builders of the first civilisation and as civilisers.

To put it another way, numerous contemporary epigone myth-builders integrate scraps of former esoteric beliefs in all possible combinations. Time and again they refer to the 'Aryan issue' and turn Blavatsky's Aryans into Slavic Aryans or even Ancient Russes. In addition, whereas Blavatsky argued that Aryans began to give way to the Sixth Race in the modern epoch, contemporary Russian occult scholars associate this crucial transformation with a transition from the Piscean Era to the Age of Aquarius

as though the 'evil epoch' of *Kali Yuga* would end at that time and a new Golden Age (*Satya Yuga*) would begin. For many of them, this provides Russia a special mission because the Russians are the direct descendants of the "bright Aryans" and the Russian language has to unite all people on the Earth in a highly integrated "World Community" (Dmitriyeva 1992: 36–41). While doing that, some of Blavatsky's followers want to deliver her constructions from obvious contradictions and inconsistency, and at the same time try to revive polygenism together with its racist outcomes (Dmitriyeva 1992: 195–197; 1994: 321). It is in this way that they restore an obsolete race theory. Yet, most esoteric teachers are dreaming of uniting humanity as one and the same Aryan race. In contrast, Neo-Nazis (including Russian radicals) aim to disintegrate humanity while at the same time providing Aryans a privileged position.

While building up an esoteric myth, Blavatsky incorporated some ideas that were popular in the contemporary scholarly and quasi-scholarly milieu and, thus, the final product seemed to be a scholarly concept. Yet, as occurs with any religious doctrine, in due course the myth stagnated, whereas scholarship kept on developing. To put it other way, the myth has lost any links with academic knowledge and became the basis of the faith, although it secured a pseudo scholarly terminology. That is why, while it does not attract scholars, it is very popular among lay people who lack the necessary scholarly experience, cannot process the scientific materials and are unable to scrutinise the scholarly constructions. Instead, their ideas are usually based on nationalist or patriotic ideas, i.e. they make efforts to meet ideological demands.

Until the mid-1990s the Aryan myth found room only in marginal national-patriotic publications and some crank periodicals (*Nauka i Religia*, *Svet: Priroda i Chelovek*). Yet, it began invading the book market from the late 1990s. At the beginning of the 21st century even certain well-known publishing houses (EKSMO, Yauza, Algorithm, Veche, FAIR-PRESS, and the like) did not fail to publish thick volumes and even series that contain various versions of the Aryan myth. Today one can find this myth within two literary genres: firstly, pseudo-scholarly works presented as alternative history, and secondly, belles-lettres. The idea of a northern homeland is repeated by numerous authors in hundreds of publications, including those of various Russian nationalist movements and Neo-Pagan communities, as well as all-Russian popular journals and science fictions from alternative authors and novels in the fashionable fantasy style. It is worth noting that some authors successfully work in both genres and use the novels to introduce or to discuss exotic or extravagant ideas that seem inappropriate in the context of alternative history. The print runs are usually 5,000 for each book, and many such books are published and re-published by one or several publishing houses. Their authors are very prolific – some of them publish one or even several books every year. Finally, today Hyperborea is a fashionable theme on Russian TV, especially the REN TV Channel.

## CONCLUSIONS

It is no accident that Aryans appeared in the discourse of radical Russian nationalism. This movement's ideologists believe that it is impossible to wake the masses and to involve them in extensive political activity without affecting their imagination with the

help of romantic ideas and attractive heroic images. They search for those ideas and images not in Russian history but in esoteric heritage and in Nietzsche's idea of a superman, which was used extensively by the Nazis. These authors argue that new Russian 'national-oriented' elite has to appropriate a heroic style. In search of this style they address the Aryan myth as well as fantasies about the northern homeland Hyperborea (Eliseyev 1995; Yashin 2006: 55–59). The myth of the Russes-Aryans is very popular among radical Russian nationalists. In particular, in the early 1990s it fascinated the then leader of the radical group Russian National Unity (RNU) Aleksander Barkashov (1993), who identified the Aryans with the White Race and presented the Russians as the "most direct both genetic and cultural descendants of the Aryans". At the same time a rapid numerical growth in the number of publications focused on the Aryan myth occurred in the late 1990s when Russia experienced a financial crisis and a painful re-distribution of property that gave the impression of the aggravation of the struggle between the Aryans and the Semites. Ever since, political life in Russia has degenerated and many former radical political activists have shifted to the sphere of literature, which provides them a channel to introduce their ideas to the general public.

