

TRADITION & MODERNITY



Selected Articles of

András László

BERSERKER
BOOKS



László András

Articles on Meta-Politics & Tradition

Index

Meta-Politics

pg.5-Considerations on the Relationship Between a Metaphysico-Traditional Weltanschauung and the Ultradextro-Conservative World View

12-A Brief Note on the Role of Political Background Powers

23-Ereignis and Power

29Liberalism and Bolshevism

30-Liberālismus contrā Libertātem

37-Man, Society, State

46-On Some of the Characteristics of the Post-Communist System

48-Tradition and Politics

Tradition

56-A Brief Outline of Yama and Niyama

59-A Critique of 'New Age'

62-A Few Remarks on the Temporal Phases of Human Life

69-Existence & Consciousness in the Light of the Metaphysical Tradition

82-Magic and realization

85-On 'Satan'

92-Power & Dominance

101-Tantrism & Sexuality

104-The Essence of Life and Death

113-The Evolutionary Self-Understanding of Man

125-The Path of the Knights

134-Tradition and the Current Age

Considerations on the Relationship Between a Metaphysico-Traditional Weltanschauung and the Ultradextro-Conservative World View

For us 'ultradesctro-conservatives' with a traditional orientation, the strong and organic connection between the world view that rests on the principles of 'Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Metaphysica Universalis Integralisque' and the political right, or, in a stricter sense, the extreme right and within this the ultra right-ultra conservative, imperio-monarchist extreme right, is clearly obvious.

The prerequisite of a true affirmation of 'Traditionalitas' is to fully and decidedly accept the right and the prerequisite of being genuinely rightist, in turn, is to resolutely affirm 'Spiritualitas Traditionalis'. In our circles this is experienced as truth and reality and -for us- this doesn't need to be explained further. For those, however, who are only taking the initial steps towards 'Traditionalitas' and for those who already consider themselves rightist and are now approaching the true, pure right (ultradextroconservative extreme right), but haven't reached it yet, or haven't perfectly realized it yet: this connection, while it may make sense, is not fully obvious yet; what's more, they may even consider our maximally resolute and unshakable affirmation of this connection to be exaggerated.

For a potentially deeper and more justified discernment and acceptance of the connection between these views, we'd like to outline a few points including their most fundamental theoretical basis. To do this, we must also say a few words about something that constitutes such an integral part of the world view of 'Metaphysico-Traditionalitas' in the strict sense, that without it we can not even speak about 'Metaphysico-Traditionalitas'.

The 'consideratio' of the basic principles of 'Metaphysico-Traditionalitas' is not philosophy but, with indisputable certainty, hyperphilosophy. This hyperphilosophy has (and indeed must have) a 'propaedeutica philosophica', well definable from the point of view of world-views. The most appropriate and accurate term for this 'propaedeutico-philosophicus' is 'metidealismus transscendantali-immanentialis et immanentali-transcendantalis theurgo-magico-solipsisticus absolutus'.

The 'philosophia metaphysica' that adequately applies this view may be considered to be the culmination of philosophy. In terms of 'hyperphilosophia metaphysica', the situation is somewhat different: in this case this is the only valid school possible and various "schools" may, at the most, only depict its variations. Where philosophy culminates, hyperphilosophy begins in the sense of a continuous self-transcendence, which is meant to connect philosophy with Sophia.

Those who hold a solipsistic view posit that Existence may only be Conscious Existence and no other Subject exists beside my own Conscious Subject(ness). I, Myself, am the Conscious Subject of Conscious Existence, its Subiectum and its Conscious Actionalitas, i.e. 'Realitas Obiectiva' (that may only be considered in a conscious sense) exists through my own Conscious Acts. Ultimately, only I exist Myself and nothing and nobody exists besides My own Self.

Freedom, Dominance, Power, Order and Hierarchy are the basic words/basic terms (with a solipsistic foundation) of 'both Traditionalitas' and right wing politicas with a metaphysical orientation. Philosophical and hyper-philosophical solipsism belongs directly to 'Metaphysico-Traditionalitas' and indirectly to 'Ultradextroconservativitas'. Exhibiting (significantly) different opinions in this respect means that one is seriously -if not fatally- confused regarding principles; such confusion likely extends to other, significant areas of principles-ideologies-views.

Beyond direct ideological preparation, an activist of party politics of course doesn't necessarily need to have philosophicus-hyperphilosophicus education: first and foremost they need courage, endurance and the ability to fight. Right wing leaders, however, beyond what should be and what is expected from activists, must have such complex ideological education for which the mere knowledge of ideology in the strict sense is less than insufficient. They must possess a deep knowledge and understanding of politology, history, sociology, law, military science, economics, philosophy and theology on a level that is above and beyond mere receptive knowledge, a level that presumes the activate presence of productive-creative qualities.

Correctly understood 'politicas' ('Politeia') presupposes an also correctly understood 'apoliticas' ('Apoliteia') in the background, without the latter in the slightest way weakening political activities. This, however, is only possible, if behind and above both of these there is a level from which both of these in fact originate; this level is 'metapoliticas' ('Metapoliteia'). From this level (in a sort of downward direction) it is possible to open both in the direction of 'politicas' and 'apoliticas'. It is possible and -as we noted earlier- it is necessary to open in both directions, we just need to decide -and we must decide unequivocally- which one should be (kept) at the forefront.

There is no doubt that in exceptional cases such a high metapolitical level may appear and subsist that the thought of an opening may not even come up. Such was the case of the supra-personal personality of Bhagavan Sri Ramana Maharshi. This, however, let's repeat it, is quite exceptional and – although it could definitely be exemplary – may hardly find proper and valid following.

The principle, metapolitical presence of 'Metaphysico-Traditionalitas' precipitates in the political-social domain as the right. The right – this should suffice without additional clarifying attributes; it should, but, alas, it doesn't.

It is normal nowadays that moderately decisive left-wing or contra-left wing parties that show some hardly noticeable, minuscule right wing tonality are generally denoted as "extreme right"; what's more, even parties that follow an unequivocally left wing, liberal-democratic line are called "extreme right", "fascist" or "nazi" by the extreme left in their crazed rampages.

Essentially, it is only the most extreme extreme right that is acceptable from a traditional point of view, but even here we need to make some distinctions. We can't truly and without reservations accept those lines that, although defined within the realm of the most extreme extreme right, are infused by contra-left and especially extreme contra-left tendencies, adopting and maintaining leftist ideologies, methods and style elements and mixing them up with truly rightist-extreme rightist principles and objectives. (There were, there have been and unfortunately there most likely will be such lines in the ranks of the extreme right that are not only infused by extreme leftist ideologies, but are also prepared to enter into certain collaboration with any groups of the extreme left that are prepared to do the same.)

It is not only the most extreme extreme right that a traditional orientation – both in the political and social realm – claims but also a pure right/extreme right that is void of any and all contra-leftist contamination. This is what we may call ultraright – ultraconservative extreme right or ultradextro-conservative extreme right. This is not the right represented by Mussolini or Hitler or others, somewhat closely related to them. What we're talking about is the radical adaptation of the pure and true right of Bonald, De Maistre and Metternich in the current era.

The most reliable, most significant ideologico-theoreticus of this right in the 20th Century, presenting the most comprehensive view, was Julius Evola.

The foundation of this ultradextro-conservativitas is clearly traditional and it may truly become a political world-view only based on a traditional *weltanschauung*.

This starting position also excludes that we, as far as we're concerned, would clash at any time with any honest and serious –although not traditional ultradextro-conservative– line of the most extreme right, whatever nationality it may be. Quite the opposite: we're aiming at friendly, comradely cooperation, at the deepening and extension of such cooperation. On the other hand –although we especially intend to cooperate with the ultradextro-conservative extreme right–, we don't consider even the otherwise most respectful circles of the 'Evolian' wing of the traditional ultradextro-conservative extreme right to be the standard, especially an unquestionable standard, for us.

The life opus of René Guénon and -even more so- Julius Evola is absolutely indispensable for anybody who wants to see clearly in the realms of metaphysico-traditional and traditional ultradextro-conservative world views, but this is not about "following", especially not in the current sense of the word. These personalities have provided so far the most enlightening standard for the Western world in respect of these world views and orientations and it would be nothing less than crazy not to take Them into consideration. It would be even more senseless to set Them in opposition to each other now, after their death. Alas, it seems that some don't consider this to be such an absurd and senseless experiment and -although just quietly for now- they start to give voice to such views. What's more, some go as far as -carefully- clashing Julius Evola the 'philosophus' with Julius Evola the 'politicus-politologus' or with Julius Evola the traditionalist in the strict sense. (Not to mention that previously, people in certain countries or even world – wide, who sympathized with 'Traditionalism' even to a small degree, were aiming to form the best relationship with each other, quite differently from the quarreling devotees of other spiritual, especially pseudo-spiritual currents; in this respect, the situation is quite different today: Guenonians stand in opposition to Evolians, but they also stand in opposition to other Guenonians and the same applies to Evolians, vice versa. These are naturally artificial, exclusively personal oppositions, without principle foundations.)

Although the opposing terms left-right developed at the end of the 18th Century in France, they may be projected back or forward in time, without limitation. These are not the best terms but we use them because we're not aware of better ones. There was a time when everything stood in the sign of the right and everybody -at least almost everybody- was rightist. People who really mattered could only stand on the right. Both the Ghibelline / Hohenstaufen and the Guelf / Welf parties were rightist in the Middle Ages; we may only say that the right wing nature of the Ghibelline / Hohenstaufen party was more pronounced and unequivocal, more intense and more pure, but no deciding role was granted to the left in any of them.

We may say, correctly, that the political-societal projection of the meta-political reality of 'Metaphysico-Traditionalitas' is the true right; what follows from this, however, is that the political-societal projection of the contra-metapolitical reality of the 'Antitraditionalitas' is the left. This seems obvious and can't be up for discussion if we stay within the realm of sanity.

The political-societal world view of a person -as long as we're talking about a human representative- who orientates himself (or intends to do so) according to the principles of 'Metaphysico-Traditionalitas', even if he decides to give preference to apoliticitas, is almost necessarily right wing to some degree; yet, it almost seems to follow from this that he'll still stand behind anti-traditionalism (antitraditionalitas) or behind the left, the contra-left or behind the right-extreme right with a contra-left contamination.

It is certain that there are many on the right or extreme right who are not in the least close to the type of person who orientates himself traditionally. The eventual decency of these men in general, or that they may be decent workers in or even fighters for the cause of the right or extreme right, may not be questioned; what may be questioned, however, is whether they see clearly in terms of what the true right is. We think that we rightfully suspect that they don't see clearly in this respect.

This extreme ignorance makes it possible that extreme rightists may have an anti-traditional orientation. This is no doubt possible. What's impossible is that people with a truly traditional orientation should be leftist. Is it possible that somebody -knowing the subject matter- despite of all this would declare himself a traditionalist while in the same time, declare himself to be a leftist, too? Since this could be actualized, it is possible. If this was so in actuality, which is unlikely, we would still have to doubt if such person really grasped the essence of "Tradition" and 'Traditionalitas' in their true depth.

When looking at the issue from the context of certain principles, considering it from heights and depths and free from confusions, we may fully exclude the possibility that somebody who confesses a world - view based on the principles of 'Metaphysico-Traditinality' , fully knowing what left and right means, could be leftist; further, we may also foretell that such a person will sooner or later become rightist, if he hasn't already.

There exists a popular and dilettantish conception according to which a truly spiritual man is absolutely apolitical, so much so that he doesn't formulate any kind of opinion in any kind of political question at all. Such people, because there really are such people, are not apolitical but -almost without exception- coward and "careful"; they give up on everything so they won't even formulate an opinion silently, within themselves since this may cause trouble for them and for their family. There are others who are able to constantly change their positions based on a low, opportunistic perspective so they can gain pathetic advantages. The previous type is different: they don't want to lie, they don't want to change their positions; instead, they opt for no position at all and they don't formulate even a secret opinion. From a spiritual point of view this is not any less despicable.

A state of absolute supra-position is possible but this is infinitely exceptional; this was the case of Sri Ramana Maharshi. Otherwise even those who, through metapolitical motivation, choose being fully apolitical may have (and should have) a metapolitical weltanschauung and a political world view; this -by a traditional orientation- can only be right wing, in all likeliness extreme right wing in the sense of ultradextro-conservativitas which one experiences in such a way that one doesn't want to actively participate in the sphere of operative politics. And this, like this, is perfectly legitimate and acceptable.

Nobody has to be an active politician forced into an extra-marginal position – this is of course not even advisable. However, everybody who doesn't live completely outside of all direct and indirect (even on several levels indirect) political relations should develop their own political position and world-view.

The view that one must be a centrist between the left and the right is a leftist view and it has nothing to do with the center. Centrality, axiality and polarity stand in the closest relationship with traditionalis dextroconservativitas and they can't be related to a luke-warm leftism that doesn't even grasp these concepts anyway. As we noted earlier, if we look back into the past, we can see the hegemony of rightism and the more we look back, the more this is so. The furthest past is almost completely purely traditional and, in this sense, that age stood in the sign and under the dominance of the right. It was the age of King-Gods and God-Kings, the era of sacred Kings and Holy Empires.

Traditionalis dextroconservativitas has always been thinking in terms of Monarchies and Monarchs, perhaps their equivalents – both in the past and today. The 'Führerstaat' as a state form may only be considered acceptable on a temporary basis. If the reality of dynastico-successionalis monarcho-legitimitas can't prevail for reasons that can't be overcome or eliminated, then -temporarily (and this period may be quite long)- a Ruler or a Ruler-Governor must exercise unlimited rulership-power as head of state while keeping the monarchical state-form fully and perfectly intact. This principle should not be compromised even in the most extreme circumstances, maximum in the sense of accepting (with reservations) the short and obviously temporary phase of a restoration process.

When it comes to judging the most extreme right (but not in the sense of ultradextro-conservative extreme right) our position is rather ambivalent. On the one hand, we'd like to aim at a friendly-comradely cooperation and, beyond this, at a political-tactical cooperation, on the other hand we can't hide our reservations that are borderline rejections when it comes to certain particularities. The reason for such reservations are the strong presence of the already mentioned contra-leftist or extreme contra leftist influences; the strength of these may vary, but their presence is never weak.

Those who orientate themselves traditionally and thus approach the right are obviously not influenced by the contra-right propaganda of the left or by any argument against the right coming from the left. All such arguments should be disregarded.

We're more concerned about whether the extreme right may be infiltrated by proletarian influences and if a proletarian mentality may prevail there. If the answer to these is a definitive yes, then we must consider restricting our initiatives that aim at widening and deepening our cooperation.

It is known – both from more and less reliable sources – that at the time of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact friendly conversations started to develop between the communist and national socialist-Hungarist inmates in the Csillag Prison in Szeged (Hungary). The topic of conversations between these inmates, who were otherwise bitter enemies, centered around the near future, the time of possible reconciliation between them when the red color of the Hungarian flag, representing communism and the green, representing national socialism-Hungarism, would find not only peace in the white color, but an alliance against the then reigning feudal-capitalist Horthy system. Although this was not an official position of either party, it reveals a mentality that was wide-spread at the time and the residues of which we can still observe today: the pipe dream of the possibility of reconciliation between the most extreme extreme right and the most extreme extreme left.

With some exaggeration we should say that through the re-actualization of the early modern age we intend to re-instate the Middle Ages and the Antiquity after that and, finally, the prehistoric age. Of course, this is an exaggeration, but there is definitely truth behind it. We would like to restore everything that may actually be restored, even if this means only some fragments or only some partial achievement. In this respect we'd be satisfied even with the conditions of sixty-seventy years ago, although we'd be much happier if we could go back six hundred-seven hundred years not to mention six thousand-seven thousand or sixty thousand-seventy thousand years.

Traditional orientation may begin with nostalgia; in fact, it often does. The continuation, however, must gradually detach itself from the determining role of nostalgia and in a late stage even from its presence. We must be able to see all of the -mostly negative- characteristics of a given era. The approach must always be a calm critique. Both optimism and pessimism are unaryan characteristics, completely alien to a traditional orientation. We must exercise sharp critique in all cases, including the political ones without any trace of desperation or rage.

There were and there are people who think that power may only be dark and sinful (Bela Hamvas also subscribed to this view) not only in the advanced phase of the Kali-Yuga, but by principle and always. We consider this view to be fundamentally unacceptable. There is no doubt that in the Kali-Yuga, mainly in its advanced phases (especially with the 20th and 21st Centuries) power is possessed and usurped by Darkness; this is sort of obvious. But this doesn't mean at all that Power and Dominance (Rulership) may not be based on true and real Supremacy. Theoretically they most definitely can, practically much less so, but even today this is not an impossibility. And if this is so -and we think it definitely is- , true and superior Dominance and true and rightful, legally possessed Power – void of all dark accents and infernal overtones has always been possible, in all eras; today much less so, but in exceptional cases it's still conceivable. With time this possibility will almost completely disappear, but it is likely that it won't be and in fact it can't be lost completely, especially not on the level of possibilities.

Both the traditional weltanschauung and the ultradexgtro-conservative world-view is being marginalized in our World, even though the interest occasionally flames up towards them. These views, however, will never be completely eliminated and there are things we can do to sustain them and keep them alive to some degree, at least within a small circle. Precisely this is what we consider to be our task.

A Brief Note on the Role of Political Background Powers

When addressing the background powers of history and politics we must start by considering where exactly these powers begin. They begin – and this is their lowest level – with secret diplomacy, i.e. those organizations, processes and operations of diplomacy that are taking place in the background of public diplomacy. Thus there is secret diplomacy on the one hand, and there are various secret services on the other: the operations between intelligence and counter-intelligence agencies partially merged with secret diplomacy. Secret diplomacy also has levels. The activities of diplomacy of various degrees of secrecy are not performed on the same level, thus there are levels of secret diplomacy that don't know about each other's activities. There are intelligence and counter-intelligence organizations that are not aware of certain levels of intelligence and counter-intelligence levels. This goes so far that secret services inform other secret services about such things that if their informer was caught, he'd be executed. Yet, the most secret versions of these are still the least hidden manifestations of the background powers.

Behind these there stand various secret societies, which we should rather call exclusive societies instead, since the network of such secret and exclusive societies like, for example, that of freemasonry, categorically state that they are not secret societies; exclusive but not secret societies, not involved in politics and are supposed to be actually harmless humanitarian organizations. (But we know this just a bad joke.) Freemasonry is an exclusive and secret society, because what's exclusive to the outside is, in this case, secretive on the inside. A freemason, for example, is not allowed to reveal who is a freemason. There are various organizations, partially cover organizations, partially manifest organizations that belong to freemasonry, including various clubs, like the International Pen Club, International Rotary Club network, International Good Templar network. All these are the manifestations of freemasonry. The prominent members of these clubs are always freemasons. Freemason organizations are called latomic organizations from the Greek word "latomos", which means mason and is a technical name reserved for freemasonry.

There are so called para-latomic organizations, parallel organizations to freemasonry that essentially belong to freemasonry. We must mention first of all the Order of the Illuminati which is an exceptionally dark version of such orientations; the darkest branches of freemasonry are directly influenced and controlled by the Order of the Illuminati.

We must emphasize that there are significant differences, even oppositions between branches of freemasonry, however, concerning significant and fundamental questions, there is always concession and cooperation between them.

We are aware of some lodges that are indeed apolitical. In France, for example, there is a lodge called "Grande Triade" or "Tradition", which represents a "Guenonian" orientation and extracts itself from the normal course of freemasonry. But fundamentally we must say that the entirety of freemasonry, including the least dark branches of them – like, for example, the Scandinavian lines – cooperate with the darkest branches in significant and fundamental questions and causes.

The darkest orientation of freemasonry is represented by the so called "Grand Orient" which is the most dangerous of all freemason organizations that took root in France. This was the line that already in the period preceding 1789 had completely shifted to an atheist foundation. The grand master of this was the Duke of Chartres, later of Orléans, who was called Philippe Égalité and who possessed a fully demonic personality.

égalité

He was the head of the house of Bourbon-Orléans and he voted for the death of Louise XVI. His son was Philippe Louise, the bourgeoisie king who succeeded Charles X., the last great French king on the throne. The 1848 revolution drove even the rather moderate Philippe Louise away from the throne; even he was too much for the freemasons. There were two other legitimate French kings, Louise XIX and Henry V, however, they were unable to attain the throne. Louise XIX was the son, Henry V was the grandson of Charles X.

Freemasonry manifested itself in 1717; this is when it declared its ambition and goals for world domination. The two hundred year intervals are interesting: 1517 – protestant reformation, 1717 – self-manifestation of freemasonry, and 1917 – the two Russian revolutions. The same forces were behind the events of 1517, 1717 and 1917, but what had been planned and manifested in 1717, they started to implement one cosmological day later, in 1789 (one cosmological day is 72 years). This was not without precedent since these forces had played a role already in the English revolution, but the French revolution was the one unleashed fully by freemasonry. It is significant that when the reign of terror had reached its peak, freemasonry got banned.

Freemasonry also played an eminent role in unleashing the 1917 Soviet revolution. The young Soviet state, at a time when even the government had been starving, provided financial support to the "Grand Orient". Russian freemasonry, however, was banned after a while.

The 1918 Hungarian revolution, and then the Bolsheviks coming to power in 1919 was fully controlled by freemasonry. The Galilei – Circle in Hungary was the product of and controlled by freemasonry; this circle had a darker than usual facade, since this is where the Martinovics Lodge was active. The headmaster of this lodge was Oszkar (Jakubovics) Jaszi and it counted among its members Endre Ady [Hungarian poet – editor], as well as Jeno (Weissfeld) Varga, a prominent free mason who participated in the secret [communist] party leadership after 1945; he was the superior of Erno (Singer) Gero. Jeno (Weissfeld) Varga also had played an eminent role in the control of the economic life in the Soviet Union, so he spent almost all of his time there. Again, his subordinate was Erno (Singer) Gero and Singer's subordinate was Matyas (Rosenfeld) Rakosi, Rakosi's was Mihaly Farkas, whose earlier name was Mihail Wolf, originally Hermann Lowy, and Farkas' subordinate was Jozsef (Lederer) Revai. Below them we find such characters as Gabor Peter, whose original name was Beno Eisenberger, or Zoltan (Weinberger) Vas.

When freemasonry had got banned after 1948, baron Bertalan Hatvany transferred the Martinovics lodge to Paris where it is still active today; so when freemasonry was not allowed to operate in Hungary openly, it functioned as a coordinator-lodge in Paris. By the way, this baron Bertalan Hatvany is the one that Attila Jozsef [editor's note: a Hungarian poet] mentioned in his resume he sent to various places like somebody who hosted him for two weeks. This is not a good letter of recommendation considering that baron Bertalan Hatvany was Europe's most infamous homosexual.

hatvanyl

Baron Bertalan Hatvany, we must note, had significant merit as an orientalist and he produced a useful Tao Te Ching translation, too.