Why does this Aryan myth seem attractive in contemporary Russia? Firstly, after the disintegration of the Soviet Union and separation of the southern republics, the new Russian borders have shifted northwards and Russia felt itself a northern country. Thus, the 'Nordic idea' met the urgent demands. Secondly, a localisation of the pristine Human homeland on Russian territory provides Russia a valuable symbolic capital while making it allegedly a sacred place where humanity was born. Thirdly, from this point, despite their historical migrations, Russians prove to be an indigenous people who have lived in the territory of the primordial homeland for millennia, rather than being newcomers. Fourthly, it is tempting to present Russians as a proto people, a mother people who gave birth to many others including, most importantly according to this logic, Europeans. In this case, Russians do not seem to be strangers, bearers of some different characteristics, in Europe. Quite the opposite, they belong to the European family of peoples, and therefore are able to develop their social and economic life no less successfully than other Europeans. Moreover, as the mother people, they are destined to be successful because Europeans inherited their characteristics from this mother people. Fifthly, some inborn qualities are meant by 'characteristics', and thus the views in question are closely connected with racial theory. In this context, Russians belong to the White Race and, more specifically, to the Aryans.

It is here that we reveal the image of the Aryans as a people who were bearers of some special qualities that distinguished them from all the other humans with respect to their physical appearance. These qualities make Aryans more perfect than all other people, and therefore they are destined to play the role of civilisers and builders of great civilisations. Moreover, this image is informed by the concept of polygeny, which, firstly, treats various races as distinct biological species and, secondly, argues that they originated from different ancestors and in different regions. A conclusion is that various races have different abilities for the development of culture and that their development is restrained by their biological nature. Therefore, Russian radicals demand a "maintenance of the human racial division", within which the Slavs occupy a deserved place among the Whites (Kandyba, Zolin 1997: 350). It is clear that this 'racial order' would leave no room for any mixed marriages, which is the dream of the aforementioned racist authors.

To be sure, at first glance all of this brings us back to the classical racial theory of the late 19th and early 20th centuries with their belief in the white man's mission. Yet, the contemporary concept depicts 'white humans' as colonised rather than colonisers. And it is the Russians who are presented as the vanguard of the white humans. It is they who have to rescue white humans from decline and extinction. However, one deals not only with the white humans. In some versions of the Aryan myth the Russians are represented as relatives of not only Europeans but also of those Asians who live in the territory of Russia. The myth emphasises a long common past that integrates the peoples within one and the same community. To be sure, this approach undermines the purity demanded by racial theory, yet it also beneficially uses some Eurasian ideas that reinterpret Russians as not conquerors but as people indigenous to all Russian territory rather than only the European part. In addition, this approach consolidates Russia as a well-integrated nation. Therefore, Petr M. Zolin claims that his co-author, Kandyba's, books "encourage the common self-awareness of the peoples of Russia just as the *Rossiyane*, who for millennia had to resolve the same general problems with respect to all the outside world" (Kandyba, Zolin 1997: 296). At the same time it is also evident that the Aryan myth provides Russia with a new universal doctrine, which contradicts the idea of a well-defined nation.

In addition the Aryan myth's popularity deals with the territorial integrity of the country, as though it is threatened by non-Russian minorities. It also legitimises territorial expansion. Indeed, the myth of a homeland in the North disconnects Russian identity from any well-bounded territory, making it senseless to talk of any territorial borders. Hence, any territorial expansion is possible. At the same time, Russian radical nationalists emphatically reject any accusations of such an expansion. Instead they claim that all the territory of Russia is primordial Russian territory. By the 'remote past' they mean all of Indo-European prehistory, which is treated as Aryan history and ascribed to the Slavic-Russes.

Finally, Aryan heritage helps to identify an external enemy in order to blame that enemy for all contemporary Russian misfortunes. In contrast to the more simple Nazi myth, today the enemy is identified as 'an international horde of southerners' consisting mainly of former Soviet compatriots coming to Russia as labour migrants. Yet the myth does not fail to point to the Jews as the driving force of this migration as though they intentionally use it to subjugate Russians, to deprive them of their vital natural and economic resources, and even culture and identity. In this context the Jews are depicted as an external force, or the fifth column, rather than as Russian citizens. Within the Aryan myth they are identified with Absolute Evil, and radical writers make efforts to demonstrate that they played this role throughout the human past including prehistory. Thus, in contrast to Soviet dogma, the view of the past has drastically changed, and social forces of development are replaced with racial ones.

From this perspective, a rehabilitation of the swastika is worth noting. In the view of many Russian nationalists, the swastika symbolises an inherent attribute of Russian traditional culture from 'Hyperborean times'. In fact, this rehabilitation is undertaken intentionally to revise the swastika's dreadful role in the history of the 20th century as the symbol of a struggle for racial purity, with all its tragic results. It is well known that in Nazi propaganda the swastika was a symbol of aggression aimed at the Jews. Contemporary Russian Neo-Nazis manifest the same attitudes: the Aryan swastika is

in conflict with the Star of David. Today the swastika fascinates Russian skinheads, who are the major consumers of Aryan ideology, which pits them against the Others, primarily immigrants.

The Arctic Aryan myth has a great symbolic value for Russian radicals. They hope that the current identity crisis might be overcome by linking Russians with a new Hyperborean, or Aryan identity. As I have pointed out elsewhere (Shnirelman 2007), one can discover an archetype here, an aspiration for an absolute principle: an absolute centre of the world (i.e., the North Pole), as well as an absolute beginning in time (hence the desire to identify one's ancestors with the Paleolithic primordial people). This image is obviously ambivalent. It includes, on the one hand, an idea of isolationism, which is inherent in Russian nationalism (the unique origin of the ancestors up to extraterrestrials – according to some versions of the Aryan myth, the ancestors arrived at the North Pole from another planet), and on the other hand, imperial universalism manifested as Russian Messianism (Russians as the ancestors of all peoples, or of only the white Race, and as the builders of culture and all early civilisations). This identity has attractive attributes: the northern people are robust, courageous, reliable, truthful, and generous, have a deep knowledge of the world, and so on. The message is as follows: the Russian people enjoyed a great past; hence, they are destined to have a great future.

As we can see, the other features of the Aryan myth are hyper-migrationism and cyclic theory. It views the Russian past as endless peaks and troughs – the formation of the largest world empire, encompassing all Eurasia if not half of the Old World, and its subsequent collapse and disintegration into numerous peoples and states that waged bloody wars with each other. Allegedly, these cycles repeated time and again throughout history. Adhering to this concept allows people to aspire to several goals. Firstly, it justifies empire and makes it a permanent and significant element of human history; secondly, it legitimises Russian claims to all the territories of the former Russian empire or Soviet Union; and thirdly, it gives hope for the restoration of the all-embracing and powerful Russian state in its full might.

The myth objectivises history, while providing it with a teleological essence. In contrast to Hegel, who argued that human history climaxed in the German people, contemporary Russian radicals go much further. According to Viktor Kandyba, “a development of the Russians is viewed as the major and necessary integral part of the All-Cosmic evolution of God and God-like [essence] in unrealized reality” (1997: 415). Thus, in this version of the Aryan myth, all human history begins and ends with the Russian people. This view is shared by many Russian radicals and nourishes the messianic idea.