Not only do the affiliates of freemasonry and its lateral organizations, first of all the Order of the Illuminati, influence life on Earth, they occupy leadership positions in it. There exists a three tier lodge system above freemasonries and the Illuminati. The lowest of these is seemingly public, but is actually exclusive and essentially secret; it is comprised of lodges that may only have Jewish members, both racially and from the religious perspective. This is "B'nai B'rith" which means the Sons of the Alliance. All the important members of the B'nai B'rith are also 33. grade freemasons. Above this we find "B'nai Mose", Sons of Moses and "B'nai Zion", Sons of Zion. We must tell these from simple zionist organizations, although there is a connection between them. What there is to know about these two is only that they exist. So there is "B'nai Zion", then there is "B'nai Mose" below it, and below that there is "B'nai B'rith", below which there is freemasonry and Illuminatism and roughly all the political powers of the world, with the exception of a few marginal powers.

The Roman Catholic Church and the Holy See, once its biggest opponent and enemy, pronounced a curse on freemasonry and any kind of contact with freemasonry results in excommunication. These directives are no longer adhered to but they are also not fully out of order; in spite of this, there are several freemasons among the Consistory and the Cardinals. Since 1945, the Jesuit Order, which constitutes the effective secret service of the Church, is full of Jews and its leadership is full of Jews that are freemasons. The Jesuit Order is in the hands of these powers; it is still effective and it uses its effectiveness for the benefit of these powers. Above these levels and above "B'nai Zion" stand the Committee of 300, the Committee of 72, the Committee of 30, 12, 7, 5 and 3 and on the top of all these there is one person who is called the Prince of the Jews. Symbolically, similarly to the head of the Assassins hiding in the fortress of Alamud, he carries the name of The Elder of the Mountains.

The objective of freemasonry is Israel, realized in three steps: Israel, in the known form, great Israel from the Euphrates to the Nile, and complete Israel, which is planet Earth. They aim to achieve this through a global Jewish Republic and then through a global Jewish Monarchy. What is it that is absolutely unacceptable in this ambition? It is not only that an ethnicity that is different from all other ethnicities wants to take over the control over the world; it is that they want to achieve this through the realization of exclusively anti-traditional and anti-spiritual objectives while destroying and subverting all traditional structures. Communism, liberalism, anarchism and all other modern formations are put to work towards this end so that in various phases, through the application of various methods, they'd facilitate the achievement of this ultimate objective. Let's imagine that this is actually a positive objective; but what kind of effort aims to work through world-communism and world-liberalism? Who or what could possibly want to attain power through the most vulgar destruction of all structures?

The question of background powers is far from being exhausted yet, since the manipulators of the world, with the Prince of the Jews at the forefront, are themselves being manipulated. It's very important to be cognizant of this. They believe that they completely hold the reins and this is to a certain degree true, but not fully. At this point there may be two fundamental delusions: one is that underestimates this power, the other is that extremely overestimates it, thereby assisting it. There is no doubt that they dispose over an immense amount of power, but not over all powers. There is no doubt that they are the manipulators of the world, but they are also being manipulated; they're manipulated manipulators. The point from which manipulation starts is already beginning to leave behind the human form of existence.

There obviously are still intermediary human agents, since the human manifestations of the manipulation are not exclusively Jewish freemason manifestations, even along the darkest lines. There are organizations that, although they maintain certain contacts with the freemason illuminati line, are not in a relationship of subordination with them. Such are certain Indian currents: Transcendental Meditation, The Krishna-Consciousness Movement that engage in immensely sinister work, considering they can do more than the Jews: they can interfere in the spheres beyond death. The danger of these manipulators should not be underestimated. The human agents at the darkest places diverge in two directions; since not all dark currents are subordinated to Jewish freemasonry, there must still be human agents that manipulate all these, but behind them, there are no longer any human agents, so these people are already under demonic direction.

These are the counter – godheads of dissolution and disintegration, in other words, satanic powers. These demons constitute the troops of satanic powers. Satan, or the Devil are possible denominations; as Luther, who we don't respect that much, said: "Gottes Teufel", God's Devil. So the Devil belongs to God, it is subordinated to God. In fact it is God himself when he distances himself from himself and turns himself into his own opposite. Satan can't damage God, but it can damage man.

It can't hurt man that has become the creator, but it can all the more so hurt man – on the level of a creature – that wants to transmute himself into the creator.

So it's important to note that no dark force that may undermine the highest divine existence, but there are powers that may undermine man who is progressing on a path: *Homo Viator*. Man that is fully submerged in darkness is less interesting from this aspect. Man that is in the very vicinity of central existence may not be touched. But man in progression on a path from lower to higher, directed from above, may be harmed, and this is the man that really matters. *Homo Comprehensivus* may not be harmed while *Homo Damnatus* is already lost, so it is *Homo Viator* that from this aspect is exposed the most to these powers, although it is him that would be worthy of not being exposed fully.

Not even Satan can undermine the godhead, the dark forces even less so, but the human personality on the path yes, the personality in whom the presence of the supra-personal lights up as a flash, but is not yet really present. If it was really present he could defend himself internally and autonomously, but he can't yet. All teachings, all statements of protection is manifested for the benefit of these people. Buddha himself said that I am addressing those whose eyes are covered by a little dust only. Not those, whose eyes are fully covered by dust and sand and not those whose eyes are already clear but those whose eyes are covered by only a little dust. All teachings in all the world talk to these people.

The activities of truly dangerous background powers may not even be described in rational human terms. The representatives of these powers can't be grasped, we only know that they exist.

Could a view that presumes such extreme conspiracy be correct?

In such a sense it is itself the representative of a conspiracy but not because it approves of the conspiracy but because it ascertains that the correct position is that of involutionism, so it considers itself the representative of involutionism; in this case we also ascertain a conspiracy, i.e. a world-conspiracy. More or less everybody is exposed to the world-conspiracy. There are people who don't grasp any of it and there are others who "grow out of it", but everybody is exposed to it; including those who orchestrate the conspiracy because the leaders of the conspiracy are not the real leaders and even the real leaders are being led.

Fundamentally I am the leader myself but while I am not aware of this I am by far not the actual leader. Guénon makes mention of people on the highest levels of the dark powers whom the Sufi tradition calls Satan's Saints. This is a truly high level. Not as high as the true Saints of God, but a really high degree that possesses immense powers. Is it possible to eliminate the relative victory of dark powers? Considering that Kali-Yuga must run its course, we must recognize that it's not.

Even the most traditionalist position agrees that Kali-Yuga must run its course. It matters, however, what the very end of the Kali-Yuga is like, since there are values that stand above the Yugas. These values above the Yugas are mostly values that are submerged into latency but these must be lifted to the level of manifestation, they must be conserved, they must be reevaluated and the innermost essential values of these values must be conserved for a new age, according to the supra-cyclic principles. This is tightly related to the completion of individual paths of realization on the one hand, and to the concept of a worthy end on the other.

I have mentioned it elsewhere that Franz Joseph did not doubt that the Monarchy would one day cease to exist. He said that he'd like to make sure that the end will be appropriate and he indeed was committed to this. He could not do so much to prevent the end, or that it would be a worthy end. Such an end may never arrive in a fully dignified way.

The effort of conservation and the affirmation of bringing the yuga to its conclusion may only be brought into synthesis if we introduce a third principle above these two. This is the ideology of building the golden age without which these would be irreconcilable. This should be the Leitmotiv. The counter-godheads or devils, satans together with their demonic alliances are all aiming at the end of the Yuga. From this point of view everybody wants the same; those who don't, don't see things clearly. But they want this in a way that conservation, especially the conservation of high values may not be realized, that the golden age may no longer be, that nothing may be saved over, i.e. that devastation and disintegration should fully triumph; and all this because the ultimate goal of the counter-godheads of dissolution is Nothing.

All dissolution aims at Nothing. The fighters of the freemason-Jewish world-domination operate with tools in which the true guiding force is the contra-godheads of dissolution, which aims at Nothing. Ultimately what will come to fruition is not what they want – although that would also be quite terrible – but the innermost and most secret goal, path, progress and way of the agents, the agents behind the agents, and of the highest agents, represented and operated in the strongest possible way. Somebody put it correctly: the first leftist was Satan itself. The dark powers use only the Left or the contra-left, both of which are essentially on the same side.

They can't use anything else because their aim is that the structures should collapse, that values should not be conserved. By the way, objectives that are realized through methods that are too indirect are related to extreme dangers even if the purest intentions were at work in them. Some indirect solutions are unavoidable but if these are executed in an overly indirect way, it may only lead to deterioration. Sometimes these take on grotesque forms; let's take, for example, the goal of anarchist terrorist attacks.

According to their ideology, if there are terrorist activities everywhere, it will provoke world-fascism. Once world-fascism is achieved, a huge anarchistico-communist left wing world revolution will break out to raise up against it, which in the end will triumph. If this was so, we could say that we'd be satisfied with the temporary middle part, hoping that a communist world revolution will not be able to sweep it away. But this is not so and the whole thing is ridiculous and frivolous.

As long as somebody has a healthy mental-spiritual organism, it's not possible to agree with the forces that control the world through the global web of organizations, today we can even say that through the states of the world – with the United States at the top –, including the engagement of such previously resisting organizations like the Roman Catholic Church. A healthy mental, spiritual organism may not be attracted to a decomposition process that triggers its very own decomposition; thus, since it doesn't only liquidate earthly life but also undermines all transcendent possibilities, in this sense, it may not be attracted to a super-suicide. Not only nations but everything is dissolved by these drives. What's really interesting about this is that which is related to the realization and actualization of transcendent possibilities. These possibilities are specifically targeted.

I've mentioned it elsewhere that liberalism stands in opposition – among other things – to libertas, to freedom; but we can go further and say that it stands in opposition to liberalitas, even to liberalism. It is a self-destructive phenomenon which would not be a big problem as long as it was disintegrating itself only, but it destructs real values, as well. Liberalism stands in opposition to everything and it wants to destruct everything; and this is only the sincere variety, because ill-willed liberalism is not even honest; it is selective and selecting doesn't mean that some things will not be destructed in general, but that it only wants to destroy positive things, not the dark ones, so it disintegrates positive things first. Eventually everything will be destroyed by this process but this is also ill-willed and sly.

Hungary is special from the point of view that these processes take on the most repulsive style elements here. The slavish imitation of the West knows no limits; but they adopt only the negatives; why not the Scandinavian social system and security?! They bring here the most repulsive, the most negative formulas, specially prepared. They give special attention not to adopt here whatever may be good there. In 1988 people used to say Scandinavian tax system and Ethiopian wage system and this decidedly became even more pronounced since then. Not only the tax system but the price system, as well. This is important because Hungary, although it is in a poor economical situation, is not in such a poor economic situation as people experience it. Why is it so? Because this is what the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, but mainly the International Monetary Fund, ordered.

The International Monetary Fund and the World Bank are two freemason affiliates. The banking world in general, with the exception of a few entities are in the hands of freemasonry. In this respect they do excel. Only the Kuhn-Loeb Bank enjoys an even more exclusive position, which officially ranks as around #100, but in reality they are in the top position – a big coordinator bank of sinister businesses.

Among operative banks, the International Monetary Fund is the most sinister, second is the World Bank and the third is the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The International Monetary Fund orders that in Hungary the prices must be raised and the wages should be kept where they are. This is why the situation is unbearable. Theoretically the prices may be set freely, but at a certain point an intervention is necessary which is done, for example, by the fuel tax and then everything follows, according to the domino principle. No need to do too much: the State intervenes by triggering price hikes. There is no classical inflation since classical inflation is the devaluation of money – which there is –, lack of goods – which there isn't –, and unlimited issue of money – which there also isn't. This is inflation but not a classical, perfect and clean inflation; the point is the devaluation which is controlled. The destitution of Hungarians – with only a few exception – is carried out on the order of the International Monetary Fund. The International Monetary Fund performs actions according to the interests of world – freemasonry. The situation is two-sided: the so called government receives the order from the International Monetary Fund on the one hand, on the other hand, the members of government – as freemasons – separately receive these directives from the side of freemasonry, as well. So the situation is rather extreme; it is even planned out how it would be retaliated if Hungary left the International Monetary Fund. They would put it in a situation where there is no solution. Maybe in spite of all this there would still be solutions – temporary ones of course, since there is essentially one party in parliament with six factions. If eight additional parties made it to parliament, then this one party would have fourteen factions.

The way these powers control the countries of the globe is very different. For example, the way they controlled the Soviet Union went like this: above the Political Committee there was a secret political committee, and above that there was an even more secret political committee. There were overlaps; somebody could have been the member of the secret political committee, while being only a substitute member of the visible political committee. This is how control was maintained there. We are aware of the number one person among the visible ones in the time of Stalin. There is always a number one among the visible ones. The top visible person of the dark powers in Hungary is György Konrád today. Obviously, there are people above him but we don't know who they are. There was such a person in the Soviet Union, too: Lazar Moiseyevich Kaganovich;

kaganovich

he was member of the top leadership and while but not the top man there, in actuality he stood above Stalin. Later he was pushed aside, even kicked out of the party but his orders were executed all the way until the middle of 1991, when he died in the age of 98. The Soviet Union didn't outlive him by much. He was among the top leaders even in Lenin's time – probably at the very top.

Such a role was filled in the United States by Bernard Baruch.

baruch

He got into this undefined position during WWI under Wilson and he was called the true president of the United States until his death, which occurred under the presidency of Kennedy. The control in the United States is different from that of the ex Soviet Union. In the United States the president doesn't receive orders; he is put in situations so that his range of possibilities for action is limited to such a degree that he has no choice but to do what they require him to do. If somebody wants to act fundamentally differently from what these powers expect will not become president in the first place. If he has individual ideas, those will be appropriately coordinated. The presidents of the United States pursue sinister goals. The relatively – and this is really very relative – most decent president of the United States was Reagan. According to his intentions, Nixon could have been like this too, but he was very soft. Secretly, Nixon supported the planned coup in Italy by navy commander prince Julio Valerio Borghese.

borghese

Prince Valerio Borghese was supposed to be the new Duce and his main inspiration for cultural affairs would have been Evola. Nixon gave orders for the American fleet stationed at the Italian shores to eventually intervene on the side of Borghese. This did not happen because the orders of the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States were not executed; they were sabotaged and Nixon was overthrown. He could not see his will through. If he could have seen it through, he would have been killed. The coup, unfortunately, failed. Unfortunately, because Valerio Borghese would have realized a more adequate fascism than Mussolini; this is clear also from whom he imaged as inspiration for spiritual life.

Similarly to the presidents of the United States who are made to face situations, such a thing is imaginable even in connection with somebody like Hitler. I mentioned it elsewhere that Hitler's nuclear weapons could have been ready by 1944 and not three of them, like in the case of the Americans, but fifteen. Additionally the V rockets were already designed; the V-1 was already in production, a few pieces of the V-2 were produced but the designs were ready all the way until the V-10.

Supposedly, the V-9 was already intercontinental and the V-10 was supposed to be a global rocket with 20,000 km range (obviously there is no need for a 40,000 km range). In the time of losing at Stalingrad and in El-Alamein, when fast weapons' development was most needed, this development was slowed down, almost stopped by Hitler. However, they didn't lay off the scientist team which was more superior than that of the Americans. Gyorgy Marx university professor mentioned it recently – which he would have probably not mentioned if it was not true – that the American scientist team was quite remarkable, but the German team was even more excellent. The American team included Oppenheimer, Teller and Fermi, the German team included Heisenber, Weizsäcker and other excellent scientists. The Germans were ahead in all respects. The Americans produced three bombs by 1945. They detonated one of them in the Nevada desert, the other two they dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The Germans probably produced 15 warheads; they were not thinking in bombs but in rockets to be carried by V-9s and V10s. This way they could have won the war, but they lost. They were difficult to defeat but they ended up being defeated and this started with Hitler. Hitler told Szalasi that he had the new weapon, that it was ready. According to all signs Szalasi didn't believe this fully but thought that they would be ready by the middle of the summer and the Germans may be able to hold out until then. He realized by April 17th, 1945 that Germany can no longer win the war because the rockets were not ready and would not be ready by the summer, and even if they would be, they wouldn't be able to hold out until then. According to Hitler's orders they would have never been ready even though Hitler told Szalasi in December, 1944 that he had already had the new weapon which could have been deployed at any time, however, it would have caused such terrible destruction that he'd try to win the war with conventional weapons.

What we know with almost 100% certainty is that Hitler was the member of some neocathar organization. Catharism was a later form of Manicheism. He was bound to this organization by oath and according to my hypotheses, it's possible that some kind of latomic or paralatomic organization stood behind this one and he didn't necessarily have to know about this. Since according to all signs he was executing orders, he decided the way he decided according to an order that came from here. The most basic common sense demanded that after Stalingrad and El-Alamein arms development should have been accelerated and not to be slowed down; to such a degree that the scientists, although not laid off, were just fiddling about with all kinds of things and were not engaged in anything serious. It's difficult to know anything about this because it is presented in a way that it was the scientists that sabotaged the development, but it seems that this was not so; the Americans recorded the conversations among these scientists when they were in prison and they leaked some of it. It would have been embarrassing to admit that Hitler was their main ally. We can't see clearly in this question yet, but some of the things that are taking shape are pretty clear.

The dark powers couldn't keep such a firm grip on the German Empire as on other countries but they had the methods with which, although indirectly and partially, they still managed to control it after all.

Ereignis and Power

The coronavirus has occasioned many interpretations across the broadest range of contexts. These include biological and economical, political and geopolitical, societal, historical, philosophical and, occasionally, metaphysical ones. Such reflections inevitably lead to a reassessment of the fundamental elements of what is most often referred to as our current reality.

Naturally, the higher the context for the narrative, the clearer the picture we get. Let's notice, however, that the hierarchy of contexts depicts distinct world-views. To use two extreme examples, a narrative derived from a purely biological context is reflective of a mostly materialistic world-view, while a metaphysical narrative may only derive from a (subjective) idealist one. Also, it is possible to provide a biological, a historical, a societal, even an economical narrative from both a naïve realist and a subjective idealist point of view – to stick to extreme examples – while it is not possible to provide an accurate metaphysical narrative from a materialistic point of view, which, alas, doesn't prevent people from attempting such a bravado.

In the same token, for someone with a naïve realist world-view it is impossible to understand a pure metaphysical narrative, while those few with a truly subjective idealist worldview, which is the most universal in scope and validity, have no problem understanding practically any narrative. (Understandably, such people rarely provide narratives to the "general public".)

Perhaps it becomes evident why this is so if we consider something that at first glance seems unrelated to worldviews: the Yugas. Namely, each Yuga is defined by a particular worldview. The worldview of the Golden Age is almost inexpressible, but if we want to be precise, we'd offer Andras Laszlo's nuanced definition for consideration: "metidealismus transscendentali-immanentialis et immanentali-transcendentalis theurgo-magico-solipsisticus absolutus" – a special category within – or rather above – subjective idealism. The worldview of the Kali Yuga is also almost inexpressible, but for a different reason: its characteristic, especially in its terminal phase, is precisely the lack of worldview, or views in general. However, we must be aware of nuances in the sense that with the unfolding of a particular Yuga, more and more inferior worldviews manifest themselves: at the beginning subjective idealism tend to dominate even the initial phase of Kali Yuga(s)[1], gradually giving way to other worldviews, for example, to objective idealism, and then to various forms of realisms until reaching the state where no views dominate anymore.

Naturally, a “no-view” is also a view, both literally and in the sense that people with no articulated views act as media for spreading well definable, exclusively false views. Why are we so sure about this? Paradoxically, it’s impossible to “spread” correct views, i.e. views that reflect the Truth, passively, as a medium: intellectual passivity corrupts worldviews. Also, when the views are the result of an intellectual ascesis, one doesn’t want to persuade, but to live according to these views. This is why it’s preferable to represent false views with full conviction (presupposing an intellectually active stance) than to passively accept correct views.

Sacred texts provide evidence that people at the beginning of the cycles fully understood the law of degeneration and provided accurate descriptions of the subsequent phases of a given Yuga. On the other hand, there is ample evidence that modern man with his materialistic worldview does not understand past eras – his own past, that is.

How far these views are from each other is well symbolized by the length of the Yugas, which, when properly considered, have symbolic value. For example, the Kali Yuga of Maha-yuga (the big Kali Yuga, which was preceded by three, increasingly longer Maha Yugas) is 648,000 years. This big Kali-Yuga, consists four smaller eras, the last of which is the small Kali-Yuga (Alpa Kali-Yuga), which is 64,800 years long. This in turn consists of:

a very small Golden Age (alpalpa krta-yuga), which is 25,920 years long, followed by
a very small Silver Age (alpalpa treta-yuga), which is 19,440 years long, followed by
a very small Bronze Age (alpalpa dvapara-yuga), which is 12,960 years long, followed by
a very small Dark Age (alpalpa kali-yuga), which is 6,480 years long.

We are living in this very small Dark Age, which started, depending on the point of view, either in 4182, or in 3102 or in 2022 BC[2]. This is already ungraspable for modern historians, not to mention the big Yugas prior, in which case we’re looking at “numbers” in the magnitude of hundreds of millions of years, or, ultimately, quadrillion years – and this is still incomparably small when compared to the concept of Aeternitas[3]. Let’s note that the materialistic worldview has no sense of time: beyond a certain threshold time becomes an abstraction for modern man, both in terms of history and physics.

We must keep in mind that the Yugas also express a particular mode of consciousness and existence – and this is precisely what we may approach with our consideration of Weltanschauung. If we consider time in a symbolical sense, we may say that the mode of consciousness of man of the Kali Yuga is quadrillions of years away from the mode of consciousness of man of the Golden Age. At the risk of being accused of simplification, we may say that by successfully actualizing a theurgo-magico-solipsistic worldview, we recreate the Golden Age in ourselves.

Actualizing a Weltanschauung is more than accepting it; accepting it is a significant and complex intellectual step, but it's not enough. The Weltanschauung must become Seinanschauung, Seinanschauung must become Seinerfahrung, and Seinerfahrung must become Seinverwirklichung. The various forms of naïve realism are the de facto actualization of a void, a lack of Dasein – something quite paradoxical, but something that explains modern man's lack of views and abstract self-experience, which, on this trajectory, inevitably wanes into the sub-human domain.

It follows that the world looked very different at the beginning of the current Dark Age than it looks today: people's worldview and general experience of themselves and the world was also very different from that of our contemporaries. The further we go back in time, through the various very small Yugas, small Yugas and Yugas, the more this is so. Thus the very small Golden Age within the small Kali Yuga of the Kali Yuga of Maha Yuga (the closest Golden Age to us) was significantly different from the very small Dark Age, which we're living in, and the very small Golden Age of the small Kali Yuga of the Bronze Age differed even more so from our current era, etc.

How should we imagine the differences?

With the unfolding of the Yugas, man's power in terms of creation, sustenance and destruction (three aspects of power) has gradually diminished. The difference between man and God may be conceived as a degree of power in this sense. A note for clarification: from His own point of view, God is Self. From man's point of view as a creature, the Self is God. Man's ultimate aim is to become – by achieving ever-higher degrees of freedom – what he essentially is: the Self.

Taken man's condition in the current age as one extreme and God as the other, let's have a look at these three aspects of power.