## NOTES

1 Here I discuss only ideology rather than practice.

2 For an acknowledgement of this fact by one of the participants, see Gusev 2000: 49–50, 96.

3 On the popularity of occult ideas among Soviet intellectuals, see Rosenthal 1997 and Menzel et al. 2012.

4 One could observe various sorts of xenophobia in Russia over the last two decades, including Russophobia. In this article I focus on the radical views of ethnic Russian nationalists. For the politics of the past among some other peoples in Russia and elsewhere, see Shnirelman 2001; 2005; 2006; 2009.

5 See, for example, Shcherbakov 1991: 135; Khomyakov 2006: 14–17, 68–71. For a discussion of those ideas, see Yanov 1987: 158; Moroz 2005: 34.

6 On the origins and history of the Aryan myth, see Poliakov 1974; Olender 1992; Godwin 1993; Figueira 2002.

7 One of them has even defended a PhD thesis on the political myth (see Kolyev 2003).

8 See, for example, Shtepa 1991–1992; Ostrovsky 2001; Shiropayev 2001; Khomyakov 2003.

9 It is no accident that this is reflected in the very titles of the respective books (cf. Khomyakov 2003; Savelyev 2007).

10 For Blavatsky's race theory, see Godwin 1993: 19–20, 41–43.

11 Austrian Arysosphy played the key role in this transformation (see Goodrick-Clarke 1985).

12 For this, see Shnirelman 1995; Shnirelman, Komarova 1997.

13 In 1991 Dugin made an attempt to establish a journal called *Giperboreyets*, but failed.

14 For this, see Shnirelman 2007.

15 This has been thoroughly discussed in Shnirelman 2007.

16 It is noteworthy that attempts to distance the Jews from the human species were taken in Russia already in the pre-revolutionary period. For example, the newspaper *Novoye vremya* presented the Jews as some “faked humans” (Stolypin 1911).

17 About the methodological difficulties in proto-Afrasian and proto-Indo-European reconstructions see, for example, Militarev, Pejros, Shnirelman 1988; Militarev, Shnirelman 1988; Mallory 1997.

18 It is worth noting that ten years earlier Petukhov (1998: 19–21) shared a traditional view of the ‘Semitic invasion’.

19 In 2008 this book, which is very influential among Russian Neo-Pagans, was recognised by the Russian court as an “extremist work” and its distribution was banned. Nonetheless, its author's lectures are easily accessible on the Internet.

20 Belov's novel on the ancient Aryans was provided with the telling abstract: “The Aryan topic, full of genuine scholarly studies, allows, contrary to preconceived opinion, to extend the borders of historical self-determination of the Russian people, to enrich their spiritual-moral state” (Belov 2000).

## REFERENCES

- Antonenko 1994 = Антоненко, Сергей Григорьевич. *Русь арийская (непривычная правда)*. Москва: Паллада, 1994.
- Asov 1998= Асов, Александр Игоревич. *Мифы и легенды древних славян*. Москва: Наука и религия, 1998.
- Asov 2008 = Асов, Александр Игоревич. *Боги славян и рождение Руси*. Москва: Вече, 2008.
- Вakov, Dubichev 1995= Баков, Антон Алексеевич; Вадим Рудольфович Дубичев. *Цивилизации Средиземья*. Екатеринбург: Уральский рабочий, 1995.
- Barkashov 1993= Баркашов, Александр Петрович. *Узнающий прошлое – видит будущее. – Русский порядок*. 1993. № 2: 4.
- Barzun, Jacques 1966. *The French Race: Theories of Its Origins and their Social and Political Implications Prior to the Revolution*. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press.
- Belov 2000 = Белов, Александр Константинович. *Великий поход: арийская мифология*. Москва: Современный писатель, 2000.
- Belov 2003 = Белов, Александр Константинович. *Искусство партизанской войны*. Москва: ФАИР-ПРЕСС, 2003.
- Bezverkhii 1993= Безверхий, Виктор Николаевич. *Философия истории. – Волхв*. 1993. № 1: 3–102.

- Blavatskaya 1991 = Блаватская, Елена Петровна. *Тайная доктрина*. Т. 2. *Антропогенезис*. Кн. 3. Москва: Прогресс, Сирин, 1991.
- Blavatskaya 1992 = Блаватская, Елена Петровна. *Тайная доктрина*. Т. 2. *Антропогенезис*. Кн. 4. Москва: Прогресс, Сирин, 1992.
- Cecil, Robert 1972. *The Myth of the Master-Race: Alfred Rosenberg and Nazi Ideology*. London: B. T. Batsford.
- Danilov 1996 = Данилов, Владимир Владимирович. *Русь Ведическая в прошлом и будущем. Основы мистической политологии (Евангелие от Ариев)*. Москва: Воля России, 1996.
- Demin 1997 = Демин, Валерий Никитич. *Тайны русского народа*. Москва: Вече, 1997.
- Demin 1999 = Демин, Валерий Никитич. *Загадки Русского Севера*. Москва: Вече, 1999.
- Dmitriyeva 1992 = Дмитриева, Лариса Петровна. «Тайная доктрина» Елены Блаватской в некоторых понятиях и символах. Часть 1. *Космогенезис*. Магнитогорск: АМРИТА, 1992.
- Dmitriyeva 1994 = Дмитриева, Л. П. «Тайная доктрина» Елены Блаватской в некоторых понятиях и символах. Часть 2. *Антропогенезис*. Магнитогорск: АМРИТА-УРАЛ, 1994.
- Dugin 1993 = Дугин, Александр Гельевич. *Гипербореическая теория*. Москва: Арктогея, 1993.
- Eliseyev 1995 = Елисеев, Александр. *Национал-революционный стиль. – Нация*. 1995. Vol. 1: 9.
- Emelyanov 1979 = Емельянов, Валерий Николаевич. *Десионизация*. Париж, 1979.
- Figueira, Dorothy M. 2002. *Aryans, Jews, Brahmans: Theorizing Authority Through Myths of Identity*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Globa 1995 = Глоба, Павел Павлович. *Живой огонь. Учение древних ариев*. Москва: Вагриус, Яуза, Лань, 1995.
- Godwin, Joscelyn 1993. *Arktos. The Polar Myth in Science, Symbolism, and Nazi Survival*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Goodrick-Clarke, Nicholas 1985. *The Occult Roots of Nazism. The Ariosophists of Austria and Germany 1890–1935*. Wellingborough: Aquarian Press.
- Gusev 2000 = Гусев, Олег Михайлович. *Белый конь Апокалипсиса*. Санкт-Петербург: ЛИО Редактор, 2000.
- Guseva 1991 = Гусева, Наталья Романовна. Глубокие корни. – В. П. Янков (ред.). *Дорогами тысячелетий*, кн. 4. Москва: Молодая Гвардия, 1991, 3–27.
- Guseva 1994 = Гусева, Наталья Романовна. Арктическая родина в Ведах. – *Древность: арьи, славяне*. Вып. 1. Москва: Витязь, 1994, 6–20.
- Guseva 1998 = Гусева, Наталья Романовна. *Русские сквозь тысячелетия. Арктическая теория*. Москва: Белые альвы, 1998.
- Istarkhov 2000 = Истархов, Владимир Алексеевич. *Удар русских богов*. Москва: Институт экономики и связи с общественностью, 2000.
- Jemal' 1992 = Джемаль, Гейдар. Имперостроительство и сакральный опыт. – П. В. Тулаев (ред.). *Россия и Европа: опыт соборного анализа*. Москва: Наследие, 1992, 414–419.
- Kandyba 1995 = Кандыба, Дмитрий Викторович. *Русский гипноз*. Москва: КСП, 1995.
- Kandyba 1997 = Кандыба, Виктор М. *История русской империи*. Санкт-Петербург: Эфко, 1997.
- Kandyba, Kandyba 1988 = Кандыба, Виктор Михайлович; Дмитрий Викторович Кандыба. *Основы СК-терапии*. Том 1. *История СК-терапии*. СПб.: Фонд народного киновидеотворчества «СПбФНК», 1988.
- Kandyba, Zolin 1997 = Кандыба, Виктор Михайлович, Петр Михайлович Золин. *История и идеология русского народа*. Санкт-Петербург: Лань, 1997.
- Khomuakov 2003 = Хомяков, Петр Михайлович. *Свои и чужие. Драма идей*. Москва: Полиграфист, 2003.
- Khomuakov 2006 = Хомяков, Петр Михайлович. *Отчет Русским богам ветерана Русского движения*. Москва: Белые альвы, 2006.