Creation

"In the highest degree and as the first step, man creates his incarnation; then – descending lower – he chooses it; descending even lower, he freely accepts it; descending even lower than this, he involuntarily takes notice of it: maybe he would like to, but he can't avoid it; descending even lower than before, he meets it; and finally, he unconsciously falls into his incarnation – into that which originally was freely created by him."^[4]

Man's incarnation includes his world. Man is not born into a (material) world that pre-exists before his manifestation. Flesh, besides the body, also denotes the corporeal world. Creation takes place by an act of will and this will is reflected in everything that exists. Modern man, however, is not aware of his will, even though, in a certain sense, his whole world is testament to it.

Manifestation, including both the corporeal and non-corporeal worlds (but excluding the created, but non-formal realm), is not universal: it doesn't contain all potentials, only a range of potentials specific to this particular manifestation.

In the Golden Age man was able to freely return to the Self – the bridges were intact, so to speak. He created himself and his world and, if he wanted, he could return to his state as creator. He could experience himself both as creator and as a creature. As a creator, he possessed the power of creation, as a creature he perceived the world as contained in himself. Man was conscious of both states, even simultaneously.

Naturally, in a state of high creative power one controls what gets manifested out of the range of potentials available to a particular manifestation. The rest is kept on the level of potentialities. The power to keep things in potential is the power of creation itself. Being constantly in such a dominant position means that time as steaming durance (duration fluens) becomes slower and time as a cycle becomes longer.

One of Schuon's insights[5] is fitting here to describe the moment that in a sense gave birth to the Yugas: "...the symbology of the Adamic androgyne and the creation of Eve may be useful here: only after Love separated itself from Knowledge – meaning that Intelligence and Will turned in opposition – was and is it possible for temptation and the fall to occur. In a certain sense, through the interference of the will – seduced and freed by the serpent from below – the rational faculty got separated from intelligence, which means that it became possible for it to choose between right and wrong; once it became possible to choose wrong, it was necessary for a forceful seduction to appear; reason, i.e. wisdom according to the flesh, is a "natural" child that was born from Adam's sin. The snake here is equivalent to what the Hindus understand by Tamas: a descending, dark, pressing and in the same time diffusing and dissolving tendency, which, in its personal aspect, appears as Satan. The question: "why is there evil?" may be reduced to the question: "why is there Dasein?" The serpent is in Paradise because Paradise exists. Without the serpent, Paradise would be God."

Our current age is sometimes described as "promiscuous" from the point of view that there is almost no control over the flow of manifestations: more and more phenomena becomes manifest at an increasingly frenzied pace. Will becomes corrupted, knowledge is forgotten and as soon as the ego emerges, it succumbs to something that's experienced as Other than the Self, which increasingly dominates it to the degree, that the ego identifies with the Other, rather than with the Self. In this weakened state, the ego becomes a passive witness of the world, merely suffering an increasingly poisonous existence.

Perhaps it won't be superfluous to highlight for emphasis: phenomena like various epidemics and certain diseases (e.g. cancer); certain animal and plant species, like, for example, wasp or weed; the lowest castes; the high level of solidity of the material world and constricting natural laws are characteristic to the Kali Yuga only, which is, from this point of view, rightly referred to as the age of released poisons, i.e. potentialities that previously, when man's power of creation was stronger, were kept in the domain of potentialities.

Sustenance

To consider the power of sustaining the world seems paradoxical from the point of view of man who forgot his Self as the creator, and is merely an observer of the flow of events happening to him. If man can't perceive himself to be the creator, he can't perceive himself to be the sustainer of the world, either; in the same token, if he can return to his Self, he can experience himself both as creator and as the sustainer of the world. It is infinitely more difficult from his lost and powerless position to approach the Self as creator. There are somewhat more possibilities available for him to perceive the Self as the sustainer of the world, and this is precisely the angle traditional doctrines take to guide those few who may still be able to actualize themselves.

To acquire the power of sustaining the world, man performs subtle operations on himself, taking control of his thinking, sensing/feeling, perception, and volition. When it comes to volition, the dilemma is the following: "I am not an active participant in the world, the world is just happening to me." (The subject and the object is separate.) The formula of the solution is the following: "Everything there is, is my will. I will the world". This formula may trigger a sense of alertness, waking man up from his daydream. All rituals aim at waking man up and keeping him in a state of alert, including prayers, meditation and contemplation. A good life in this sense is one that is lived by trying to remember and, ideally, remembering God or the Self – continuously. As shown earlier, the difference is a question of worldviews. Remembering oneself as the Self (subjective idealism), in this age, is infinitely more difficult than to remember God (objective idealism). However, one may reach the former through the practice of the latter.

In the course of this practice subtle, but significant changes take place in one's experience of Being (Seinerfahrung) and actualization of Being (Seinsverwirklichung). Events – the Heideggerian Ereignis – present themselves that temporarily – even if just for a moment – remove the very conditions that determine the ego, which experiences a flesh of intuition about a particular aspect of the Self: man remembers. This experience has longer or shorter consequences: a sense of freedom bursts forth that shakes the very foundations of the world and one's view on it. Possibilities open up that defy the ossified assumptions of false worldviews. For example, it turns out that it's possible to clear the streets of the swirling crowds almost overnight – even in the most tourist-infected cities; more importantly, one also remembers that this event is willed by the Self.

The mechanical processes that lead to such an Event – for Homo Viator, man on his way of becoming the Self – are not important in the face of the power that manifests itself in one's consciousness. An Event is a possibility for man to wake up to the power of the Self and conquer it.

Of course, when life is ritualized all events are Events. Routine is the opposite of rituals: it may only dominate when the subject is powerless towards the world and views it with an ontological indifference and, let's not forget, with an existential fear. Rituals, in the proper sense, help man conquering the power of creation and sustenance. To perform rituals man must be awake. He puts himself in the position of the creator above time, thus his acts become eternal, imitating the very first acts of God[6]. When one's thinking, feeling, sensing, willing, as well as his waking up, cleaning and cleansing, working, resting, etc. are ritualized, man gets closer to the Golden Age and his life is not a promiscuous, uncontrolled, indifferent flow of events. Instead, everything reminds him of God and he consciously perceives various aspects of the Absolute: Beauty, Truth, Love, Hope, Faith.

Aspects of the Absolute may be transcended. At this stage the Self is virtually actualized with only Power (Potentia Pura) remaining to be conquered.

All traditional doctrines agree that for transcending the human state man[7] must create a counter-pole for the Will of the Self. When successful, one kills the ego. This counter-pole is a lack of intent. *Fiat voluntas tua* may be thought of as *Voluntas tua voluntas mea est*.

Destruction

Potentia Pura or Prima Materia: not only the principle of matter, the principle of woman, but the principle of any manifestation on any level of Being; even the principle of non-Being. It is the first act of the Absolute: Its negative image. Absolute power capable of manifesting anything. When it's considered by itself, it is absolute nothing. The return to the Self leads through Potentia Pura. Destruction is Hermetic Incest: the Son penetrates Pure Potential – from which He comes into Being – in its virgin aspect in order to become – as the totality of all potentials – the Father, i.e. the Self. This return is the principle of destruction.

When man ritualizes his life by turning towards God, he destroys his conditioned self. As a progression of this step, when man identifies with the Self, man sustains the world. When man returns to his Self, man destroys the world. In this position, the power of creation, sustenance and destruction becomes one, and Creation, Sustenance and Destruction become the naked principles of all Events.

[1] Fundamentally, one's worldview is determined by one's experience (of the self, of the world, of Being). Man's actual power in the Golden Age corresponds to subjective idealism, man's lack of power and corresponding experience in the Dark Age is reflected in the opposite view: materialism. On the other hand, hard and complex as it may be, changing one's worldview affects one's experience of oneself, the world and Being.

[2] Source: Baranyi Tibor Imre: Fejlődő Létronás és Örök Hagyomány

[3] Laszlo Andras, Solum Ipsum, 761: (The hierarchical grades of infinite time) Aeternitas is a timeless, and super-temporal, absolute and endless time. Aeviternitas is endless time manifesting together with time considered from the side of timelessness, while sempiternitas is endless time manifesting together with time, considered from the side of time. Perpetualitas is considered to be an endless duration, while diurnitas is a finite but very long duration. Perennitas – that is eternally valid – is the light and imprint of aeternitas on time.

[4] Andras Laszlo's Solum Ipsum, aphorism 118

[5] Gnosis – Göttliche Weisheit

[6] See Mircea Eliade: The Myth of Eternal Return

[7] Only those may be considered man whose aim is self-realization, i.e. the realization of the Self.

Liberalism and Bolshevism

Excerpt from an interview with Dr. Andras Laszlo – translated from Hungarian

Liberalism and bolsevistico-communism stand in the sharpest contrast and opposition – on the surface. This opposition however can be resolved and it does get resolved in the worst possible sense: the hypocritical nature of this opposition becomes evident mainly when they are faced with an actual enemy. Such was decidedly the case in World War II. Thus liberalism and Bolshevism – although they are enemies – come from the same roots and follow the same objectives, since the ultimate purpose of communism – whether or not it is articulated this way – is a status anarchisticus (an anarchic state) and the highest goal of liberalism – whether or not it is articulated this way – is the same. Anarchism attacks communism because it is not communistic enough and it attacks liberalism because it is not liberal enough. Essentially both liberalism and communism aims at an extreme status anarchisticus and affirms anarchism; not pronouncedly yet, but almost. This is how it is evident that their goals are the same and it may be deducted from this that their origins are the same, as well. No matter how far they get from each other in the course of their development when extreme necessities call for it, they always cooperate.

We consider liberalism, just like communism, an extremely dangerous enemy. Communism is obviously more brutal and more intolerable, but the sins of liberalism are of a different nature. It may also become intolerable at any time because liberalism doesn't shy away from terroristic moves if its interests so demand. So liberalism may produce the most reproachable acts at any time, but it is indisputable that when it comes to regular practice, a more demonic and destructive system than communism has not been invented yet. All right wing orientations, but especially the ultra-dextro-conservative position stand most decidedly and sharply in opposition to both, but they also stand against national Bolshevism, as well, which constitutes a third possibility; this latter one appeared in Germany already after World War I. The rot-braun (red-brown) initiatives aim at the revival of this. This is also very dangerous and while we can cooperate with national socialism in general – which is always better than the name suggests –, we can't cooperate with the rot-braun line and we are not even willing to consider such moves. All these we consider to be our enemies.

This phenomena is suitable for creating total confusion and prevent people from seeing clearly; let's not forget that one of the goals of skotazmocratism and the intermingling of judeocratism and latomocratism within it, is precisely to make sure that people have absolutely no political world-views. If people have no political world view, manipulation over humanity may become absolute. People are already prone to manipulation to a very high degree – and we should see that nobody in any sense would be able to see through such unclarified relationships like the intertwined lines of liberalism, communism and rot-braun initiatives. This is very suitable for fully extinguishing all political commitments people may have and manipulate them exclusively on the basis of the most fundamental daily pragmatics.

Liberālismus contrā Libertātem

Man's relationship to freedom is determined by the relationship between the person and the subject. This means that the more it is the spirit that dominates a person's being, in other words the subject in action, "subiectum in actu", the higher and more complete the level of freedom is; if the subject is fully in himself, then freedom is absolute and infinite. All other states depend on the intensity of the spirit and on the intensity of consciousness. It follows from this that whatever in a person is not conscious as subject-support, it *eo ipso* can't be free and whatever is determined by the unconscious in the sense of contra-regulation, essentially stands in opposition to freedom; it is different from it, it is far from it and it opposes it.

Opinions about freedom therefore mostly don't stand on the right foundation since they consider the freedom of people in connection with the limitations of movement or with the freedom of movement or the acting of the generally known human being. Thus the point is not and cannot be whether an individual or even a committee or a human collective can do or does what in his consciousness becomes actual from a certain direction and in a certain sense.

What appears in consciousness as intention is in the majority of cases an inferior, unenlightened, heteron force; a force that is to a large degree foreign and that is not being experienced by its naked self and which is experienced only through its results and when it's already run its course. Whoever lives according to these, without limitation, without assumed limitations is still not nearly free since the heteron, thateron in man that he's not conscious of is what paralyzes and arrests him the most. Within the sphere of these regulating and contra-regulating restrictions it moves people who, due to an eventual spiritual blindness, confuse these restrictions with freedom.

Liberalism is a philosophical or a philosophically definable view that builds its tenets on the freedom of man but is not aware of what human freedom actually is and sees freedom fundamentally in the freedom of ideals and in the free manifestation of ideals. First we have to examine this view with goodwill. Freedom, as I mentioned, is fundamentally spiritual and outside the scope of spiritual freedom, besides the freedom of the spirit, freedom doesn't make sense.

The essence of freedom is autonomy; the autonomy of consciousness; the autonomy of the consciousness of the subject when the subject determines itself according to its own principles, when the subject determines its existence and the mode of its actions according to its own fundamental principles and it can perform these freely, without limitations, since it possesses all the powers to do so. Generally, this kind of freedom doesn't manifest itself this way in the concrete human form of existence, so freedom is not full freedom, but freedom never means the lack of slavery; it always rises above that, thus freedom by itself always has validity and existence even if freedom is not fully manifest. Theoretically, freedom always means more than merely the absence of restrictions and of being constrained.

Liberalism as an ideal is based on the affirmation of freedom and on the enforced affirmation of freedom, but it doesn't consider according to what kind of triggers a person or more people define, understand, feel and determine their own freedom. If freedom is meant as giving free rein for the instincts we must know that this is not and can't be about freedom.

It can't be about freedom because what is instinct today used to be will in archaic, prehistoric times, even beyond the frames of the dimensions of historical times; autonomous will. The loss of autonomous will and its degradation to instinct means that the role of the subject is led and moved by a different power which is already distant from the subject and which is, according to its primary and ultimate essence, itself an auton, but an unrecognized auton; the unrecognized auton as heteron-reality, as reality with power, becomes a trigger as a pseudo-subject, channeling impulses and forces towards the soul, in the direction of the soul that is illuminated by the spirit. These manifest themselves in the spirit, in the spiritual space of consciousness illuminated by the spirit and thus they are able to move the person.

It is fundamentally wrong to think that a human being is free when he satisfies his instincts without any external or so called internal restriction. It is fundamentally wrong because freedom, non-freedom and restriction may not only be determined by the criterion whether some kind of restriction is or is not in effect; we must know that all heteron-controlled internal processes without any kind of restrictions, restrict the subject itself, they restrict subjective existence and the existence of man as the supporter or "carrier" of the subject; in fact, the more unrestricted these are, the more so.

No yoke is heavier and more paralyzing than the yoke of unknown powers. So if we don't interpret and define freedom and we don't put it on the pedestal from the side of the spirit, then we are acting against freedom. Defining a certain freedom for man and then positing it with force without defining the fundamental criterion for freedom is comparable to humanism which only tries to solve man's problems within the confines of strictly human boundaries, or tolerantism that, beyond the absolutely necessary and crucial tolerance gives way and tolerates everything in all possible domains and orientations, or pacifism that doesn't only welcome peace that stems from the victory of light, but is also prepared to accept peace even if it follows the victory of darkness, thus thriving to complete something by all means, without clarifying from what direction what he wants to achieve will come to fruition.

This kind of liberalism as philosophical, and, derived from this, as socio-political view may not be accepted because it disregards the actual foundation of freedom, namely what it means and what determines it, from what direction freedom arrives and what exactly it sets free; whether it is the pure and actual self-assertion of the subject, the spiritual freedom of the auton or the penetration of some foreign power into the consciousness of the soul illuminated by the spirit. In the Dark Age, which is becoming increasingly dominant, it is obvious that the lower and external, foreign, corrupting and leveling versions can always better assert themselves than the higher, the more superior and more innate versions that stem from the center, thus philosophical liberalism currently specifically favors the awakening of dark powers. In other words: freedom by all means, but this, in reality, will be favorable for the dark powers.

We may add to this that liberalism that manifests itself on the political plane is not even this, because here it is about a supposedly benign liberalism that nevertheless still stands predominantly in the service of dark powers. In concreto, liberalism, when it appears on a political-social level, is not benign but specifically ill-willed and malicious. It wants to set everything free – in the sense of a freedom that represents darkness and that was specifically defined by certain powers and circles – that is suitable for these circles and for the circles that are controlled by these dark powers, but it doesn't intend to set anything free that may manifest itself as unfavorable for the circles that are controlled by such dark impulses. So on top of it all it is also malicious, it restricts freedom, it complies to and corresponds with those we have just outlined; it liberates the inferior and calls this freedom and then subjugates them to various interests.

Thus what liberalisms primarily stands against is freedom itself. The reason I've given the title *līberālismus contrā lībertātem* to today's lecture is because liberalism acts first of all against freedom. It acts against human freedom, preventing the subject that manifests itself in the person from being able to lead himself back to his own pure subjectivity (to his own pure subjective self). This is the meaning of the metaphysically determined *līberālismus – libertās* relationship in context of a supra-philosophical realization. And then these mean and have historically always meant, since these were first addressed, in all the derivatives, should they refer to the freedom of the spirit or to the freedom of world-views, that opinions should freely be stated and this have never meant anything other than the free manifestation of contra-spiritual and destructive opinions. Only this, nothing else. It can be proven historically that whenever this came up, it meant only this.

Free opinion used to mean that people may state in front of everybody that there is no God, that there is no immortal spirit, there is no spiritual superiority, that there is no true, valid, dignified order. These comprised the big, free ideologies.

It is highly typical of our era that a darkening process is called enlightenment because, in an enlightened way, it may be stated that there is no immortal spirit, that my own being, my existence, my life has no foundation and purpose that precedes and transcends it, and, based on a consensus we may relate all this to enlightenment. Not only does this era ascertain darkness, but it calls darkness light and it calls the light darkness; and it calls slavery, the liberation of ideals censured by inferior interests and the free affirmation of these ideals, freedom. But this liberalism which is of course also tolerantist, doesn't tolerate it at all if somebody, according to the spirit and on the side of the spirit and order aims at and posits a world that corresponds to a divine, hierarchical graduation; if it is about the affirmation of such a world there is no more tolerantism, no more tolerance in any shape or form, no more liberalism of any kind and such opinions are not allowed to be manifested. These opinions must be opposed and acted against. The dark age manipulates with darkness, as well by switching these terms and values; for example, when it talks about the dark middle ages.

The middle ages were perhaps dim in comparison to the antiquity but in comparison to modernity and especially to post modernity it was an incomparably bright era. What is referred to as renaissance, as rebirth, is in fact the beginning of decay. What is referred to as reformation is related to the loss of true and original forms and what is referred to as humanism tries to solve man's problems and ultimate questions with tools that don't transcend the human domain and does all this against man. This is what humanism means in our era.

The highest degree of darkening is when man becomes estranged from his own essence. It's not about refuting an external God, but about denying the divine foundations of his own existence, of his own being; it's about denying his own possibilities. He denies his own restricted but still existing possibilities – and this era is called the enlightened age, the era of the light.

The most important task for man is to reevaluate absolutely everything in the world that surrounds him, to reevaluate everything he has heard from the time of birth at home, in schools and at work, in his environment; everything that he hears that determine his views; the task is to liquidate these views. There is hardly anything left that should not be eliminated or liquidated in a sense of destruction. Almost nothing.

The real principles are, almost without exception, those against which the whole world is currently working and the ideals of darkness are those, according to which the current world is getting defined in general in this era saturated with a malicious liberalism. Seemingly everything is allowed, in practice however this is absolutely not the case; spiritual principles are, theoretically not banned (although occasionally they are proven to be banned, too), but the ideals that are being pushed and promoted at every opportunity, with all possible means – sometimes indirectly, but typically directly, sometimes subtly, but typically with more and more force – are decidedly those in the service of darkness.

We must revise everything and almost everything must be rejected that spiritually, but essentially anti-spiritually, surrounds us. We completely and infinitely stand on the side of freedom; we stand for the positing and affirmation of infinite and absolute freedom and only this do we consider to be acceptable, but this has nothing to do with the distorted and degenerate perception of freedom proclaimed by philosophical and mainly political liberalism. What we are positing are true principles of freedom, but they have nothing to do with liberalism.

By the way, liberalism, that's applied on the political-social plane, to further underscore its malicious nature, is a view that stands decidedly for oppression and repression and intends to function in the sense of oppression and repression; it stands strongly on the side of oppression, disablement and suppression. It wants to suppress everything that in any way diverts from the ideals maliciously defined as the criterion for liberalism by the supporters of liberalism, driven by sinister intentions.

So it is an oppressing and anti-liberal orientation not only from very high perspectives, but also in the most vulgar, most concrete and most general sense.

Traditionalism is radically anti-liberal because traditionalism radically stands on the side of freedom. On the side of freedom, but not on the side of setting the darkness free, but it intends to be free in the sense of the universal and spiritual liberation of the soul to lead it back to the absolute; this is what it considers to be freedom, this is the freedom it accepts and it manifests itself on this side.

Yes, freedom, libertas must be lifted above all – freedom, consciousness, will, spiritual power, the supremacy and dominion of the subject above all; order and orderliness which is the condition of the realization of freedom.

The chance of realization in the vortex of dark powers is approximately zero. The forces that manifest themselves in the human domain and which currently give shape to the world and to the human condition don't operate in the interest of people; these forces are anti-human. They are anti-human, anti-consciousness, anti-spiritual and anti-liberal. All freedom ideals that are generally proposed always and fundamentally, by their very nature, act against true freedom.

We've discussed many times how pathetic and ridiculous it is when somebody says that he does whatever he wants. What this means is that he considers the uninhibited satisfaction of unconscious forces that dominate him, to be what he wants. What he truly wants doesn't even appear in all this. To want something freely and to act freely: this is possible only from the center, from the subiectum in actu, from the subject in action that affirms himself, in other words from the spirit; this spirit realizes his own freedom through maximally being himself and this, to understand it appropriately, must be conceived in the first case singular: if I am fully myself, then I am infinitely free in the absolute sense. But if there is a foreign power acting in me, then I'll be noticeably dominated by unconscious energies, powers and triggers; in such cases, within the terrains where these dominate, we can't speak about freedom. This applies both to the individual and to the community; freedom is on the side of the spirit, the spirit is on the side of freedom and these two are inseparable – we can't speak about a spirit that's not free and we also can't speak about freedom that is not realized in a spiritual sense.

The spirit is not an infinitely subtle matter, but subiectum in actu, subject in action, subject in self-affirmation and the more he affirms himself and the more he is subject and the more he appears like this, the more he is spirit; this is the essence and the meaning of the spirit. From another aspect spirit is light which enlightens consciousness that it creates; spiritual space.

Spiritual space is created by the spirit from himself; this is what he enlightens and either everything stems from the spirit and then freedom is complete, or not everything, in which case freedom is still reality, but in the areas where it is not experienced, some foreign power is at work; the freedom to liberate foreign powers is not freedom and the liberation of foreign powers always acts against freedom, creating a tie that is stronger than any other internal or external tie.

Precisely because liberalism, both philosophically and in an benign sense, is a view that pushes for freedom by all means and disregards where freedom may come from, and because the chances for the liberation of darkness in the age of darkness is infinitely higher than the free reign of the dominance of light, liberalism must be rejected on all levels: both in a philosophical sense and in its benign perception, but also in its political, social and of course in its malicious versions, too.

The refusal of liberalism organically belongs to a world-view that's based on metaphysical tradition; without this we can't speak either about traditionality in the strict sense of the word or about metaphysical tradition, or about the affirmation of light; not, if in the same time we want to liberate darkness or if we don't want to liberate it but make concessions towards such attempts.

Spiritual order means restriction; but the spiritual order acts for the sake of realizing absolute freedom and it is for this sake that it restricts. This restriction doesn't originate from the powers of darkness but from the opposite: it is the restrain of these very powers.

The man who, following an inner path, a true sacred asceticism, is working on his own transmutation, does what he does for freedom; for leading himself back to himself; for Himself. During this, as ascetic acts, he definitely restricts himself, but also restrains the foreign, the heteron powers that are active in him. In order to realize freedom he restricts these powers, restrains them, gives them boundaries, reduces them and ultimately eliminates them.

This is the essence of freedom and the realization of freedom.

In terms of freedom and the destruction of chains, the traditional view also considers symbolical connections when defining its position. There are two types of slaves. One is *sui generis* a slave; by his essence, in a genuine way; if this one revolts and breaks his chains, this revolt is illegitimate. If somebody is not a slave but is by his essence free and represents the mentality of a ruler, this person must revolt and must break his chains; in this case the revolt is legitimate and may be approved spiritually.

The more spiritual somebody is the more he has to do legitimately with true freedom. Representing and liberating the dark powers is comparable to destroying a dam, to enabling the unrestrained flow of sewage. These make no sense from the point of view of freedom.

Freedom assumes autonomy, but it is not the heteronomy of instincts; what we call autonomy is the autonomy of the spirit, the autonomy of the auton. The heteronomy of darkness could be called autonomy but this, besides acting against freedom, both in terms of terminology and, especially, as practice, acts against intelligence and logonomia.

Because autonomy is also logonomia, the dominance of the logos, the dominance of the auton, the dominance of the spirit, the dominance of supra-rational intelligence. The dominance of intelligence above the sub-intelligent. All these notions, values and value systems may be raised in relation to freedom.

We will always stand by freedom, but always and exclusively by true freedom, by true libertas. We want to protect this libertas from liberalism, from pseudo-freedom, from "freedom ideals" that set the darkness free; we want to protect it from the offensive of heteron, the dark heteron, the heteron that originates from darkness. We want to protect Freedom, Ourselves, the (my) Self, the Subject.

Man, Society, State

If we adhere to the traditional world-view and world-conception we must follow a fundamentally different approach to man, state and society than the approach taken by current conceptions and views that examine (if they do at all) this trinity separately or in their relationships.

The traditional world-view – which is a world view based on metaphysics that leads back all its premises, and its general conceptions and judgments to a supra-natural Principium Principiorum – examines those aspects of man's life that one way or another bind him to a community.

The community in which man lives or may live may be collectivum sacrum (collectivum sacrale), when the Spirit "sacredly" influences the individual and the community that unites people. In most cases however the opposite comes forth: collectivum profanum. This means that people are integrated by an inner disposition that lacks sanctity – it's even anti-sacred – and by an external orientation towards objectives without any transcendental perspective and goals focused only on one's most basic biological life that starts with conception and ends with death.

It is typical of collectivum profanum that its objectives lack a transcendental dimension, that it pursues goals that are decidedly meaningless for the individual after his death. If somebody raised the point that although such goals may not be meaningful for the individual, they are meaningful for the community, we'd have to say that this is not valid, since the perspective of the community and the perspective of the individual should overlap.

We can't expect this overlap to be perfect but without a certain degree of overlap – under normal circumstances – neither individual nor collective life may be conceived or is imaginable. We can't say that "although my life ends, my work and my activities have a meaning that survives my life". This is a flat, banal, rational – essentially sub-rational – depiction of the relationship between man and his own future and the relationship between the individual and his community. If somebody – not through meditation, not in the sense of a superior approach, but simply by a moment of self-observation – truly tries to tackle this question, he'll immediately realize that no goal makes sense that is decidedly based on the assumption that the individual will dissolve in death; – or that is based on the assumption that although the individual will not dissolve in death but his subsistence is automatic and necessary.

In order for man – the individual – to subsist after death, he must go through certain levels in the course of his life; he must realize levels and he must overcome trials that make him suitable for being able to experience the trauma and crisis of death while he consciously, truly maintains his self-awareness and his sense of self.

The community may only be *collectivum sacrum* if it provides the conditions of self-transcendence for all its members, if all the individuals that make up the community thrive for self-realization and if the individual may see a sacred framework in the community for his self-realization, if he wants a sacred frame and if he realizes a sacred frame in it.

The modern world stands in the sign of anti-tradition; it stands in opposition to everything that's sacred, that is traditional, spiritual, divine, holy, that is related to self-transcendence – both on an individual and on a collective level. The individual that will dissolve may only do something in the community of individuals destined to dissolve in death while he is considered to be alive; to do something valuable he must lift himself from the conditions of his nature prone for dissolution – from the state of his conditioned self. Only through this can he make a move that may result in that his community should move in some sense and to some extent from its position in which the orientation is aimed at annihilation.

*

The original meaning of state is higher than the original meaning of society. The ancient *collectivum sacrum* stood in relation with *status sacralis* (with *status traditionalis* or with *status spiritualis*) and with *societas sacralis* (with *societas spiritualis*).

In the duality of sacred society and sacred state, sacred state is superior.

When we consider the Word itself, *status* in Latin means state and it also means state of conditions, stopping, staying, being founded. The god-king of Rome, Jupiter Stator, Jupiter the Upholder, the conditioning Jupiter, Jupiter the state-founder, is the one who stops the flow of processes.

The state is always related to the axis, to the two poles and to the center; the axis is around which movement is happening, around which he can control and dominate movement while keeping himself in a calm, motionless state, in a state of being held back in a way in a state beyond states, in the state in the original sense.

The Ruler is more than the state. The state is where the Ruler manifests himself. The state is axial – i.e. it is of axial nature –, polar – i.e. it is defined by the poles – and central, defined by centrality. Axiality, polarity and centrality constitute the foundation and in the same time the symbol of the state; and also that in which Dominance and the Ruler possessing power manifest themselves. We should add that currently there are no states in the traditional – in other words in the original and actual – sense: today there is not a single true state anywhere in the world. There are pseudo and contra states in which the apparatus statualis – i.e. the state apparatus – seems to be a reality independent of the state. There exists an actual state apparatus but a true state doesn't exist.

It is obvious that a state in the original sense of the word – and we can't conceive of an actual state in any other sense – is not in any way an “oppressive organ in the hands of the ruling class” as was stated by the hideous and paralytic Lenin. Even a state apparatus is not an oppressive organ – provided that it serves a healthy state. Even if the state apparatus without a state doesn't serve a healthy state, it is not an “oppressive organ in the hands of the ruling class”, but an oppressive and manipulative organ under the influence and control of circles incorporating sinister powers. Essentially it is precisely this that depicts our era: there are apparatuses but there are no states.

We should also add that in the current era Rulers also don't exist – even less so than states. According to this, in the current era, the folk/people doesn't exist either, in the original sense. In its stead we find a conglomerate, the anti-sacred heap of people – a distorted collective.

The above mentioned misshapen state apparatus democratically leads the collective – based on the power of the folk. The Greek word *demos*, although it is connected with *daimon*, with the demon, in the Dark Age it actually means a connection with *kakodaimon*, with the wicked demonicity of darkness.

We stress that democracy may be dictatorial, may be liberal-parliamentary. People say that *dictatura democrática*, which is adopted in China, is an absurdity; however, democracy doesn't contain in any way equality, equal rights or freedom. What democracy means is only that in it, supposedly, the folk – the *demos* – rules.

If we look deeper it becomes obvious that the folk in actuality never rules in any democracy. It is not demos that rules, in fact it doesn't rule in any way, but a system of dark powers that develop a special relationship with the lowest level of needs – on the level of instincts – of the demos. This doesn't mean that they satisfy the needs on the level of instincts, but that they somehow respond to such needs; they disclose to the demos the possibilities of satisfaction, dissatisfaction, privation and rejection in relation to these needs. They respond to the demos and they make the demos react to their directives.

Evidently the Greek demokratia doesn't correspond to the principles that originate from traditionality. Although the difference between the Greek – Athenian – démokratia and democracy in the current sense is astronomical, even the Greek – Athenian – démokratia does not correspond with the original, traditional view. It is also evident that the dark, terroristic dictatorships that develop a relationship with –without satisfying the- the darkest needs of demos also don't have anything to do with what traditionality demands. I repeat: a democracy may have a dictatorial, even terroristic character, and it may also be liberal-parliamentary – both are the products of anti-traditionalism. Neither the democracy in the dictatorial, nor in the terroristic or liberal-parliamentary sense may ever be accepted on the base of traditionalism.

The majority decides – this is the motto of the view that is dominated by quantity. The Dark Age – as follows from all traditional principle and as is pronounced by the founders of traditionalism and as René Guénon succinctly stated – is the age of the reign of quantity. The age of quantity, not of quality. When things are grounded in quantity, pseudo-qualities are introduced. Even in the world of quantity some quality-residue must be present and in the world of quantitative views this quality-residue (pseudo-qualitative pseudo-residue) is the majority. "The majority decides" – children are chanting this when there are five of them; and countries, continents and a whole world are stating this as a basic principle to be followed.

Bela Hamvas writes in his Invisible history – very aptly – that the mass is not weak minded, as the sociologist Le Bon thought in good faith; the mass is a satanic idiot: this is what manifests itself in the mass and in the majority. If not cliques but truly the demos rules in democracy, it is still dark, demonic and satanic. Democracy always appeals to what is dark, satanic and blind in the mass, to what may be manipulated and changed. Essentially there is no principle that may not be made acceptable to the mass if it is consistently communicated in the right way and for long enough. Gradually everything becomes acceptable – everything, without exception; and, in the near future the opposite of everything and then the opposite of those too, this time pointing to a yet again different direction.

Let's emphasize: both true and pseudo-democracy are the straight, cardinal and combatant manifestation forms of anti-traditionality; all liberal-parliamentary, and all terroristico-dictatorial forms of democracy are also – similarly to the previous ones – anti-traditional, anti-spiritual, destructive, devastating societal and state forms that stand against man, against life and even more so against everything above life and against the Spirit.

It is evident – and this is a fundamental traditional premise – that the only forma statualis that reflects traditionalism is the monarchy, the kingdom, the empire, the principality – i.e. monarchies. No other state form may be imagined or conceived that would correspond with traditionality. There could be statualis formations that don't directly contradict traditional principles, but still, essentially only the monarchy is the single appropriate state form.

The initial period of the Golden Age was called abasileia , which means no kings. The antitraditional attitude may draw the conclusion from this that the most archaic state was somehow in opposition to monarchy. This would be an incorrect conclusion since in the age of abasileia everybody was a king, everybody ranked as a king and because of this there was no need for a special one. This also implies a human community whose every member was above castes, in fact, every member stood at the very peak of such supra-caste state. Under such conditions it is not important if there is a special ruler or there isn't. If not everybody stands at the very top of the supra-caste state – and in our current era the majority of people stand near the very bottom of the sub-caste state – , it can't be posited that monarchy doesn't make sense. The only reason why monarchy doesn't have sufficient sense in the current era is because the majority is not worthy and not suitable for living in a monarchy. The majority is unworthy and unsuitable for forming a community that is appropriate for a monarchy, for comprising the collective of a state that is suitable for a monarchy.

In the Dark Age the sacral Ruler is missing the highest grade of which used to be the God-King once. This was followed by the sacral king in a more direct sense – the king that was touched by the divine khrisma, whose calling came from Heaven; then kings appeared that ruled by the grace of God, followed by those in whom this kingdom by the grace of God still somehow manifested itself – even if just dimly, partially and relatively; with time even this disappeared – in parallel to which, in some sense even preceding this – the community disappeared together with the people that under the rulership of the king and under the leadership of those worthy for leadership could manifest themselves as demos hieros. Demos hieros is a folk that indirectly – through the Ruler – has sanctity; and this folk is disappearing in our age, probably it has already disappeared.

Yet, even today the only valid state form is still the monarchy; state form in a relative sense because true states no longer exist. Only state imitations exist with their apparatus. Despite this, if they created something at least in analogy with the true state, this could be conceived only in a monarchical framework.

If there is no king, if there is nobody who is elevated to this rank through a heavenly khirmsa, then at least a regent (regens) should emerge who to some degree approaches this dignity and who, until the true and worthy Ruler appears – perhaps only in a subsequent world-era – in a way substitutes the actual Ruler. The regens – and even more so the regnator – would substitute the king in the capacity of a ruler. The chances are minimal even for this in our times but this is the only direction where something may be conceived.

Here we must mention a very important thing: the question of whether the state and the church (any kind of church) may be separated or not. 99% of the people who consider themselves spiritually oriented would answer with a yes, that the two must be separated. This view is perfectly anti-spiritual. The state and the church may and must never be separated. Such separation means: to revoke statualitas from the church and to revoke everything that the church represent from statualitas – the Spirit and the divine. Such separability should never even come up even on the level of considerations.

Yet, as we said earlier, currently there are no actual states. (If we want to be really generous we should say that true states don't really exist.) The apparatus statualis that is operational today makes the impression as if there was a state but there isn't; there is only an apparatus. And without doubt the church may not be subordinated to the apparatus and the apparatus may also not be subordinated to the church. So it makes some sense to separate the two today but when we say this – even before we do – this situation must be interpreted and elucidated: why the two may not be intertwined today as it would otherwise be normal.

It belongs to this question that the church is only minimally a church today. This fact just underlines that the state apparatus – the state apparatus without a state – may not be subordinated to the church. If the situation was normal the state and the church would be in an organic symbiosis with each other – in inseparable symbiosis.

If the state is a real state and society is a real society, then the state would stand guard above society. If society is real society – i.e. it is an organic society – then it is also in symbiosis with the state, but in a way that the primacy of the state in this symbiosis remains intact.

The question arises if a total state has authority. Let's recognize that superior to the total state – infinitely superior – is the organic state, the status organicus. Status totalis is acceptable as long as the status totalis is: organic. Thus we consider the organically total state to be acceptable which in its control and structure is organically catagogic (following a top down direction), and which in its goals is organically anagogic (following a bottom up direction). In case of the state imitations – that often aim at totality – of today we can observe an inorganic and anagogic control setup and an also inorganic and catagogic orientation. These are formations that are moved by lower powers or controlled by the advocacy (reflecting the attitude of attorneys) of lower powers.

In these state imitations the most destructive goals of lower powers are taken up and represented by cliques of "lawyers" – without regard to whether or not they are suitable for the masses. No real value is expressed in these goals. Namely the mass can only recognize (just like the lowest level people can recognize) what is it momentarily that he finds, say, the most pleasant, but it can't identify what is for them the most positive; – and the two are by no means the same. The most pleasant! For example if they want to eat, they want to eat – everybody knows this and more or less even a collective may know this. If there is no money, they want more money. But about what is positive for them, they have no idea. What's positive also have transcendental perspectives; – and when I say "also" I am making concessions because it only has transcendental perspectives. Somebody in whose life the transcendental doesn't play a decisive role, can't recognize what are the true positives.

It is obvious – and we can't stress this enough – the terroristic and dictatorial forms set in opposition with the liberal-parliamentary democracy do not provide a solution either. Even in these, they take on the needs of the folk in the sense of advocacy. Although they don't satisfy these needs but in a certain way they still respond to these adequately.

Let's assume that they would really satisfy the needs of the people and thus once true democracy (which has never happened) would become a reality world-wide; when this would not be manipulated by money or by anything else. It is possible that this would be the most terrible formation which man on Earth has ever seen. This would be namely fully anarchistic. If so called freedom is increased to the extremes, it is always anarchistic, thus terroristic. And if freedom is extremely repressed that is also always terroristic. The intensification and repression of freedom ultimately concludes in the same result because we are in the Dark Age, because the world and man is in a darkened state.

Man in abaseleia – whether or not he's ruled – stays in an enlightened state. Today however either the terror of the dictatorship of the apparatus or – as the other extreme – anarchist terror takes over – and practically there is no difference between the two.

Society may only be organic if there is an organic – even organically total – state ruling over it and society may only be an organic society if it is hierarchically structured; we can say that it is structured in the sense of a hierarchical graduality, a hierarchical graduation of existence.

This view is in full opposition with what is being force-fed to people since their childhood today. This however can't hinder us in pronouncing the principles that are valid and that absolutely don't concern themselves with how man has been manipulated throughout his life.

Originally (and this always means a state that is closer to the origin, to archaicity, even if it is not fully in archaicity itself) man built a collective unity physically-mentally-spiritually in which the correspondence of inheritances realized on the physical plane, the mental and interincarnative inheritances, as well as the transcendental origins was perfectly harmonious. Originally everybody incarnated where, according to their essence, they had to. This, in some sense, is still like this, but then the formulas were clear and precise. So only such a person incarnated into a bráhmana family that physically, mentally and spiritually met the fundamental characteristics of the bráhman; – never anywhere else, and whoever incarnated specifically there, could not have incarnated anywhere else. This applied equally for the kshatriyas, the vaishyas, the shudras and the chandalas, too. Everybody incarnated physically, mentally and spiritually to the place that was most suitable for them to be their physical-mental-spiritual carrier. Everybody incarnated to where they belonged by their essence – and these were clear formulas.

Today somebody who is by his essence a bráhmana – although there are not too many of these, but let's assume that we're talking about a potential bráhmana – may incarnate in terrible conditions because this from a certain point of view – due to the special dispensation of obstacles and advantages – may be to some degree advantageous. But this is no longer a clear formula. In reality – based on special karmabandha relationships – everybody incarnates where they belong even today, but these may no longer be considered to be clean formations. Thus it is conceivable that there are five siblings in one family and one of them is a potential bráhmana, one of them is a potential kshatriya, one of them is a potential vaishya, one is a quasi-shudra and one that corresponds with a panchaka. If there was a sixth sibling, that one may be an avarna. This may be conceived without reservations today, however in the age of organic correspondences this would have been an absurdity.

We should never forget that the bráhmana principle or the kshatriya is just as valid today as they have ever been – not by the slightest degree are they any less valid. What's lost is the clarity regarding the carriers. This means that the frames of manifestation of the castes have become unstable. These frames became massively unstable very long time ago, in the age of the historical Buddha – so roughly 2500 years ago, around the critical year of 510-509 B.C. This doesn't mean that the castes in India for example would have lost their validity by today. 2500 years have past and they still have validity. Although it is possible that bráhmanas are only minimally bráhmanas, in the same time among those in the fifth level we still can't find bráhmanas even today. Those higher have slid down, those lower slid further down, not the other way.

*

The West – meaning west from the meridian that crosses the Kheops or Hufu pyramid (this meridian also goes through the vicinity of Saint Petersburg) – in some sense is truly a part of the world that's related to settling and decline, in other words the part where the Dark Age prevails more than elsewhere. The Dark Age of course prevails everywhere, in the West, in the East, in the North and also in the South, but in the West somewhat sooner.

The clean caste formations in the West became unstable almost in pre-historical times, but their remnants remained observable for a long time, occasionally even as quite superior forms. The Roman patricians for example were the last representatives of a caste whose members were simultaneously bráhmanas and kshatriyas and represented an extremely superior and ancient archaic unity – in a dimmed and deteriorated form, but still absolutely not indignantly. The majority of the patricians who were the representatives of the gens – the founding dynasties of Rome – (these we should differentiate from the later patricians that got appointed) represented this origin on a certain level; – not all of them and not always and not unconditionally, but to some degree definitely.

Castes may not be created artificially. Yet: we may say that the European middle class of antiquity, of the Middle Ages and of early modernity to some degree and in some sense meant the pale reflection of the original vaishya. The warrior nobility showed some relationship with the kshatriya and the clergy also showed some pale relationship with the bráhmana.

Certain priests (and in this case this also includes monastic priests) represented a certain bráhmana quality and some of them – although only a few – were exceptional personalities, this however was not enough for the formation of an actual hereditary caste.

Making celibacy mandatory originates from mixing up two principles. The possible fusion of pontifical priestly quality and the monastic priestly quality: monastic priesthood (monk-priesthood). This however should not be unconditionally extended to the entirety of priesthood. If priests had married only from priest-families then such families may have had such characteristics (only pale and secondary) which may have provided a more appropriate base for people with priestly qualities in term of incarnations. Although a priesthood in this sense would have represented (even as a late and pale version) the original bráhmana to only a very small degree, this could have still resulted in a certain –probably very low– vicinity to that state. And here we must note that we must detect an anti-traditional intervention in the fact that the non-monastic priesthood was not allowed to marry, the effect of an intent whose aim was that the bráhmana caste may not exist even as an imitation – even as a pale imitation.

There was however a possibility in the West that connected the ascetic and the warrior life style. In this chivalric-ascetic line -represented by only a few- there was a possibility and an orientation towards the restoration of the original state above the castes. No other social formation carried this possibility, besides the chivalric-ascetic orientation. And it was precisely this orientation that they attempted to marginalize the most; at a time when this truly had significance and relevance or even today, when these no longer have any effectiveness – only on some castrated, charity level. It's significant in this respect to remember the antipathy and hatred that Paul VI. Manifested towards the Sovereign Military Order of Malta. Starting mainly with John XXIII., the popes professed antipathy towards everything that truly represented any kind of superiority.

*

In this advanced stage of Kali-Yuga society may no longer be led back to itself- to its own organicity. But it's possible to awake in people such illuminative possibilities that point out the direction towards which man and the world should be led. There isn't much practical hope in reaching the appropriate goal but certain possibilities do exist. We have mentioned on many occasions that in a certain direction all necessary steps must be made even if the success of these doesn't seem to be guaranteed at all. From the point of view of an innate and personal thrive -that aims at a supra-personal goal-, these steps may be very valuable. It is more likely that they will not produce results in the outside world but if somebody follows an inner path and as his outside path -ritually- chooses to change something in the outside world, his efforts -despite the lack of success on the outside- may result in a certain inner progress. That's all and this -seemingly- isn't much. In comparison to the highest possible goals that may be set, this is of course very little. But in comparison to what is possible to do in the Kali-Yuga at all, this is not a little. Independent of whether there is or there isn't any hope for success, everything must be done and if somebody commits to following an inner spiritual path then – at least on this inner path – he can progress.

On Some of the Characteristics of the Post-Communist System

Following the natural sequence of decline, the rule of the brahmanas, ksatriyas, vaisyas (and their quasi-equivalents) "should have been" followed by the rule of the sudras and for a while it seemed that this had in fact been the case: in countries dominated by the bolshevistico-communist reign of terror, the sudras, the sudra-equivalents and sub-sudras did have a leading, although not a defining role. This, not unexpectedly, more or less ceased to be the case after 1990-1991. While in some countries the communist system continues to subsist, the general dominance of bourgeois intelligentsia has become commonplace.

This, however, in our opinion, doesn't mean that the representatives of a traditional orientation were wrong when they foretold that the bourgeois would be replaced by sub-bourgeois elements in power; essentially they were not wrong, although they didn't consider some references, relations, circumstances and metamorphosis with enough clarity.