- Kolyev 2003 = Кольев (Савельев), Андрей Николаевич. *Политическая мифология: реализация социального опыта*. Москва: Логос, 2003.
- Lakshin 1993 = Лакшин В. «Конец, тупик, кризис». Россия и русские на своих похоронах. – *Независимая газета*. 17 марта 1993: 5.
- Mallory, James P. 1997. The Homelands of the Indo-Europeans. – Roger Blench, Matthew Spriggs (eds.). *Archaeology and Language*. Vol. 1. *Theoretical and Methodological Orientations*. London: Routledge, 93–121.
- Menzel, Birgit; Michael Hagemester; Bernice G. Rosenthal (eds.) 2012. *The New Age of Russia. Occult and Esoteric Dimensions*. Berlin: Verlag Otto Sagner 2012.
- Militarev, Pejros, Shnirelman 1988 = Милитарев, Александр Юрьевич; Илья Иосифович Пейрос, Виктор Александрович Шнирельман. Методические проблемы лингвоархеологических реконструкций этногенеза. – *Советская этнография*. 1988. № 4: 24–38.
- Militarev, Aleksander U.; Victor A. Shnirelman 1988. *The Problem of Proto-Afrasian Home and Culture. An Essay in Linguoarchaeological Reconstruction*. A paper presented at the 12th International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences in Zagreb, 1988.
- Moroz 2005 = Мороз, Евгений Львович. *История «Мертвой воды» – от страшной сказки к большой политике. Политическое неоязычество в постсоветской России*. Stuttgart: ibidem-Verlag, 2005.
- Mozhaiskova 2001 = Можайскова, Ирина Владимировна. *Духовный образ русской цивилизации и судьба России*. Часть 1. Москва: Вече, 2001.
- Novgorodov 2006 =Новгородов Николай Сергеевич. *Сибирская прародина: в поисках Гипербореи*. Москва: Белые альвы, 2006.
- Olender, Maurice 1992. *The Language of Paradise: Race, Religion, and Philology in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Ostrovsky 2001 = Островский, Николай Николаевич. *Святые рабы: о русских и России*. Москва: ФЭРИ-В, 2001.
- Rarus 1912–1913 = Папиус [Жерар Анкос]. Эзотерические беседы. – *Изида*. №1 (1912): 9–13; № 2 (1912): 11–16; № 4 (1913): 10–13; № 5 (1913): 14–17.
- Petukhov 1998 = Петухов, Юрий Дмитриевич. *Колыбель Зевса. История русов от «античности» до наших дней*. Москва: Метagalактика, 1998.
- Petukhov 2001 = Петухов, Юрий Дмитриевич. *Тайны древних русов*. Москва: Вече, 2001.
- Petukhov 2003 = Петухов, Юрий Дмитриевич. *История Русов*. Т. 1–2. *Древнейшая эпоха 40–43 тыс. до н. э.* Москва: Метagalактика, 2003.
- Petukhov 2008 = Петухов, Юрий Дмитриевич. *Русы Древнего Востока*. Москва: Вече, 2008.
- Petukhov 2009 = Петухов, Юрий Дмитриевич. *История древних русов*. Москва: Вече, 2009.
- Poliakov, Leon 1974. *The Aryan Myth*. London: Basic Books.
- Polozkov 1998 = Полозков, Иван. Россия, которую мы ищем. – *Патриот*. 1998. № 44: 8–9.
- Razumov, Khasin 1991 = Разумов, Геннадий Александрович; Михаил Федорович Хасин. *Тонущие города*. 2-ое изд. Москва: Стройиздат, 1991.
- Rosenthal, Bernice G. (ed.) 1997. *The Occult in Russian and Soviet Culture*. Ithaca, NY; London: Cornell University Press.
- Savelyev 2007 = Савельев, Андрей Николаевич. *Образ врага. Расология и политическая антропология*. Москва: Белые Альвы, 2007.
- Shcherbakov 1991 = Щербаков, Владимир Иванович. *Асгард – город богов*. Москва: Молодая Гвардия, 1991.
- Shigrapayev 2001 = Широпаев, Алексей Алексеевич. *Тюрьма народа: русский взгляд на Россию*. Москва: ФЭРИ-В, 2001.
- Shnirelman, Victor A. 1995. Alternative Prehistory. – *Journal of European Archaeology*. Vol. 3, No. 2: 1–20.