The reign of the sudra-like elements of the proletariat and the peasantry concluded in 72, in some places in 45 years. However, this period was not defined by their dominion; they –especially the sub-sudras, the pancakas– were at the forefront, but actual power was exercised by a Jewish-freemason leadership from the background.

It was becoming obvious even for the least apt observers that the specimen of the proletariat, the infra-proletariat and the sub-peasantry were not only unable to actually exercise power, but they were fully incapable of fulfilling even their puppet leadership role.

The role of the bourgeois intelligentsia was already significant around 1960 and it continued to rise rapidly, until its declared "take-over of power" in 1990.

This didn't mean a return to a previous stage; this may appear so only on the surface and only for the most superficial observers. What happened was that the rule of the pancakas, the sub-sudras has become complete. Certain pancakas (as opposed to the upavarnas) are capable of attaining and retaining pseudo-intelligence and corresponding qualities and applying them in practical areas.

The office

The pseudo – bourgeois pseudo-intelligentsia of our days (possibly with a philosophiae doctor qualification) are repulsive monsters below the level of sudras who – besides serving subterrestrial-infernal powers- are "open" only toward voraciously and unscrupulously grabbing the most materialistic material goods driven by the lasciviousness of an infinitely inferior hedonism.

Today's management type is a typical representative of the "guides" on the road to this infra-hominalitas. So we can't talk about the return of even a depraved form of the bourgeois. The Western world subtly transitioned from the world of the depraved bourgeois to the world of bourgeois intelligentsia below the level of the sudras, almost unnoticed. While those who had lived behind the "Iron Curtain" did experience the transitional period of the sub-sudras in the form of the infra-proletariat, the West encountered this only as a latent possibility.

Antifa

We now find ourselves in a period dominated by increasingly inferior and demonic, in the same time increasingly pseudo-intellectual pancaka tendencies, approaching the conclusion of this particular cycle of the earthly-human world.

Tradition and Politics

The need for the Truth tends to become acute in extreme situations. For example, when things are getting out of control. To regain control we need to introduce change in our course of action. To determine what the appropriate change is, we need to reflect: perhaps we've been acting on false assumptions; perhaps our world-view has been distorted. Sometimes there's time to reflect, sometimes, for example, when things escalate fast, the correction of views and action must happen simultaneously. In such moments of truth those fortunate enough to be blessed with (intellectual) intuition experience what's right in a supra-temporal moment; intuition, which connects the now with eternity, hits them as lightning and lifts them above the flow of events, bestowing supra-rational certainty and, in many cases, odds-defying strength on them.

The turbulent events of the early 20th century called forth the need for a course correction. This, alas, took place only in world – views; the events themselves continued to escalate in the wrong direction.

The tremendous intellectual step of articulating the correct world-view was undertaken by what we refer to as the Traditionalist school. The great personalities of this „school” were dealing with Metaphysical Tradition from all possible angles, including religion, politics, society, arts and sciences.

I must mention in passing that sporadically, throughout the 20th Century, certain heroic personalities attempted course correction also in the field of action, against all odds. Perhaps we'll have the chance to present these in due course. I can't not mention it, however, that earlier this week (October 24th, 2019), 44 years after his death, one of them, Francisco Franco, was ordered by the disrespectful mob to be exhumed – an event quite symbolic of our times.

For various reasons the authors of the Traditionalist school have remained rather unknown to the general public. In the last few decades, however, we can see an increased interest, especially in the works of Rene Guenon and Julius Evola. This interest created opportunities for new publishing companies in the English speaking sphere to emerge, and these evolved into platforms mostly to promote political ideas, only some of which are inspired by the

Traditionalist school, mostly by Evola. It has now become somewhat fashionable to read the authors of the Traditionalist school and these authors are quoted and possibly even read by politicians and political activists. After decades of isolation, it seems that the principles of Tradition fell on fertile ground outside of the small, well-maintained and exclusive gardens of various religious orders, foundations and, sporadically, academia.

Could this be good? Overall, it seems that instead of clarity and order, which characterizes the founders of the Traditionalist school and their direct followers in terms of both writing and living, we mostly encounter chaos and confusion when it comes to those who interpret them or refer to them – with only a few exceptions.

We encounter a wide range of people who declare themselves traditionalists while promoting a rather broad range of untraditional, even contra-traditional ideas, including

various forms of anarchism,

national bolshevism,

the promotion of democracy, or

promoting unconditional egalitarianism while

denying qualitative differentiation,

naming all differentiation racist, and even going to such extremes as to

declaring that the goal is to “win” or conquer modernism or perhaps post-modernism (the metaphor is wrong: modernism is not a fortress to be conquered but a symptom to be eliminated), not to mention more distinct particularisms trying to sell themselves in a traditional packaging, like, for example,

white nationalism,

the alt-right,

the new right and similar, and last but not least

considering Traditionalism as only one of many movements or ideologies, without ever taking an uncompromising Traditionalist position themselves – in their works and in their lives.

This list is far from being exhaustive.

Of course, the situation is complicated since the hodgepodge of individual ideas are always mixed with plenty of elements from Traditional doctrines: the better read the writer, the more of these we'll find in their works. To untangle such a chaos would require several volumes written on one single chaotic book – which would obviously be an absurd approach leading to a never-ending process.

Naturally, we find the biggest confusion in the most popular domain: politics where we mostly encounter interpretations of interpretations – at best; there is almost no sign of any traditionalist doctrines or principles in these. Of course, it is precisely here where we encounter the biggest challenges and where the situation is most hopeless. In fact, we have to face it: there is no room for traditional action in politics today: on the one hand, there is no longer any room left for action outside of the democratic system, on the other hand, even if there was, the availability of people who possess the necessary qualities required for such an action is negligible. Further, the vertical integration of those who do possess the necessary qualities, is not solved: there are no structures in place for this. Let's have a closer look at this problem. (I am not going to address the theoretical possibilities for action outside of the democratic system this time.)

First, qualifications. To start at the top, there are still qualified people in various religious orders; we should mention especially some of the Sufi orders. What's more, in certain Islamic countries there seems to be regular, formal interactions taking place between political leaders and the leaders of such orders. Also, in these countries religious leaders exercise a great deal of direct influence on the population. There are also some Sufi orders in Western countries, including those that the representatives of the Traditionalist school belonged to that hopefully exert some influence on practical politics – but this, alas, is not likely.

We are not aware of organizations that would qualify people even in the theory of Traditional doctrines outside the religious domain, not forgetting, of course, the exceptions in academia, like Seyyed Hossein Nasr, William C. Chittick, Harry Oldmeadow, to mention just a few, or some isolated personalities that are active outside of both academia and religious orders, like the Hungarian Andras Laszlo.

Naturally, there is a big difference between teaching, studying and living the doctrines of Tradition, should they concern traditional religions or metaphysics, and simply talking and reading about them with or without qualifications. Luckily, those who are not qualified typically give up on their autodidactic endeavors. They find themselves in a paradoxical situation that they may not overcome without actual qualification based on intellectual predisposition and a dedicated praxis: although they understand the words and sentences, they can't grasp the meaning of what they are reading.

Many times, it proves to be very challenging for such people, who are often highly educated, even to make sense of individual sentences – which they need to keep on re-reading – or to follow the chains of thought outlined even in shorter paragraphs.

Those who may qualify by their intellectual disposition face many challenges if they don't have proper guidance. These include various currents of influences that have, to a large degree, shaped their current world-view, and, of course, their world-view itself. In the intellectual milieu fostered by the modern education system it takes at least a decade of disciplined intellectual ascesis to establish a proper world-view capable of discerning the true from the false in the currents of influences one encounters from "interpreters" of traditionalist authors, from various self-proclaimed Indian, Chinese, Tibetan, etc. gurus selling yoga, Buddhist practices, etc., as well as others, like opinionated publishers, journalists, activists, politicians, philosophers, celebrities, etc. On a lighter note, an example: we know somebody who boasted that his guru in India is always on call and responds to him with a few hours turn-around time on skype; one of the local "gurus" in his medication class can "go into Samadhi in like 15 seconds" – and similar.

Let's not forget also, that once the proper Weltanschauung is established, it must be consciously maintained throughout life; as Andras Laszlo put it: "To eliminate his defective judgement of value, man should attend to a radical process of autocorrection in the course of which every earlier view should be rejected, and then that which stands the test of the new view, should be reaccepted."

Without proper foundations people tend to accept or reject ideas for the wrong reasons and once they do, they can't make them their own. Intellectual ascesis is the way to achieving authenticity in the intellectual domain.

Another considerable challenge qualified individuals face is the active, "outward" aspect of life itself: to live with integrity, without making fatal compromises. Organic organizations used to serve as protective shields against destructive tendencies. Now, even if one is exceptionally lucky to have proper guidance, one will find himself almost completely isolated, without the chance to meet others on the same path. Needless to say, this applies to almost everybody in the Western hemisphere. Such lack of horizontal integration means that no "field of gravity" develops around them that may exert influence on the lower strata.

I'd like to add here that we have seen an interesting anomaly when it comes to vertical integration, depicting the reverse situation: a small group of qualified representatives (this itself is quite unique) of Tradition managed to exert through their publications quite significant influence (considering the circumstances) on the power domain (political or semi-political movements and organizations), while they themselves maintain only a lose connection with each other, without any formal organization or structure. Of course, this means that individually, without the protection of traditional organizations, they are directly exposed to destructive, anti-traditional currents – even more so than most.

Internal qualifications may find manifestation in specific style elements and these in turn are necessary for vertical integration. Let's repeat for emphasis: style is not arbitrary. Internal qualifications bestow supra-individual style elements on people. Religious or military orders, the ranks of the military itself, guilds, the members of dynasties or even families in organic societies strictly adhered to such style elements in their rites, ceremonies, speech, conduct, all the way to how they ate or walked or to the way they were thinking – ungraspable for today's individual who considers these superfluous, strenuous, even intolerable.

Style is the application of theory. Theoretical qualification is not enough. Not to apply knowledge, in other words, not living according to it, is nothing less than betrayal; betrayal of the self and of the (potential) community. This is what, for example, the correct practice of the Eightfold Buddhist Path or various tantric paths signify; a practice that extends to all imaginable moments of life. Not just for the duration of performing rites and ceremonies, but even to how one speaks with whom, for example. There is no such thing as an insignificant moment or an insignificant happening in a life still connected to its source.

A proper look at style (lifestyle, speaking style, writing style, behavior), from this point of view, should suffice to judge to what degree somebody internalized knowledge, or, in other words, to what degree one has become one with what one knows. Style contains both peculiarities, related to the person, and universals. The more one approaches the Absolute, the less peculiarities one exhibits.

After qualifications, let's have a look at structures. Earlier I mentioned that style is quite propitious for vertical integration. This is important to our topic, because vertical integration is a political task. The power domain must be subordinated to the spiritual domain and the domain of economics must be subordinated to the power domain. (With the pervasive corruption of governments that respond only to financial and material considerations this seems to be, ironically and in a inverse sense, already achieved. Also, when looking at things from a higher context, taking the semi-invisible political background powers into consideration this also seems to be achieved, again, in an inverse sense. While this latter factor is undeniably powerful, and covert in the sense that it has not pronounced a well-articulated purpose, nor are his agents known, we may recognize it by its characteristic style elements: it doesn't follow true principles, it operates mainly with financial and material means, it's highly manipulative, its manifestations contain self-contradictions, and it aims at destroying structures that may still provide qualification and integration: in other words, they stand in opposition to organic hierarchies.)

Horizontal integration takes place within the individual domains, vertical integration takes place across them. To use the analogy of a tree, horizontal integration takes place along the branches, vertical integration takes place along the trunk connecting the branches. The direction of horizontal integration is towards the trunk (the center), the direction of vertical integration is up.

Vertical integration is not possible from the bottom up: it has to start from the spiritual domain that exerts a "pull" towards the lower levels. Also, horizontal integration can't be achieved from the periphery: it must start from the trunk, so to speak. Horizontally, those most qualified are the closest to the trunk. Vertically, those most qualified are closest to where the trees are reaching: to the heavens. It's clear from this analogy, that integration means returning to the origin(s) and the origin corresponds to Tradition. (The roots of the tree in our analogy is not the origin, but the starting position. The starting position one finds oneself in (in manifestation) is the farthest point from the origin.)

This analogy helps to explain the challenge. It is a pleasure to observe horizontal integration initiatives. These happen mostly in the domains of economics and military, paramilitary or other movements, for instance in martial arts, in addition to various specialized publishing initiatives. For example, we may consider the BJJ "brotherhood" or the Sistema movement, to name but a few, as attempts of integrating people with a kshatriya disposition; we may consider attempts to revive guilds or organic farming in order to perfect trade and to strengthen local communities as an attempt to consolidate people with a vaishya disposition, and so on. However, in lack of vertical integration, following traditional doctrines, these quickly lose momentum and start to deviate and deteriorate.

When organic societies were extant, the role of the monarch was to maintain the vertical integrity of the organic state – politics in the modern sense didn't exist back then. If we insist on the right – left dichotomy, we can say that there was no such thing as left. Politics today should aim at re-establishing organic structures. If this is not the aim, we can't even talk about politics. The *weltanschauung* that dominates is not favorable to politics on any level, and it seems like politics is indeed being replaced by business. Money has replaced principle(s) as the cause and purpose of the organization of various forces. What can possibly be achieved in today's political game in terms of truth, justice, beauty, organicity in the Traditional sense? The traditional institutions of the horizontal planes (of religion, military, trade) have long ago disintegrated, and there are hardly any qualified people left to bring them back to life: we are standing among ruins.

Perhaps it sounds like a cliché, but it's worth spelling it out:

The spiritual/intellectual class must (re)organize itself

The spiritual/intellectual class must help the reorganization of the warrior class (including the political domain)

The spiritual/intellectual class must help the reorganization of trade & commerce

The qualification of all three classes are vital, thus traditional education, including both theory and practice must be a central topic concerning all possible approaches to politics.

There is an interesting question that is being discussed from various angles, but the bottom line is this: how to define Tradition in the left – right spectrum, and should we bother with this at all?

More important than this is to have a well-defined political position from a Traditionalist point of view in the first place. Such a well-defined position should serve as a point of reference for judging the value of various political currents from a Traditional point of view for the sake of clarity and corrections.

In his essay on the “Relationship between metaphysico-traditional weltanschauung the ultradextro-conservative world-view” Andras Laszlo provided a precise and exhaustive definition in this respect, rightly emphasizing that from a Traditional point of view there is no compromise in questions of principles. Compromises in this domain lead to corruption. Andras Laszlo outlined Tradition’s stand in the left – right spectrum, providing a special definition for the right. For those who consider the left – right dichotomy inadequate for a Traditionalist position, it’s enough to replace his special definition of the right (implied in the very title of his essay) simply with the word Tradition.

Naturally, it’s not possible to participate with integrity in real-politics in its current shape or form from the Traditional point of view. In the same token, none of the above mentioned measures are superfluous to pursue: they help prepare for filling the vacuum that is emerging once democracy will be deemed useless and called off by those very powers that institutionalized it for their subversive, anti-traditional purposes.

Tradition

A Brief Outline of Yama and Niyama

It is well known that yama – as 'stopping', 'restraining', 'eliminating', 'rectification by elimination' or 'correction' – means the first group of ascetical operations in yoga. Besides and before the ascesis of metaphysical realization (i.e. yoga) it is, however, also connected to prayoga ('pre-yoga'), to 'pre-initiation', to preparation (and self-preparation), and to pre-preparation as levels of fundamental auto-control, auto-correction and auto-rectification.

When it comes to direct goals it's best not to talk about metaphysical realization, yoga, or initiation, but simply about self-control, self-study, self-observation, and self-correction, as well as their more or less immediate possibilities.

The first set of tasks aims at certain decisions based on self-observation:

I.1. Initial self-study about one's innate spiritual – mental attitude toward modernity. Decision, and if appropriate, moving to the next step.

I.2. Initial self-study about one's spiritual-mental-physical disposition, as well as about one's basic characteristics. Decision, and if appropriate, moving to the next step.

I.3. Initial self-study about the quality and strengths of one's affinities, attractions, repulsions, relations and spontaneous intentions and thrives. Decision, and if appropriate, moving to the next step.

I.4. Initial self-study about the quality, strengths and the actual state of one's conscious intentions, thrives, and goals. Decision, and if appropriate, moving to the next step.

Following these considerations – provided we performed them with high awareness, intensity and honesty, without self-delusion – we may decide if we're predisposed to Mehr-Leben (more life, to live more) or to Mehr als Leben (more than life). It is advisable to choose the negative option both privately and publicly rather than misleading oneself and others by incorrectly choosing the more superior, more positive option. Namely, a true decision and choice, even if it's negative, will not exclude subsequent possibilities, and due to the strength of recognition, one can still do a number of things.

For achieving true results, we must tackle the following tasks:

II. 1. Studies. Deepening our studies of already familiar doctrinal, interpretative and supplementary literature; additional studies (for example, traditional languages). Writing.

II. 2. Having made some progress in the previous steps, we must intensify and expand our self-study, with special emphasis on attachments and conscious-autonomous intentions and thrives.

II. 3. Further-clarifying positive-ascensional thrives. (Examining our thrives already points in this direction; here it's about expanding this.)

II.4. Integration of positive-ascensional thrives, according to the goal.

The last two, but especially the last task (II.4.) can't be completed without first developing certain *actitudos*, i.e. the orientations of the subject toward certain 'action-forms'.

III. 1. Developing various *actitudes* (realization-oriented, aristocratic, scientific, artistic, philosophical, practical, heroic, magical) must start with a high level of intuition of the subject – after proper previous orientations.

III. 2. Unfolding the *actitudes* through action. (*Actitudes* wane without proper action.)

III. 3. Constant and permanent self-study and self-control.

III. 4. Deepening and expanding a high level of thematic thinking.

This is where the most basic exercises begin in *yama* –operations on the corrective-pre-preparative level – although in the III.3 level of the previous group we can already detect certain elements of *yama*, since (an almost) permanent self-control is significant not only in terms of awareness, but also as a factor of rectification. This is what should be further developed in the subsequent steps.

IV. 1. In context of self-control, while maintaining and intensifying the previous operation, we must give special attention to the content and quality of thinking.

IV. 2. All automatic-spontaneous associations, and later all non-thematic –hypothematic thinking must be stopped intentionally and consciously; these must be replaced by a high-quality, resolved thematic thinking. There are, of course, levels. (First, for example, the level of the topic may be raised: non-thematic thinking may be first replaced with thinking about a historical topic and later with thinking about a philosophical topic.) Although a positive element is always present here, this operation is essentially "negative", i.e. it aims at stopping and eliminating something. For now there is nothing extraordinary in this thematic thinking replacing a non-thematic thinking: nothing that may qualify as an actual operation.

IV.3. A further development of this is what may be compared to Scaligero's *distractio* (break-off). In such cases not only the thinking areas and processes should be stopped and replaced suddenly that don't qualify as thinking in a strict sense, but, in certain hours, at certain intervals, even the process of thematic thinking: it must be stopped suddenly and be replaced with thinking about a different topic. This may be – and should be – repeated several times.

IV.4. Self-control in general also entails the control of emotions. Here we need to gradually increase control, ensuring that emotions will not (or just minimally) manifest themselves in behavior or in facial expressions, even if we're alone.

What we've covered so far constitute the most basic pre-operations of the pre-preparative yama exercises. We must keep in mind that these exercises are not highly effective – years of practice is necessary to achieve little results in these areas.

Naturally, it will become more and more necessary that the flaws that are revealed by reflections will be acknowledged and radically eliminated; radically, but with full awareness of causes, backgrounds and interrelations and, if necessary, gradually but absolutely not brutally.

We must take others' opinions into consideration, but not necessarily as a determining factor. If, for example, somebody discovers a flaw in us, we must take it into consideration. The discovered flaw – in certain respects – really is a flaw, but only we may know truly its weight, significance, context, and cause – at least we should.

Exception is when our spiritual guide – who stands on a higher level than us and whom we trust fully – turns our attention to a flaw of ours: the exploration and elimination of such flaws must be pursued with the upmost attention.

Yama exercises always contain something from niyama exercises, but – as we noted earlier – the emphasis is still on the elimination aspect of corrections and this must remain so for a long time.

The greatest danger – against which yama operations must be applied – is mental-spiritual inertia. This means a sort of pseudo-thinking the topic of which is amorphous, almost undefinable: it stems from a state of thinking that concedes to the body and inertly sinks into cerebralism. If somebody can't correct himself in this respect, he won't be able to correct himself in other areas, either. If somebody doesn't consider self-correction necessary in this area, he can't seriously consider it important in other areas, either.

We must note that even the pre-preparative – corrective pre-operations of yama must (partially) be preceded by the establishment of a global and coherent world-view. We can see that many people, including even those who are in possession of the necessary intellectual powers and have set spiritual goals for themselves, have a muddy, limited and self-contradictory so called "world-view" that hardly qualifies as a world-view even in a modern sense.

A world-view may not be a rigid, vulgar system of opinions that may be applied nominally – verbally at will, something that guides what to say in what situation without the vivid and active act of viewing; but it also can't be a constantly changing "looking" that lacks any point of "crystallization", any integrative core or convergent goal, i.e. something that can't be

global, can't be definite, and can't be coherent. A grave flaw in world views is epigonism, which always follows others (authorities); it has no independent views and even if it had, it would check it against an authority and repress it, as the case may be. Not any smaller flaw is the drive for independence by any means – this is nothing more than capriciousness and over-compensation for a Minderwertigkeitsgefühl (for a feeling of inferiority). A similar flaw is the disregard of authorities. There may be and there are authorities and they are necessary. However, what proves them right is that what they say is true and not merely that they are authorities. Whether what they say is true may be established only independently – perhaps with some help, but ultimately independently.

A Critique of 'New Age'

It seems the most extreme forms of today's pseudo-spiritual deviations are represented by the "New Age" movement.

The name "New Age" was chosen as a reference to the era of Aquarius and to a renewal this implies. The assumption is that the age of Aquarius (more precisely: the "praecessional" age with an Aquarius-Taurus-Leo-Scorpion dominance) has already begun. Followers of the "New Age" are actually quite divided and uncertain in regard to the actual beginning: some think that it began at the end of the 18th Century, or in the 19th or 20th Century, or in the 21st Century, but, according to them, it will definitely begin by the 22nd Century.

[...]

"New Age" started to unfold and take on a definitive form due to influences from the most destructive "oriens" of Freemasonry.

"New Age" as a school and as a loosely organized but effective movement is building – and absorbing – the influences of other deviant and deviator schools – even if these schools may not be aware of this, or even if they specifically reject the principle manifestations of "New Age".

To pick an example: this includes the "pseudo-theosophisms" represented by the Theosophical Society – and this ranks among the better ones.

"New Age" accommodates most of the occult and pseudo-occult lines of the 19th and 20th Centuries, in addition to the various forms spiritism. Shamanism (pseudo-shamanism, that

is) is quite favoured, but even the main lines of satanism managed to find room among the "accepted and respected" schools of "New Age", not to mention witchcraft, the views of which is decidedly favoured among the advocates of "New Age".

Almost all branches of modern "psychology and psychologism" enjoys the full sympathy of "New Age", especially those that have "practical applications".

When it comes to the application of drugs and similar chemicals in the human body, no reservations are raised, whatsoever.

Followers of "New Age" are big fans of export-import yoga and "practical" Zen, "practical" Taoism and the export-import forms of Buddhism.

Besides propagating "old" and "new" meditation techniques, they also favour triggering artificial "meditation" (cf. "hemi-sync" method).

Even physicists, like, for example, Capra, have joined the "New Age" school, who are capable and willing to initiate "openings" in their own discipline that may be considered positive. For this, however, they don't need "New Age". On the other hand, the "physicalization" of the spiritual is not foreign to the advocates of "New Age".

The political position of "New Age" is democratic "anarchistico-liberal", but its followers only want to exercise an indirect influence on politics – by way of eliminating it. They are essentially left wing, although they don't call themselves that. The liberal-anarchism (with an internationalist-cosmopolitan accent) of their followers attempts to assert itself – as we have mentioned above – in the forms of direct apoliticism and indirect politicism, but, when it comes to orientations, in a destructive way.

"New Age" strongly propagates the importance, what's more, the indispensability of "lunarism"; it truly is a Lunar school both when it is almost arrogant as when it is subtle about it. Decidedly related to this are "feminism" and "femininism" – not so much "matriarchy" as rather "gynecocracy". What they want to achieve is the "feminization" of man and the world: everything and everybody – including men –, culture, social, – family, – and individual life must be feminized, according to the devotees of "New Age".

"New Age" – as a view – is, in certain respects, certainly universal, since it's capable of applying almost all views, all positions of the given era within the realm of its own ideology and practice. It accepts everything with the exception of spiritual and metaphysical tradition. In fact, it is also willing to accept traditionality both partially and in its entirely, but only by first submitting it to a process of "detraditionalificatio" and then, as a second step, to a process of "contratraditionalificatio".

"New Age" neither welcomes traditionality, nor turns against it, but it removes most of its essential features and turns it against its essential orientation. A truly spiritual view, as well as an internal and external stance that is based on metaphysical tradition, always puts a great emphasis on the indispensable necessity of maximally increasing the awareness of the current era. A perfectly sharp and increased awareness of both the present and the origins: without this, we can't talk of traditionality. A traditional stand postulates multidimensional knowledge of the current era, its rational and supra-rational understanding, the nuanced consideration and evaluation, as well as the application – in the course of realization – of the positives, negatives and the ambivalences hidden in the era.

A traditional view, even in the advanced stage of the Dark Age, clearly sees the positives and opportunities which help drawing positives from ambivalences and even from negatives. Further, it is well aware that it is possible to transcend the Dark Age along an axis that is vertical to temporality through a transformation of consciousness and reach the Bronze Age, the Silver Age, the Golden Age and ultimately, by transcending everything, to reach Absolute Eternity.

When it comes to the general conditions of the earthly human mode of existence, spiritual and metaphysical traditionality is definitely aware of the existence of Kali-Yuga. It also emphasizes that we must turn against Kali – Yuga (as Kali – Yuga). However, it also emphasizes that we can also cooperate with Kali – Yuga (as with the temporal representation of Eternity) – in fact, we must cooperate with it, but without in any way serving the tendencies that drive it.

There are schools, lines of thoughts – with their representatives and followers – that cooperate and collaborate with the forces that generate Kali – Yuga; they do this in both an organized and non-organized fashion, driven by various external and innate motivations. We know that these generative forces lead to the degeneration and destruction of the physical, mental and spiritual world of man. Almost all branches of Freemasonry – and those that are lined up around (besides, below and above) Freemasonry – are extremely supportive of the forces and powers that are active in the Dark Age; they are always ready to cooperate with these – consciously, semi-consciously or unconsciously. "New Age" – besides many other schools – is the product of these circles and their devotees as well as the powers they mediate.

On the one hand, it is impossible to reconcile or synthetize this school with spiritual and metaphysical traditionality; on the other hand, it is completely useless, or, from another point of view, such an attempt would only lead to serving the most satanic tendencies of the Dark Age.

The thorough treatment and examination of the details and problems necessary for the judgement of the "New Age" movement may be the topic of another work.

A Few Remarks on the Temporal Phases of Human Life

There are three adequate views on time as a streaming durance (duratio fluens):

a) linear time and time-view, – b) cyclical time and time-view, – c) radial time and time-view. Not only are these three types of conception of time and temporality all valid, considering all of them together is the only acceptable position.

Time – as streaming durance – is simultaneously linear and cyclical. Radial time appears in the interrelation of streaming durance (duration fluens) and static durance (duratio stans). This is the “point” of entry of time (as static durance) into time (as streaming durance) and in the same time it is the “point” of exit from streaming durance directly to the level of created static durance (duratio stans creata), and indirectly toward uncreated static durance, ultimately toward absolute super-temporal timelessness.

The individual-personal existence and life of corporeal man in the state of the earthly-human world begins in time (in tempore) and ends in time (in tempore) but on higher levels of existence (that are always present) other beginnings and other ends are always present, in addition to other durance, together with the two-way orientation of linearity, cyclicity and radiality. The interplay of these determine the quasi-rhythmic gradation of durance of human life.

The normative minimum of human life is – according to traditional views – 72 years; in the Far-East they also consider 81 years or even 120 years, but –from an astrological point of view- even 96 years, 100 years and 108 years, or –according to some schools- 60, 64 and 84 years of duration are also of special significance.

It is crucial to consider a 3 grade division, although it is generally neglected. The ages of youth, maturity and seniority are valid differentiations but don't allow for further gradation.

It seems that a four grade division is more valid especially if – similarly to the yugas – we focus on the ratio of 1:2:3:4 as progression of durance.

Here we have to take 70 years and 90 years –of secondary significance- as a base, since on the other hand, their base years of 7 years and 9 years are of primal significance. Thus:

1 x 7 years = 7 years; 0-7 years childhood

2 x 7 years = 14 years; 7-21 years pubescent/adolescent

3 x 7 years = 21 years; 21-42 years pre-mature age

4 x 7 years = 28 years; 42-70 years mature and post-mature age

In this gradation seniority starts above 70 years and this roughly corresponds with the conclusion of activities oriented outwards. This is when one truly needs to begin turning inwards.

The other way:

$1 \times 9 \text{ years} = 9 \text{ years}$; 0-9 years childhood

$2 \times 9 \text{ years} = 18 \text{ years}$; 9-27 years youth

$3 \times 9 \text{ years} = 27 \text{ years}$; 27-54 years maturity

$4 \times 9 \text{ years} = 36 \text{ years}$; 54-90 years seniority

Old age, in this setup, begins after the age of 90.

We receive a more clear and precise picture if we combine these life-duration gradations with the planetary classifications of astrology.

According to the 9 year basic gradation:

0-9 years Luna

9-18 years Mercurius

18-27 years Venus

27-36 years Sol

36-45 years Sol

45-54 years Sol

54-63 years Mars

63-72 years Jupiter

72-? years Saturnus

According to the 7 year basic gradation:

0-7 years Luna

7-14 years Mercurius

14-21 years Venus

21-28 years Sol

28-35 years Sol

35–42 years Sol

42–49 years Sol

49–56 years Sol

56–63 years Mars

63–70 years Jupiter

70– ? years Saturnus

According to the 12 year basic gradation:

0–12 years Luna

12–24 years Mercurius

24–36 years Venus

36–48 years Sol

48–60 years Sol

60–72 years Mars

72– 84 years Jupiter

84– ? years Saturnus

These three different systems of gradation are valid together and have to be considered together besides strict consideration of the two types of tetractys-gradation.

Details of the 7 year base gradation for the first 7 years of life:

0–1 age Luna – Luna

1–2 age Luna – Mercurius

2–3 age Luna – Venus

3–4 age Luna – Sol

4–5 age Luna – Mars

5–6 age Luna – Jupiter

6–7 age Luna – Saturnus

This partial gradation also appears in the later stages of life but not so sharply and unequivocally.

According to Tradition, human life in Satya-Krta-Yuga -in the Golden Age- would be between 4000 and 4320 years and it may have lasted even longer; in Treta-Yuga the duration of earthly-human life was 3000-3240 years; in Dvápara Yuga this duration was only 2000 or 2160 years; in Kali Yuga -in the Dark Ages- the length is 1000 or 1080 years or less, while in the terminal period 100 or 108 years is the general maximum; people usually live shorter and only in exceptional cases longer than this.

Astrology considers life circles of 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, (132), 144 years but many follow also the 100 year Frank Glahn life circle. Post mortem it's possible to create a life circle that's based on actual life duration = 360° key and retrospective this of course is more valid than any other life circle.

Quantitatively, the life span – in terms of prospective – is generally not known, thus in order to determine a spiritual life plan in broad terms, thinking in terms of a 72 years long life, although life may be much shorter and longer, too, may be acceptable. If somebody has already past their 72nd year, they can switch to a 144 year life span (divisibility by 36 is especially significant).

Special modes of life conduct, tasks and responsibilities belong to each age (life phase) which – if they remain unfulfilled- may lead to the accumulation of significant – even fatal – disadvantages on the path of autotransmutatio spiritualis et metaphysica.

There have been strictly exceptional cases, exceptional lives, exceptional individuum personales/persona individualis' who transcended/transcend the conduct of life determined by otherwise valid frames, also in regard to tasks related to age; for example those who follow one of the regular – in exceptional cases irregular – paths of Yoga. Yoga –as the ascesis of metaphysical realization – may exonerate one from the otherwise obligatory caste-laws (varna-dharmas) and age-laws (ásrama-dharmas).

In the world determined by Indian-Hindi tradition, the following ásrama-dharma circle belonged to the varna-dharma of the bráhmaṇa-varna (age law appropriate to the Brahmana caste), according to gradual phases:

1. brahmacári(n) phase

This refers to the adolescent age that corresponds to the period of intense study in order to establish an increasingly spiritual life-path.

2. grhastha phase

This is the period of the head of the house, of the husband, father. This period is dedicated to establishing a family, to increase material wealth, to beget children; all aspects of all these must be subordinated to the principles of a spiritual-metaphysical orientation.

3. vánaprastha phase

Once even the youngest child of the bráhma-father becomes independent and he has no other task of unconditional validity, the father-husband must leave his home and move to a sylvan hermit community so his life may be oriented exclusively above and beyond life.

4. sannyásí(n) phase

The old age reached in the sylvan hermit community presents a new task for the bráhma: he has to leave the hermit community in order to live the remaining of his life as a wondering, fully homeless hermit-ascetic fully dedicating his life to achieving metaphysical liberation –moksa-.

These life-phases were loosely connected to the life-phases of temporal gradation; the relative tight connection meant an optimal approach and if this was not hindered or excluded by something, the adjustment to these was also considered to be a quasi-task.

To draw a somewhat ironic opposite to this we could say that the “average man” today is infantile until the age of 36 and then – almost immediately – becomes senile or at least starts to become senile.

The nine year cycles – with a plus-minus one-two-three years accuracy – are extremely important. Most people “stop” around the age of 27, and become idle; their views become fixed by then and even if they manage to change a little, this will no longer be real change: it will stay within the already developed and coagulated frame-scheme and even if they adopt new views, they do this the same way as they adopted the one they are about to replace. People on a very low level get stuck as early as 18 and their life – especially in terms of views – will be sustained and determined by what they have internalized up until then. Nowadays it’s becoming an “achievement” if somebody reaches this stage around the age of 36 – let alone 45 or 54, which is increasingly becoming exceptional.

People with spiritual orientation should never become idle and we know that people with true spiritual orientation never stop, never become rigid and “ossified” even above the age of 100, if they live that long, or any time after that.

We must be at the highest spiritual level right in the moment before death (and of course in the moment of death) irrespective of when this takes place. A biophysiological slow-down could happen and this is "permissible", but actual mental deterioration is absolutely not.

The "eternal youth" of the body in the Kali-Yuga is possible only to exceptional Viators of exceptional paths and even for them, less and less so. To keep the soul significantly intact and uncorrupted is however a prerequisite for a spiritual man and the soundness of the spirit is a *conditio sine qua non*, which is self-evident.

In the current stage of Kali-Yuga the spirit's influence on the body is not so significant as before, but it is able to prevent its determinant effects on the body in regards the spirit and the soundness of the spirit. The body is usually capable of exerting a strong effect on the soul, and through it, it can also influence the spirit. Those who define themselves as the followers of a spiritual – metaphysical path, have to definitely reduce the direct and indirect – significant – influence of the body on the soul and on the spirit.

The difficulty of completing this tasks is extraordinary and – considering our era – this difficulty will only increase with time.

When one grows up, one must become fully adult; this is indispensable for the mature preservation and increase of awareness; one must achieve this by preserving the child in oneself while in the same time excluding all infantilism. To lose the child in myself prevents my spiritual-metaphysical realization, just like if I don't become perfectly adult. An infantile adult is who – despite growing up – remained a child without ever reaching true, mature adulthood. Adulthood – without the preservation and subsistence of the child – quickly reaches the initial phase of senility. The fading away of the child in ourselves – to put it strictly: in myself – is the main meta-somatic cause of the development of senility.

To sum it up: both infantility and senility, although differently, prevent spiritual-metaphysical realization.

A child (especially a baby) is closer to the origin and through it to what has no beginning. An adult, on the other hand, has reached or approached a state of mature awareness, the state of vigilant maturity. The state of the baby – even though it's continually decreasing – is given; the state of the adult – starting from the middle of life, being exposed to natural contingencies – is declining unless a decisive inner (we could say supra human, life-transcending) resistance develops against this decline. A counter-movement is required that's striving for ascent: not only for actual ascent but also for stopping or even for slowing the pace of decline. Whoever relies only on the physical plane must die young if he wants to avoid getting old in a state that's approaching the sub-human and to finish his earthly life this way.

In relation to the earthly-human temporality, praeeexistentia and postexistentia belong to timeless existence. This, however, is by far not the absolute supra-temporal-timeless eternity (aeternitas), just a temporality that is so different that in relation to the generally experienced durance, it means – even if only relatively – an actual quasi-timelessness.

We definitely submit to the unconditional certainty of the reality of human praeeexistentia and postexistentia and we generally accept – with appropriate amendments – the theological positions related to this – which could be quite varied. We reject redincarnationismus vulgaris; we can't accept the tenets of moderate postulatio redincarnationis, either. Regeneratio tendentionalis is universally and unequivocally accepted from a metaphysico-traditional point of view. This is indisputable. The question is if there is anything acceptable – in addition to the reverse stream of carmically determined tendencies – that may be related to the basic tenets of the nuanced and restrained teachings of re-birth. The answer must also be nuanced, moderate, diverse and ambiguous. Proper treatment of this would require a whole team of authors. Since this is not our objective now, we can't deal with this range of questions even tangentially here.

What we can say is that the firm rejection of redincarnationismus vulgaris and the non-acceptance of redincarnationismus subtilis belong to our basic tenets but these don't necessarily mean the complete denial of factualitas redincarnationis.

Life – embedded in a higher domain – doesn't start with birth, with biological conception, not even with occult conception and similarly it doesn't end with biological and or even with perfect death (including all the subsequent temporal facts). The way of praefecundalis and postmortalis life beyond life is immensely complex, multifaceted and ambiguous and the related questions and answers also contain several aspects and dimensions.

The totality of life is much broader in scope than the rhythmicity and cyclicity of ages and their gradation or the possibility of their gradation. This however doesn't contradict the classification of the duration of life into various phases, as a fully reasonable and well founded procedure both in terms of validity and justification.

Life can be hardly planned. An eventually successful life-conduct – from a metaphysico-traditional point of view – is minimum ambivalent. If we do consider it possible and positive, the most explicit and deepest consideration of the age-phases is essential; these should be studied both in general and specifically in relation to our own lives/my own life. The former fosters the latter and – when it comes to recognizing principles – the latter depends on the support of the former.

Temporal existence as a duration is related to the multiplicity of cycles. The smallest ones are in the order of magnitude of ten thousandths of a time-second and shorter, the largest ones may be "measured" in quadrillion years.

The study of these doesn't belong to the domain of metaphysics in a strict sense, but metaphysically determined cosmology and anthropology are important pre- and side studies for building the foundation for the immersion in metaphysics.

Modern man is insensitive toward anything that exceeds and points beyond his earthly-human existence in a vertical sense, upward. But man of this era is not necessarily modern (although he generally is). Modern man doesn't consider the gradation of life based on duration and phases, even if he informatively knows about these, if he has read or heard about the consequences of their application.

The attention of people of our era who are capable of detaching themselves from modernity definitely extends to the occult background concatenations of life. This is not metaphysical orientation yet but – in optimal cases – it may prepare it, introduce it, it may build its foundation. This is why we need to judge such things in a positive light until there is no fixation on the occult "only", since this fixation may become one of the major obstacles on the path to the metaphysical.

Learning about and understanding the (often modern) occult schools of this era reveals the existence of the already mentioned danger and its complex nature. (Although we don't consider the extensive and detailed study of occult schools indispensable – besides being interesting – we still consider it important.)

Earthly – human life is not in the least of earthly origin. Kali – Yuga – which is first and foremost a state of consciousness – generally subsists. (To affirm this doesn't contradict our solipsistic position.) Human life runs its course among the conditions of Kali – Yuga, but Kali – Yuga itself is not independent of higher realities of consciousness and existence. This understanding must be projected into the interpretation of the particular phases of human life.

Existence & Consciousness in the Light of the Metaphysical Tradition

Based on a lecture delivered by Dr. Andras Laszlo in 1988.

The concept of existence and consciousness being one has emerged even in the course of the Western history of philosophy, from various aspects. From the Greeks until today there have always been philosophical schools that emphasized this existential and conscious unity (following different approaches), but they have never dared to draw final conclusions. Even the philosophical currents that went the farthest in subjective idealism stopped, according to the platitudes of philosophical lexicons, when faced with epistemological or ontological solipsism. Solipsism means "only myself", "based only on myself"; explained in first case singular: only I exist myself, nothing and nobody exists besides me.

Naturally, this “nothing and nobody exists besides me” is not meant from the point of view of a human individual: it is obvious that there are many people, many persons; but there is only one subject. The multitude of human individuals and the singleness of the subject must be understood correctly, since considering the human person to be single would lead to the most vulgar theoretical deviations. The subject precedes man and the world. The subject is the center of consciousness which means it is the ruler of consciousness; the “ruler of consciousness” means: the Ruler of Existence.

The subject rules existence but not as an ontological or some other sort of abstraction. I may only posit the subject in first case singular: it's always I. If I speak, I speak as a human person and through this human person I speak as a subject. We can only look for the subject in the first case singular, otherwise we can't find it. Eastern thought expresses this more pronouncedly since this is constantly the foundation, the centre and the purpose of its world-view, manifesting it either quite directly or indirectly (like, for example, in the case of cosmology).

All spiritual currents that aimed at self-transformation (for example yoga or other paths that are equivalent to yoga) would make no sense without solipsism. The currently popular views according to which these paths of realization transform the various acts, tuning or orientation of the human soul, are false. These paths touch the human person only in as much as they detach him from the subjectiveness that manifests itself through the personality and by the personality but is also paralyzed, reduced and constrained by the personality.

If the powers emanating from the subject become weaker, they result in defects and weaknesses that cause man to assume an objective reality that exists independently of himself. When one suspects, feels and experiences the world as independent of himself, this only means that one is subjectively weak: a sign of one's own weakness, one's own mental weakness. Why? Because the subject, (auton in Greek, ātmā in Sanskrit) creates existence. The creation of existence hides so deep behind the personality, in the central power-sphere of the subject, that man, who almost completely lost himself in his own personality, can't discover it in himself. Thus the creation process, in which it creates the totality of existence, is constrained to mere personal perceptions; what's left of creation is only what the person perceives. One doesn't experience himself as creator. This, by itself, may be acceptable, but one doesn't even recognize it intuitively that in his current state, reduced to being a mere creature, he contains the potential creator; thus what's left from creation is mere perception, experience, recognition, acceptance.

If one studied his own mental functions, one could recognize that if there's some creativity left, it is in thinking; however thinking is also the weakest, the most volatile and the most subtle mental function. The willful creation of mental images is somewhat stronger, but the creative power that's active in it, is weaker.

The spontaneous creation of images is even stronger but subjective existence is weaker in it. What this proves is that the farther we get from thinking toward empirical experiences and perceptions, the clearer the shape an existent takes on and the less the subject participates in it, the less it experiences itself as creator. The fact that the willful creation of mental images is more difficult, more fragmentary and more uncertain to achieve than for example in half-dreams or spontaneously, well describes the current state of man. In other words, the powers of the "other", the heteron powers that oppose the auton, are greater than the auton powers. This is inseparable from the reverse view concerning the intensity of reality. The Sanskrit language describes this view with „viparyayá”, meaning turned-around. The goal is *vipari-viparyaya*, i.e. turning around the turned-around. The Greek language in its older form used "metagnoiá", later "metanoíá" which, as conversion, always referred to a conscious awakening, finding my way back to myself. We may say that this is when we turn towards the source of the light, away from the world lit up by it.

Thus one of the fundamental and grave consequences of this inverse view is that man considers real all that he is powerless against and the more powerless he is, the more real he'll consider these; in other words, he'll consider the 200 kg bag that falls on his head incomparably more real than his own thoughts and thinking functions. What crushes him, what he's powerless against, what he can't affect exists, and the less he can affect it, the more it exists. This degeneration of views must be turned around on the spiritual paths. But if man changes all this only as content of his awareness, he made but a small step: he redefined something in himself. But this redefinition doesn't mean that from now on he'll be experiencing the world like this; he won't be, but in a certain sense he has opened himself up to this possibility. At this stage realization is still far away: realization means that I realize myself but not in a psychological sense; in a psychological sense man realizes himself when he reaches his goals, executes his plans and similar. Metaphysical self-realization is not about all this. To realize means to create. From this point of view it's absolutely not important that I am already created, that I find myself cast into this world as a given (this is what Heidegger's *Geworfenheit* means), if I don't experience myself creating myself in the world, if I experience myself as if I was not created by myself. And if it wasn't I who created me, than it was another: the heteron. Heteron is unrecognized auton: the other, my unrecognized self. Recognizing the auton in heteron leads to the elimination of heteron, but for this it is necessary to develop a world-view, a view of existence that is more than just a view: a world view, a view of existence that functions. It is not enough for the static aspect to be valid, which is implied by "view"; a dynamic aspect is also indispensable: when I am viewing, I am constant and I am consciously viewing. So we are dealing with more than a view, we are dealing with viewing; with more than a world-view, with viewing the world; with more than a structure and frame, with an organic process.

The interpretations of certain doctrines may of course help significantly in viewing myself and the world differently, in intuitively seeking out the points where the acts of creation are perceivable – especially Eastern doctrines. In fact, Western teachings and the dogmas of Christian denominations also provide significant help in this respect, since within Catholicism, for example, the dogmas are much deeper than what the Church usually presents from these. There are esoteric depth in these teachings even though these are usually not explored. Patristic literature or Greek philosophy get much deeper than is usually taught or assumed. The reason why Eastern doctrines receive more emphasis here is not theoretical but didactic, namely, that they are more suitable for illustration. Realization as a path and as a goal was sustained longer in the East than in the West. Hinduism, Buddhism, Bön in Tibet, Taoism in China and the various form of shamanism from the point of view of direct activities, all considered realization to be crucial. Behind all these, considered as religions, there stood a spiritual-metaphysical tradition focused on realization.