- Shnirelman, Victor A. 2001. *The Value of the Past. Myths, Identity and Politics in Transcaucasia*. *Senri Ethnological Studies* 57. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- Shnirelman, Victor A. 2005. *Purgas und Pureš: Urahenen der Mordwinen und Paradoxa der mordwinischen Identität*. – Eugene Khelimsky (hrsg.). *Mari und Mordwinen im heutigen Russland: Sprache, Kultur, Identität*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag, 529–563.
- Shnirelman 2006 = Шнирельман, Виктор Александрович. *Быть аланами. Интеллектуалы и политика на Северном Кавказе в XX веке*. Москва: НЛО, 2006.
- Shnirelman, Victor A. 2007. Russian Response: Archaeology, Russian Nationalism and Arctic Homeland. – Philip L. Kohl, Mara Kozelsky, Nachman Ben-Yehuda (eds.). *Selective Remembrance: Archaeology in the Construction, Commemoration, and Consecration of National Pasts*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 31–70.
- Shnirelman 2008 = Шнирельман, Виктор Александрович. Мигрантофобия и культурный расизм. – *Ab Imperio*. 2008. No. 2: 287–323.
- Shnirelman, Victor A. 2009. Aryans or Proto-Turks? Contested Ancestors in Contemporary Central Asia. – *Nationalities Papers*. Vol. 37, No. 5: 557–587.
- Shnirelman 2011 = Шнирельман, Виктор Александрович. *Порог толерантности. Идеология и практика нового расизма*. Т. 2. Москва: Новое литературное обозрение, 2011.
- Shnirelman, Victor A.; Galina A. Komarova 1997. Majority as a Minority: the Russian Ethno-Nationalism and Its Ideology in the 1970s–1990s. – Hans-Rudolf Wicker (ed.). *Rethinking Nationalism and Ethnicity: the Struggle for Meaning and Order in Europe*. Oxford: Berg Publishers, 211–224.
- Shtepa 1991–1992 = Штепа, Владимир Ильич. Влес-книга. – *Истоки*. 1991–1992. № 2–6.
- Shure 1914 = Шюре, Эдуар. *Великие посвященные. Очерк эзотеризма религий*. Калуга: Земская управа, 1914.
- Stolyrin 1911 = Столыпин, А. А. Заметки. – *Новое время*. 1911. 5 октября (18): 3–4.
- Surov 2001 = Суров Михаил Васильевич. *Вологодчина: невостребованная древность*. Вологда: Б. и., 2001.
- Uvarov 1998 = Уваров, Александр Тимофеевич. Русское национальное самосознание. – *Патриот*. 1998. № 23–24.
- Uvarov 2000 = Уваров, Александр Тимофеевич. Русское национальное самосознание. Современный взгляд. Москва: ИТРК, 2000.
- Vashkevich 1996 = Вашкевич, Николай Николаевич. *Утраченная мудрость или что в имени твоём*. Москва: Б.и., 1996.
- Yanov, Aleksander 1987. *The Russian Challenge and the Year 2000*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Yashin 2006 = Яшин, Сергей. *Против течения*. Санкт-Петербург: Опричное братство имени Святого преподобного Иосифа Волоцкого, 2006.