Realization of course was always present in the West, as well. It was alive in Christian gnosis, in the Order of the Templars, in the Order of the Gral, in true Rosicrucianism. In terms of this latter one we must emphatically state that it no longer has representatives; there are more than thirty rosicrucian organizations active world wide, each declaring themselves to be the original, authentic and competent organization. Not one of these are authentic. Nobody could ever "enter" into the original rosicrucian order; spiritually one could grow into it, but never enter it. All authentic spiritual schools represents a rank – a spiritual rank that can't spread, can't grow in numbers in an ordinary, profane setting.

The power of consciousness is absolute. The power of consciousness is the power of the center: the power of the subject. The term "subjective" or "subjectum" is rather unfortunate since it means being "cast below", being "subjected" while "objectum" means being "cast against", "cast to the fore". The Sanskrit language, on the other hand, deducts the word for the subject from its actionality; kartr means "subject", i.e. the one acting, doing. The process is kartum while the objectified act is karma. Thus the views that were expounded first in Sanskrit, namely, the views of Hinduism and Buddhism, approached subjectivity from actionality.

A few spiritual schools, like theosophy (although this term meant something different) or anthroposophy can't be viewed as metaphysical in the strict sense since their focus and orientation don't transcend existence. Occult and hidden goals only cover a minuscule segment of metaphysics. Metaphysical always means two things: first, it refers to that which is beyond natural phenomena (meta ta physika), second, to that which is beyond everything that exists. Even that which is "beyond nature" is beyond the scope of physics. Physicality also includes different space and time structures, although this is not the range of physicality physics deals with. It's not only about having to transcend that which is beyond space and time, but also that which exists at all.

Occult schools don't even reach the first meaning of metaphysics, but get stuck in a different space and time structure and being stuck in time and space makes these schools delusional.

If we look at the most important statements of a true spiritual-metaphysical orientation, we'll find expressions to which a sentimental orientation relates with antipathy. Such expressions are "strength", "power", "ruling", "freedom". How a supra-human, supra-personal subjectivity transcends the earthly mode of existence and the multifaceted nature of this transcendence are much more strongly connected with powers of consciousness, with conscious presence, with dominance over personality and over factors that support consciousness (as its carriers), than with what a life led according to moral categories may entail. Thus the traditional view on morality has always been quite peculiar. For superior man, moral rules are warnings and reminders that in the specific areas addressed by the directives, where the chance of failure is high, he needs increased prudence, presence and awareness.

For people that are not highly spiritual, the directives are unequivocally just directives; they need to be ordered and they need to follow the orders. Superior man also follows these orders, but from a different aspect, from the point of view that following them belongs to the conditions of his transcendence. They warn him that he has to be highly alert. Religions that appear in the form of sects (which by itself doesn't mean anything besides being "cut off") always focus on the secondary, consequential aspect of things, instead of on their essence. They hypertrophy some of these residues and represent them with immeasurable aggressiveness. Overemphasizing these even in a much milder way would be still rather dangerous, but when they do this aggressively and in an overly forceful way, it always leads to psycho-spiritual deformations. This, by the way, although in a completely different sense, is also characteristic of pseudo-spiritual and contra-initiation paths. We will deal with the difficulties that arise here in subsequent lectures. For now let's note that the process of gradually leading myself back to myself may also lead to a different direction. For example consciousness may be led into a world, i.e. into a state of consciousness (since worlds are states of consciousness!) in a way that consciousness and through it its own perspectives get poisoned and become impossible. Poisoning existence and consciousness is the method of certain dark, contra-spiritual and anti-initiation schools; they do this by performing a ritual, an ontological operation: for example they introduce death-forces into states where these forces are originally not present. Death-forces may also be transported into the appropriate states of existence in a positive sense – but these schools don't perform these operations in a positive sense. All deviation may be recognized by their position to subjectivity. There is room for mistakes here, but with appropriate attention this may be eliminated. Schools that focus on the person may be confused with schools the foundation of which is the subject. On a basic level the possibility of confusion is great, but if somebody familiarizes himself with certain doctrines, if he can immerse himself in them, then the possibility of confusion is reduced almost to zero.

To illustrate this we can use an example from the Old Testament. When Christ says "I am the way and the truth and the life", first we should understand this in a way that this is what He says about himself: "I am the way and the truth and the life". So He is the way, the truth and life. But this can really sink in only if I perceive it like this: "I am the way, the truth and life". How to understand this? That I already am all this? No. Not in my personal self, that currently manifests itself to me. So in my personal self I am not all this, but I could be. In the sense of the goal, in the sense of the potentiality of the goal, I want to be all this. This is why I've emphasized many times that we can't talk about God in terms of whether or not he exists. The question that aims at the existence of God is a question of a weakened judgement that's just about to deviate and all pro and contra answers belong to this same category. God is the summit of all ontological goals and this is precisely how his ontological nature is recognizable. Usually, if somebody's crushed by life or experiences fundamental impressions, be they even natural phenomena, he may easily draw conclusions concerning his own smallness.

Not long ago I heard that somebody had to see the Niagara Falls to realize how small he is. Others even consider the recognition of their smallness as something especially significant. Certain phenomena may be much bigger than I am but I am the one who notices these phenomena and they only exists in as much as I am aware of them, I see them and experience them. They don't exist in any other sense. I am always more than what I see. I am also always more than what I assume. The goal is not somewhere. This is the fundamental difference between latentia and potentia. The goal is not hidden somewhere that I will reach sometimes. The goal becomes real by the very fact that I reach it. There is no goal that is waiting to be reached. I must create the goal; my own goal. No goals are waiting, especially not those with the most fundamental significance. The other world is not latent but potential. It becomes real by my realizing it. The same applies to the ordinary world: it exists by my constantly constituting it, although I don't recognize my own power of constitution in the act of constituting it.

Studying religions and their teachings – besides finding orientation for myself – is actually worthless by itself. It's not a professional question. Religions and teachings can't be really studied from a professional aspect. If somebody doesn't understand existence and doesn't understand consciousness he will not understand Buddhism – even if he professionally does so; from the professional perspective he may, but he's constantly in a state of non-understanding. If somebody doesn't understand himself, if he doesn't consider his own processes, what can he really understand at all? This is the reason why the translations of almost all sacred scriptures are to a very large degree incorrect even though they are translated by experts who know the given language and the words' meanings correspond with that in the dictionary. When it comes to Western languages, where there's constant connection and control, this is not so sharply observable. But when it comes to Eastern and especially to archaic languages, each translation reveals a position; each translation reflects

a view or perhaps the view is detectable by that it's missing, by the lack of adequate reflection on itself. For example Helmut von Glasenapp's book of the Five World Religions [Die Fünf Weltreligionen] is available in Hungary. This man has spent his life dealing with the history of religions. His expertise is indisputable. His discerning ability however is so weak, it makes you wonder. He hardly understands anything. Such books may have some fragmented value of course, in that they may turn attention to something which helps one draw conclusions. There are of course other currents that lead to continuous deviations. There are disciplines that seem like they were created specifically to lead to deviations. For example almost all current schools of psychology are like this; if somebody starts dealing with them, over the years he will know less and less about the soul. This is how they are constructed. All disciplines could be different, they could all contain life, spirit, discernment, there could be elements and powers that could help evoking additional powers. But this is not so.

What I represent – as a perspective- is practical. This practicality should be the actual goal; not the direct goal but an indirect one on several levels. It's not about the dissemination of knowledge. There are lectures, books, courses, etc. specifically for the purpose of education. To help one viewing the world differently: this is the goal. Viewing differently in an auto-reflective sense, viewing that is directed towards the world; to provide help, points of view, certain inspirations. To give more in the current era, especially directly, is not possible; in fact nothing should be accepted from those who say otherwise. The poisoning in this department has reached stupendous magnitudes. True spiritual currents only vegetate in a couple of minuscule streams. Pseudo-spiritual currents, on the other hand, are operational by the thousands. Europe has been flooded by a dangerous type: the Indian pseudo-yogi. Since Sanskrit is taught in high schools in India and the original language is also somewhat similar to Sanskrit and since they teach asanas and similar in gym class, anybody from India with a somewhat higher intelligence may present himself as an expert, as a yogi, even as a guru. If this was done purely for profit, it could be viewed simply as a series of base practices. The danger however is much greater since the goal, beyond profit, is much more damaging. The Indians – and recently even Tibetans – wracking havoc in the world nowadays are making the last, already minimal, chance of realization impossible. If there was absolutely no darkness in these currents, they would still be incredibly dangerous, considering that they concern things that are by orders of magnitude beyond people of this era. There is, for example, a Buddhist monastery near Zurich that occasionally admits Europeans (still making it real difficult for them). An important aspect of learning is memorizing and reciting the Tibetan sacred scriptures. The more diligent somebody may be, the worst he'll fare. Those who are less diligent may leave and realize later that the whole thing doesn't make any sense. And currently it truly doesn't. There was a time when reading meant understanding. The writer could not only write and read but also knew the essence of writing, since writing or reading unessential things was unnecessary. This means that in earlier eras reciting a text meant understanding the text and understanding the text almost meant the realization of the teaching.

Even for Tibetans, there is nothing left from this by today – and for Europeans even less so. So what they do in this Buddhist monastery is fitting for Easterners of an era hundreds and thousands of years ago; and they make people do this today as step one, and whoever is doing this, is thinking that he's practicing Zen, or Tibetan Buddhism, or yoga, or something similar – but nothing is farther from the truth. It seems like it is true, but it has nothing to do with the truth. What awakes in him is not the light of consciousness; he sets in motion special vital forces instead, and all vital forces that are void of the spirit, as well as all life forces will turn into death forces that first damage consciousness, and then they damage the "carrier" of consciousness. Vital forces that are awaken inadequately, in other words, when they are not awaken by an act of the spirit, function as death forces. This is an anti-alchemical process that is performed by the heteron; by my unrecognized self. There is no greater enemy than my unrecognized self. This is the prototype of all enemies.

The satanic principle is also related to this one. "Satan" means accuser, enemy, opponent. From God's aspect there is no Satan, only from the side of the human mode of existence. Thus from the point of view of my own goal there is no Satan, but from the point of view of my starting position there is.

In the Sanskrit language the name of existence is the same as the name of the essence: sat. Sat condenses both of them simultaneously. Non-existence and non-essence is asat. The name of truth in Greek is alētheia. Alētheia is connected to not-forgetting. What could it be that has metaphysical weight as long as we don't forget it? Obviously the decisive thing is the forgetting or not forgetting of the metaphysical origin of myself from myself. To live in non-forgetfulness, in forgetting forgetfulness, means living in truth. The name of truth in Sanskrit is satya. Satya is recognition, teaching and life according to existence and to the essence. Thus, from this point of view, whatever is non-essential or not essential is not true. The question of truth – non-truth in a material-content sense in traditional cultures is actually of secondary importance; not that such truth wasn't present to a very large degree – but the emphasis was not on that; there, always something more was meant by what manifested itself in Latin in relation to spiritual truths as veritās, or in relation to legal truths as iustitia. The Greek equivalent of iustitia is dikē, that of veritās is alētheia. Such proverb and platitude-like residues as "the light of the truth" even in such a worn-out form express the connection between the truth and the light; that truth, alētheia, satya, and veritas are related to the light and light is related to the essential nature of consciousness. Light is the nature of consciousness. "The light of consciousness" is almost a pleonasm, i.e. using a single expression serially. The spirit is the light of consciousness and darkness the darkness of consciousness. Consciousness is broader than the spirit and the light. Spirit always means the center of consciousness, i.e. that the subject is in action. The subject is in action, it is in the culmination of actions. Subiectum in āctū – this is my definition of the spirit. The spirit being in action. The conscious act of the subject is the spirit, i.e. the light; not physical light. It was not the physical, natural light that, by analogy, served as the name for the spiritual light.

What we physically experience as light is the lost, gross, exteriorized light. The spiritual light is the cause of the external light. The Sun was not compared to God because they saw it; they didn't associate to God from the Sun. The Sun exists because there is a SunGod. Auton is the self-generating light – existence; consequently there must be an imprint of it in the physical world and this is the celestial body. But neither the name nor – especially – its existence is what originates from here. It's rather pathetic when they try to trace religions and the spirit from natural phenomena while forgetting to consider why there exists anything in the first place. They never raise questions about this either in terms of assuming an answer or in terms of refusing an answer. Nothing was ever derived from any natural phenomena. It's always the spiritual and the superior that's primal both essentially and – if it has connected to temporality- time-wise.

To posit the unconscious, especially in the exaggerated sense deep psychology does, is an offence against the powers of human understanding on the one hand, and an explicit error, on the other. Some recognize an actual spirituality in Jung's school, for example, even though it is an especially anti-spiritual school. Anti-spiritual because it derives consciousness from the unconscious as if the it was the unconscious that is primordial and not the conscious. Obviously, in Jung's school this is not as strongly and grossly evident as in Freudism, but without doubt, it is there. Fundamentally, there is no such thing as "unconscious" or "subconscious". Consciousness has actuality and potentiality; a potentiality that is infinitely open. Thus this potentiality has strictly individual, collective, familiar and cosmic aspects. In such sense, when we speak about the layers of consciousness we are using simple similes; there is potentiality, and there are higher and lower potentialities. There are potentialities that once actualized, destroy consciousness; and there are potentialities that once actualized, trigger the elevation of consciousness. The whole question should be raised only from the point of view of actuality and potentiality, otherwise we'd get a view on consciousness that postulates some kind of original but hidden nature somewhere in the background. If that which psychology calls unconscious has any kind of effect, it is not because the unconscious performs some kind of occult function, but because it is not conscious, it is heteron, it is different. The unconscious is actually not I, and whatever is not I works against me in some sense. We must discern the subtleties of this otherwise we may immediately misunderstand the whole thing. What this means is not that everybody and the whole world is against me but that if everything stays on the level where it is, then they truly bring death not just as a biological occurrence but in a much broader sense.

The world exists so I can take it back to myself, or, which means the same thing from a different point of view, it exists so I can detach it from myself: to detach the world as world, as heteron from myself, so I can take it as potential auton back to myself.

The goal is unity. Unity is the unity of the auton. What seems to fall out of unity is the heteron. I don't want to take back that which seems to be falling out of unity to myself as heteron, but as auton; in other words I must recognize the auton before I take it back.

According to the tantrik doctrines everything in the world may be perceived and experienced as yoga. This especially applies to the individual human being. Thus if the necessary powers of recognition have already developed, then each individual may be viewed like they manifest something: with their life they symbolize something. The closer I know somebody, the more exponentially this is true. Some people seem to be connected to symbols that represent specifically powers of destruction. This should be understood with an appropriate degree of differentiation since this is not black and white; even in one single individual we can find an incredible richness of qualities. This applies not only to people but also to species of animals – even individual animal specimen may represent something.

Considering that most human relations are insignificant, we should view at least the more important people like this: what does he represent, what manifests itself in him? And here we must really probe deeper since the role of superficial impressions from this point of view is quite small.

There is only conscious existence and there is conscious objectivity. I can't say that something exist if I don't have any kind of relation to it, and I can't say that something actually doesn't exist if I have a relation to it. No doubt, there is objectivity. But in what sense? There is no objective reality that's independent of my consciousness – this is senseless. I must say there is nothing more senseless in the history of philosophy because this actually doesn't fit into the history of philosophy. There is a grave inner contradiction here, namely that I am aware that something exists because I know about it, because it is in my consciousness, and yet I declare that it also exists, when it is not in my consciousness; I even declare that it exists even if it has never even been in my consciousness. This by the way doesn't apply only to the totality of objective reality and to the spheres of the "other world" but also to something much more concrete. If man is sufficiently alert, he may realize that an entity that's present in his consciousness has quite a special ontological position. If somebody believes that he's returning home because he finds his house there, is a naive realist. What does it mean that it's "there"? It means that various modes of existence of the house defined by thoughts and images may emerge. Otherwise it has no modes of existence at all. How is it possible that something may be found with such regularity? It's because the constituting power of man is rooted so deep, so far away from the sphere of power that man can control ordinarily, and its inertness is so great – this is why we can find things. This is why we know what we'll find if we go somewhere. Not something fundamentally different, since even if the house is in ruins, we don't find something fundamentally different. Fundamentally different would be if we possessed constant magical powers in relation to everything and everybody that exists. Although not in the sphere of direct accessibility, this magical power is available as a potentiality, since power itself is potential.

If this power potential is actualized it's no longer about demon-magic whereby various powers manifest themselves as beings, because the magus (magician) hasn't taken possession of the power over himself. The appearance of magical powers in the form of beings, due to the incomplete control over them, in other words the merely partial realization of dominance, may be dangerous since these powers that manifest themselves as beings are, to a large degree, real. The demon-magus dominates these powers, but not through controlling himself. As opposed to goetik and demonomagic, the nature of theurgomagic is such that the power of the auton begins to expand towards the unlimited in it; this means first of all power over himself, which means that the magus exercises his power over beings and forces, i.e. over the heteron, as his power over himself. Having completed this operation perfectly, the magus becomes the creator, the sustainer and the transmuter of the world, recognizing that the world exists because he has created it and because he is sustaining it, in the sense of the Hindi *Īvara-Trimūrti*: as Brahman, as Viṣṇu and as Śiva.

And he'll recognize that it was always he who created, sustained and transmuted the world. However, this is not only a question of recognition but also a question of realization: the question of supra-personal realization. Having reached his goal, the magus not only realizes his own person, his own personality, he also actualizes his whole being. If there was one single element in existence that's left out of realization, what we call metaphysical awakening would become impossible.

Omnipotency in the absolute sense, without any limitations, is not a result but a pre-requisite of metaphysical realization. And this is not only omnipotentia, but also omniagentia. Not only omnipotency but also universal activity. There is nothing in the world that would not be performed by the magus who reached his goal. Who is the magus who has reached his goal? I myself, if I reach my goal. Is there a world other than a conscious one? There isn't. Is there another center of conscious existence besides myself as subject? We can't say there is. Thus the whole world originates from myself. If, however, I don't experience the world as originating from myself that means that I am not fully in the center of myself. In other words, I am not fully myself. If I was fully myself, I would actualize myself as creator, sustainer and transmuter. The significance of this is tremendous – at least for those who don't resign themselves to their current state; those who do resign themselves to their current state will also leave this behind, but not in an upward, but a downward direction. If one is not striving upward, one is declining since one needs extraordinary elevation-powers even to slow down the decline, not to mention stopping it and to turning the process around.

If we look at an ordinary human life we see the teleological greatness of providence on the one hand, and its complete denial and destruction on the other. All these are a question powers. While man occupies an earthly-human mode of existence, he finds himself in a process of unfolding – not evolution. To see this process as an analogy to evolution is flawed. It's about conquering a mode of existence.

Naturally, the powers of death get immediately activated already at the beginning of such a conquest, but they can gain an overwhelming position only if man doesn't resist. Spiritual man immediately resists the powers of death. What does this all mean? It means (and it must mean) that man – not even in the sense of high-realizations, but simply in terms of his own personality –, however long he should live, must stand on the highest degree of realization in the last phase, in the last moment of his life. Thus if he lives 120 years, naturally he stands on a much higher level than when he was hundred and nineteen and on a much higher level than when he was fifty. Generally speaking, this is not the case; we can't see people reaching a high age being 'in floribus' in their last months. This means that a foreign power begins to operate, a power that essentially isn't foreign but for now it is experienced as such; an effect is generated.

We know that an illness is never caused by what seemingly causes it. The decline of mental faculties is not caused by cerebral sclerosis, death in cholera is not caused by the cholera virus and in general, nothing is triggered by what man thinks. These are all side-effects accompanying something else, and they play a role in the periphery of the triggering event.

We obviously can't say that an agent, a bacteria has nothing to do with the illness, but fundamentally, it has nothing to do with it; it's not the fundamental cause of the disease.

All diseases reflect the changes of fate. On a high level we are talking about heteron and auton; fate is actually my differentiated acts of gaining and losing power as auton over the differentiated and infinite multitude of powers that manifest themselves as heteron-beings. These are the ones creating so called fate-situations in order to launch attacks from them against the current form of existence. The actual attack takes place in deep-metaphysicality and it is accompanied by the triggering causes on the periphery. The actual causes are thus somewhere else (not on the periphery) and from this point of view the perceived cause of a disease is more of a consequence; it has causality but it is not primal and not secondary, not even tertiary, but an exponentially indirect causality. This is why the fight against them can't result in fundamental convalescence. On the periphery even full recovery is possible, but not in the depths. A healing process in the multitude of levels and aspects was hardly possible even in much more distant and pure epochs.

Finding my way back to myself is not treated as a goal by spiritual views – and this is especially emphasized by Eastern views- but as an operation related to the beginnings, not forgetting that such operations at this stage may appear as a goal. Nonetheless such operations of realizations can't be made mandatory for anybody; we can't even say that they may be specifically recommended to everybody. One of the main characteristics of the paths of deviation of our times is precisely that they put a great emphasis on that everybody should follow some definitive path. This is not surprising, considering that they purposefully offer deviative paths and their interest is that people start out on these. There are also more serious and well-meaning approaches, yet these propagate similar things.

Although it is ultimately -but only ultimately- open to everybody, metaphysical realization is not suitable for everybody. In a strict sense, for the majority it is open to a very small degree. It is only open to those who represent the upward orientation, the elevating aspect of the only Man, the spiritual and universal Man in themselves as a possibility that's much stronger than a mere potentiality. It is only a doctrine that metaphysical realization is ultimately open to everybody and that I can attain awakening by experiencing myself in everything, and according to this doctrine everybody is capable of this. From this to come to the conclusion that I also have a chance -especially if I am not even trying- is, in my opinion, something that people do who, although not striving to attain metaphysical awakening, are under the impression that it is an intelligent thing to nominally identify such goals. Such people think that it is good and intelligent to strive toward such goals, and that I have a chance, even if I only do anything toward this end, when I happen to have some time.

If somebody recognizes the law he is representing, then he recognizes what Hinduism and Buddhism calls svadharma in Sanskrit. Svadharma is the being's own law and dominion. Not only does it mean the mission and what one must do, but much more how one can find the path that leads him back to himself. Once one completely returns to himself, dharma and svadharma is transcended and thus eliminated since he who achieves the goal becomes the ruler of dharma; this is why there is no dharma that applies to him: he no longer has a svadharma. Nonetheless, the path is determined by svadharma.

Finally, we must say a few words about karma, a term that suffers much abuse. Karma means "act". Karma-vāda, or karma-doctrine means that all acts are connected. Naturally, my own acts or whatever I experience as such, are even more tightly connected to my personal self. The principle of action-reaction is embedded in the karma doctrine just like the concept of karma as bondage, although the two are not the same. Karma in general is often confused with karma- bandha , with the karmic bond. Karma-bandha is a bond. Why this bond? Is it because the poor bastard is doing something? Not in the least. It is a bond because the act was not performed fully by himself. The heteron makes it a bond, because the heteron influences all acts and it is the heteron that turns karma into a karmic bond, vinculum karmicum, a burden, a web; because it is not him, who performs the acts, because he is only a co-performer. Even in thinking one is only a co-performer and heteron plays the smallest role precisely in thinking. This is why all paths of realization can and must begin with thinking – not because it is the strongest and the most elemental, but because in thinking is man the most himself. Even if one starts out on totally different and wrong tracks in his thinking, the thinking function itself has such characteristics that it may serve as the starting point of a metamorphosis. Otherwise even the smallest feeling is stronger than thinking but the heteron-function is so strong in feelings that no path may begin with them; no realization may be based exclusively on feelings. Naturally, a certain stage of realization deals with feelings, too, since they belong to the most significant elements of life.

I can only reach- and this is one of the basic tenets of Eastern metaphysics- that I have actually never left. "Actually" I have never left it, because "actually" I have left and I have distanced myself from what I have never left. I may only reach what I have never left.

Magic and Realization

Magic, which exerts its effects from the highest to the lowest domains, is the most superior and most complete actionality among the radical forms of metaphysical tradition that is at all possible in relation to human existence, or in existence in general.

The Greco-Latin word magic comes from the Greek mageia; a strong Indo-European etymological connection may be established between the words mageia and māyā. At the depth of each we can find a "mi" root that strictly speaking can't be translated in words and conceptually it's almost ungraspable but it is certain that it is related to creation or to creation even beyond creation.

Certain traditional authors, including Guénon, had an aversion against magic and used, as well as recommended the word theourgia instead, as something fundamentally different from magic. With the utmost respect towards these authors we must say that this view is, to some degree flawed, since across millennia, two types of magic has been differentiated: mageia goetike and mageia theourgiike.

Goesis or goetia means an applied form of magic, since – although it is most directly connected to what is referred to as sorcery, the scope of magic exceeds the domains of application and applicability. Magia goetike or simply goetia or goetiko-mageia or goeto-mageia used to mean an applied form of magic which was also called daimono-mageia, demonomagia; this means a level of magic when magos, the magician, is still not in possession of the forces of consciousness and existence in such a degree that he could perceive them as his own on all their levels and in all their dimensions. Certain forces and powers manifested themselves to the magician in the form of beings (demons) who in a way exercised control over him; the magician had to dominate these beings and ascertain his will through them. In case of a higher level of domination these beings were integrated into the direct power sphere of the magician as his own qualities.

Demonomagic was also divided into two parts: agathodaimono-mageia means good, helping demons and depicts one aspect and one grade. On the other side there are the kakodaimons, the evil demons prone to revolt, representing forces over which the demonomagus possessed even less power and which stemmed from his own impurity.

We should avoid talking about white and black magic because magia nigra (black magic) is strongly related to the magia nigredo of alchemy (blackness, blackening) which doesn't refer to something negative but to a level that must be realized.

Magia alba is in connection with albedo and depicts a higher level. But there was also magia viridis (green magic) on the same level as magia alba and on a somewhat higher level there is magia flava (yellow magic) or magia citrinitatis. On the highest level, uniting all, there is magia rubea or magia rubra (red magic). There is one level even above this, magia aurea (gold magic) that already means the achievement of the goal, the realization of gold, the solar state, fulfillment.

The other expression is theurgia and its relation to magic. Theos, theo and ourgia together, means "creation according to divine powers", but it also means "creation as god" or "creation of god". Because of this, theurgia often meant the most sacred acts, superior all other acts, in the Middle Ages. (Occasionally it was referred to as satanism, the evocation of satan, the awakening of satanic powers as a result of fully misunderstanding the higher meaning of this word.)

René Guénon put magic and theurgia in opposition both in terms of terminology and practice, approaching theurgia as something fully positive; he viewed magic as a sort of technical possession of knowledge. These views can obviously not and should not be accepted unconditionally, i.e. theurgia should not be considered as something that stands in opposition to magic, but as a truly realized level of magic. Even demonomagia may be accepted as long as it means a transitory phase that leads to a higher one. If, however, this becomes autonomous by removing itself from these gradual levels and starts to act independently and for its own sake, then demonomagia will take on dark tendencies and will no longer be part of a path of realization.

Two fundamental ranges of capabilities are required for the acquisition of magic: gnosis and praxis heroiké. Gnosis means transcendental knowledge, a trans-sensory quality and a level of path that reaches the ultimate heights and depths of consciousness and existence; we can also say that it reaches the ultimate heights and depths of myself, in other words, reaching my own heights and depths. Praxis heroiké essentially means seeking out the very limits of existence. Heroicity always refers to the relationship with the limits of existence; the overcoming of the most extreme challenges of transcendental magnitude; the triumphant completion of a struggle at the limits where the stake is to find awakening or to face annihilation.

From the point of view of magic both gnosis and praxis heroiké is considered to be prerequisites. Without these two qualifications nobody may walk the path of magic. The role of pistis, the third quality, was also not insignificant. Pistis means transcendental certainty, pre-existing, intuitive transcendental certainty. Certainty about what? Certainty about my own transcendental self, certainty about myself; the certainty of the self-centeredness of the soul.

What other certainty is there? Pistis means this certainty. This may have a lot of connotations and it's possible to posit many directions and orientations of pistis, but essentially it is always oriented on this centrality. It concerns myself and existence centered in myself; whatever special orientation it may have, ultimately, through them, it may only point in this direction.

Pistis pertains partially to gnosis, partially to praxis and partially to magic. No demonomagia or theurgic magic may be practiced without certainty. This plays a role when it comes to having gnosis, it plays an indirect role when it comes to authentically performing the praxis and it has a straight forward connection with magic. Magic may be appropriated by anybody, but it contains a functionality, an actionality, a qualification that has a supra-human dimension; because of this, no human or non-human, or supra-human or human-side ambition or endeavor may be compared to this because it essentially transcends all other ambitions. When we refer to magic we always do so in the sense of theurgia; creation with divine powers, creation as god, creating god. All these aspects complete its meaning.

Magic has the perceptively closest relation to philosophically, or rather to supra-philosophically understood solipsism; this is crucial also from the point of view of gnosis and from the point of view of all true transcendental praxis; in no other perspective is this such crucial a preparatory world-view as precisely in the case of magic. The less magic is addressed in the sense of demonomagia and the more in the sense of theurgomagia, the stronger this supra-philosophical solipsism is connected with it; this is so much the case that solipsism – which, from the aspect of views I consider to be an indispensable part and back bone of metaphysical tradition – may be named theourgo-magiko-solipsism. Not simply solipsism; the main premise is not simply that I am the subject of existence, that the world is my world that exists only as a way of my conscious function but that all this is so magically, that I am potentially the ruler of existence and its creator even though I am in a way sleeping through my own acts of creation. I am the sustainer of existence in a vaishic sense even though I am also sleeping through my acts of sustaining existence in existence. I am also the transmutator of existence in a shaivic sense but I am sleeping through this, as well.

It is possible to wake up from these sleeps: awakening is possible. What does awakening mean? It means to wake up to myself and this is fully in line with magic; to wake up and reach my absolute Self.

I am always myself but not fully. Awakening is that I change myself fully into myself, it means finding my way back. I am myself right now, but not fully; I can be my even more complete, infinite self and this is the objective – this is solipsism as realization. This is the same as waking up. Nirvāna is the deflammatio or exflammatio of the “other”; extinguishing the “other”. All “others” appear in relation to a vortex. The exflammatio of the forces of the vortex affecting me, like that of a flame, is nirvāna. In nirvāna, I am the center. I reach the limit and cross over it: this is the meaning of the expression “the lord of limits”.

I rise above the center so that I dominate the vortex through the center. Chakravartin, the king of the world reigns over the vortex, he's the lord of the vortex, the "turner of the wheel" (this is the literal meaning of the word). Not only is the turner of the wheel in the center, he is also above the center. He dominates the center and through the center the vortex, the wheel, the spinning and the turning.

Reaching the goal means omniscientia; in a way omniscientia is the prerequisite for reaching the goal; omnipotentia and omnipresentia as well. The one who reaches the goal, also takes possession of something in addition to all these; he infinitely completes everything, since the condition is also a samsāric omnipotentia, omnipresentia and omniscientia, even omniagentia.

The magic of the center is magic that starts from a position above the center. It is not only in the center, above the center, but also on the periphery; it is not only the turner of the wheel but also the wheel itself; it means domination over samsāra and nirvāna. A timeless and infinite magic that turns samsāra into nirvāna and nirvāna into samsāra.

Excerpt from a lecture held by the author on January 25th, 1995, in Debrecen, Hungary.

On 'Satan'

The the most comprehensive elucidations of the doctrine of divine descends that culminate in incarnation – Avatars – are concerned about the Godhead manifesting himself as God, separating himself from himself and distancing himself – in this state of separation – from himself. If he sustains the continuity of consciousness in the descent of such auto-distancing, we may talk about the manifestation of Avatar; if he breaks his own conscious continuity, various forms of existence will become manifest, including that of earthly man in Kali Yuga.

Based on the proper understanding of traditional doctrines and connecting this with the conscious examination of our own cognitive processes, we'll find further possibilities that may also be actualized: in the process of manifesting himself as God, the Godhead – through a partial manifestation – may (and does) separate and distance himself from himself, and turn this separated and distanced self against himself.

God – and through him the Godhead – is unassailable. However, the opposition may – and does – turn into attack. The attack is not aimed at God – this would not be possible – but at the acts of self-realization of redintegratio unionalis – in God – and through God in the Godhead. Satanicitas-diabolicitas always tries to prevent – in all possible direct and indirect ways – the "execution" of actionalities under the aegis of reductio at redintegratio unionalis transsensualisque.

Essentialiter-principialiter it is always directed against the realm above life and against actionalities aimed at realizing this realm, but – along the lines of indirect relations – it also aims against life itself; both in a biological sense and in general.

Satan or Diabolos usually attacks the personality and the supra-personality from below the sub-personal spheres. Diabolos itself, however, is primarily supra-personal; its manifestation may be an impersonal force that comes to manifestation through various effects, but it may also take on personal features. It may be something or somebody, since its primary essence is neither.

In addition to unipolaris Diabolos, certain spiritual schools also recognize bipolaris Diabolicitas. Eugen Heinrich Schmitt differentiates between Mammon and Belial. Partially due to his influence, Rudolf Steiner also developed a bipolaris Diabolos theory: the duality of Ahriman and Lucifer. Later he developed his Diabolos concept into a tripolaris one by introducing the Ind-Hindu Asuras, but in a diabolistic light.

Although we consider neither E. H. Schmitt, nor R. Steiner as a prime authority, we are not in the least against accepting the validity of bipolaris, tripolaris or even multipolaris Diabolos concepts – besides maintaining the unipolaris concept in the sense of positing a supra-personal factor, acknowledging also the parallel, secondary and tertiary validity of impersonality/non-personality and being-personality.

Diabolical attacks may be quite diverse, multifarious and they may even turn against each other.

There is no doubt that certain forms of diabolicitas are closely related to what is conventionally referred to – almost always and everywhere in the world – as sin or sins.

This is an unquestionable fact and we're convinced that there's no room and there can't be any room for arguments about this. On the other hand, it is also beyond doubt that – according to the spirit of metaphysico-traditionality – diabolicitas primarily doesn't manifest itself along the lines of morality versus immorality; in fact, we're inclined to label the opinions that divert from this as sentimental deviations. Sins, be they even the gravest ones, are always consequences and at the very least secondary (or even less significant) in comparison to weakening the mental-supramental-spiritual forces; and diabolicitas plays a primal role precisely in the weakening of these.

The key for a deeper-higher understanding, like also in many other cases, is Ahamatma Brahmasmi – i.e. that I AM Brahma myself. Aham, Atma even Asmi should be understood completely differently than when I say I or (my)self or even AM. These words express very different possibilities of existence from those expressed in the previous declarative sentence: something that is infinitely far on the one hand, but what is – on the other hand – not only close but even more present than anything else perceived to be present.

Essentially – although for now only potentially – I am the supra-personal and impersonal Godhead, but I am also the personal God myself, and I, myself, am also all his personal aspects. I am the one who creates the distance, and I am the one who is being distanced – the one who is distanced and the one who has never been distanced. I, myself, am that who distance myself from myself, and who turn my distanced self against my unchanged/non-distanced self. I, myself, make myself turn, I, myself, turn against myself, and I, myself, am the one who is being turned in opposition to myself. This is the beginning of diabolicitas; the beginning, but not the completed, actualized diabolicitas.

Diabolos, be it supra-personal, impersonal, or personal, or unipolaris, bipolaris, pluripolaris or multipolaris – will become truly Diabolos when it becomes a Heteron; when it becomes a Heteron that may only be experienced indirectly; when it becomes a Heteron who/that turns against the Godhead-God in a way that simultaneously attempts – in any way possible – to prevent me from successfully leading myself back to the Godhead-God, in other words, to my Absolute Self.

Diabolos is the invisible, giant Heteron; it is also the de-facto contra-Auton. According to its primordial essence, it is Auton, but it is Auton that operates as the most unrecognizable, the least experienced, and – this is crucial – the most powerful and strongest Heteron.

If I become Diabolos, I'll be a monster; but only if this transformation is directed specifically toward Diabolos and thus it's imperfect. If I integrate Diabolos into myself and I integrate myself into God-Godhead – i.e. into my Absolute self – then Diabolos will cease to be a Heteron and will cease to be Diabolos. This could be the redemption of Diabolos.

According to the followers of Heinrich Schmitt's neognosticism, for example, Belial may be redeemed (according to Steiner it's Lucifer that may be redeemed), while Mammon may not be.

Such concepts do have some sort of foundation, but only if we try to reveal it by elucidating the concepts themselves, and thus we sort of shape this foundation – turning them into a real one – so it may serve as a basis for rethinking the thoughts behind these concepts, thereby making more sense of them.

Truly, there obviously isn't any absolute "irredeemable" – non-re-integrable – satanicitas. However, it doesn't make that much sense to talk about an "irredeemable" – non-re-integrable – satanicitas if a supra-personal, or non-personal, or personal power or force, breaking out from the sub-personal realm rids the aspirant – let's say a man – of all or almost all of his capabilities with which he may coordinate his efforts towards higher domains or even just toward life.

In another context, Christianity talks about sin committed against Pneuma Haigón – Holy Spirit –, which is unforgivable. The Holy Spirit is more or less comparable to the re-integrative – reductive – transmutational Shivaic spirituality; if somebody, inspired by some power, exerts extreme force against this, he won't be able to lead himself back to himself – this is what “unforgivable” means in this context. It may be mooted that a mammonistic effect comes forth here, which is primarily targeted against Pneuma Haigón, in other words, against my own Shivaness. Being redeemable in this context – while the possibility is not to be excluded – doesn't really make sense, just like being forgivable wouldn't either, although the latter one – as an expression – may be misunderstood, or, more precisely, it may make understanding more difficult from a metaphysico-traditionalist point of view.

We know that there is a fundamental and not only theoretical difference between hetero – or heteronotheism and auto – or autonotheism.

According to the general conception of heteronotheismus God or the Godhead is someone or somebody else, who/what is completely different from me; it is either outside of me, or even when it's within me, it's still completely different from me.

According to autonotheism, God or the Godhead – as a state – is indeed truly different from my state determined by the human form of existence, but essentially and – in terms of degree of realization – potentially I am God and / or the Godhead myself. This, of course, doesn't automatically mean that here and now – in terms of degree of realization – I am God and / or the Godhead. We don't and we can't state anything like this. If, however, I reduce myself through myself to myself – to my Absolute self – then my now only potential being a God and Godhead will be realized. God/the Godhead therefore – as my essential self – is a goal and a power-potential.

It makes no sense to talk about whether or not God exists. God and/or the Godhead may be, if and when I realize myself as God / the Godhead by leading myself through myself to myself – to my Absolute self.

A God that conducts – or more precisely: may conduct – a dialogue with me while being absolutely different from me, as an external, personal (as a being), invisible and infinitely powerful, but still thinking, (emotionally) feeling, passionate, happy or wrathful, offended and forgiving god – actually can't be God, if we really apply this designation to the highest Manifest factor.

Heteronotheism either posits these – perhaps more subtly – or it posits something from which – we may get to these – eventually.

Heteronotheism – and we are sure of this – is actually a veiled and complexly indirect, in the same time weakened, but still dangerous diabolism.

It's quite obvious that when it comes to the state in general, as well as on the level of social life and cultural – civil currents, even the most vulgar heteronotheism is worth immeasurably more than the most moderate materialistic atheism. We have always emphasized this and this shall remain our position in the future, as well.

Realificatio Metaphysica and Initiatio, as well as the preparation of these on various levels, require spiritual and theoretical preparations. In this context it's unavoidable to consider the question of what position to establish regarding theisticitas; and this question is not insignificant at all. When it's considered in this context, it will become clear that heteronotheism is not much superior than materialistic atheism. The essence of realization, its purpose and execution, becomes fully senseless and groundless in the muddy and dim light of heteronotheism.

Just as we must defend Christianity – in a bellicose manner if necessary – against liberal-democratism, social-democratism and communism, we must also exercise a sharp – in some sense crushing – critique from a theological point of view.

Perhaps Christian gnosis – we should say probably – contained autonotheism behind the veil of heteronotheism – however, it was marginalized by all available means and methods by the main current of Christianity. It re-appeared once again, somewhat later, in the life opus of Meister Eckhart, specifically in the parts that were condemned by the Church. We can detect traces of autonotheism – in parallel to and after Meister Eckhart – also in the life work of Tauler, and later in some of the rhymes of Angelus Silesius. The general self-interpretation of Christianity – in all three cases of Roman Catholicism, Eastern Orthodoxy and Protestantism – always excluded, excludes and will always exclude the possibility of even the most moderate discussion over the unconditional position of extreme heteronotheism. The secret and semi-secret currents of Christianity obviously contained autonotheism but these could never gain ground externally.

Heteronotheism is diabolism on the one hand, blasphemy on the other, and from yet another point of view – in a supra-confessional sense – it's a heresy.

Satanicitas-diabolicitas has penetrated the realm of pre-initiatic, initiatic and realificative exercises: this is how contra-pre-initiation, contra-initiation and contra-realificatio are realized; this is how they become dangerous realities. Such cases include exercises that were created with this specific goal in mind, or people who are made to perform proper exercises but who may not be – most likely aren't – qualified or capable to perform any kind of even semi-appropriate praxis. Such people – especially after a long praxis – become completely inadequate for performing real exercises. (A true and proper spiritual praxis is almost unimaginably difficult, while a pseudo or contra-praxis may be performed without difficulties – they only require tenacity.

To properly perform the proper exercises of the past is almost impossible even for the best, while to perform them inadequately presents hardly any challenge, thus they may become a regular praxis even for those who otherwise lack the capabilities to perform them.) In our era, people are saved from immersing themselves into contra-transcendentale – through pseudo, and especially through contra exercises – by one of their flaws: their laziness.

The reality of Satan may also be captured from the side of profanities. This approach is pathetic and ridiculous and it essentially belongs to the realm of atheism (in fact to materialist atheism) which is itself a satanic product. (What we may and should call materialistic atheism is determined by a satanic inferiority. We don't respect this world-view or those who represent them; we despise (sometimes while feeling sorry for them) those who even derive joy from denying, right off the bat, everything that is more superior than the crudest physicality.)

When it comes to heteronodiabolism's relation to heteronotheism, the latter in fact corresponds to the former. The lack of reductive-re-integrative praxis doesn't allow for a true solution. Heteronotheism – and heteronodiabolism – is not a flawed, but an inferior teaching. If somebody calls God an external (other) being with personal, even human qualities, and characteristics like angry, strict, powerful, invisible, and truly believes in it, then it really is. We, however, would not call this God, nor one of the gods; we'd say that there may be, in some cases there are, objective existents produced by consciousness, including some truly special ones. There are other beings that are ill-willed and demonically human-like. We'd never deny the probable or sometimes actual existence of these, but we wouldn't call them devil, satan or diabolos. These are the background creatures of a conscious objective reality that rarely manifest themselves: it may be "interesting" to deal with these within the framework of a quasi-natural science that extends to the realm of the occult – but that's all.

Autonometatheism has levels where satanicitas-diabolicitas won't be denied but becomes insignificant. Within the frame of the sharpest focus on the self, the positions of counter-forces may be disregarded. This way – and only this way, within the coherent conditions of the corresponding level – may we switch off on lower levels – if not fully, but at least significantly – the established, and perhaps overly valid aspects of "focus-also-on-Satan".

*

Finally, a few words about the principle foundation of Satanist sects: the love for Satan.

The first of the basic types simply calls God Satan.

The premise of the second one is that there is God, but he's evil, he created a world of suffering, and even within this world he forbids everything that's relatively good.

One of the possibilities after death – according to God's plan – is annihilation accompanied by sufferings; the other one is a rather doubtful happiness. Contrary to all appearances, Satan is good; he's a benign Main God who is more powerful than God. He grants man all happiness on earth and beyond, and he forbids nothing. Whoever loves and respects Satan must deny the orders and expectations of God, they must act against these, thus weakening his power in his world.

The third of the basic types is fundamentally hedonistic. According to this, we must strive to enjoy life without limitations. This pleases good Satan who, as a reward, will provide infinite pleasures in the afterlife.

According to the fourth basic type, Satan's reign is Unlimited (goodness is not emphasized here) and he must be served with evil deeds; with the most extreme evil deeds exceeding all previous conceptions about evil, with human sacrifices and ritual murders.

The four basic types are not common as pure manifestations. There are countless mixtures and overlaps between the large number of variations within the basic types.

Love for Satan is certainly satanic in all its shapes and forms, but not necessarily the most satanic appearance. Counter initiation and counter realization, both of which appear to be void of all evilness, is most certainly more satanic than the satanism of all satanist cults. Worldwide liberalism or communism, or left wing anarchism are also more satanic than all nominally determined satanism. Love for Satan is bound to religions. There exists Christian (contra-Christian) satanism, there is Muslim (counter-Muslim) satanism, and in addition to these, there are other types of counter religious satanism.

There are forces that connect to satanism, to the love of Satan, but these negative forces stem exclusively or almost exclusively from deviance – often manifesting themselves among unbridled and crazed forms, or rather, formless entities. There are also efforts of realizations connected to satanism, but these, never leaving the realm of satanism, have no chance in terms of positive outcomes. This can't be otherwise, considering their extreme heteronism, but also because of their inferior egoism and extreme non-neutrality.

It is necessary to think further about the topic of satanicitas-diabolicitas; this is something that also the author of these lines still have many things to say about and something that he'd like to read about, perhaps from his older and newer students and audience.

Power & Dominance

Metaphysical tradition – as a world-view – presents a well defined position in questions that concern the problem of the spirit manifested in the world. The way the spirit manifests itself, the way it prevails or recedes is tightly connected with the cyclicity in which man, nature, the world and mainly consciousness participates.

This permeates and determines the inner and external world of man except for the areas where man conserves his autonomy according to his metaphysical position. The presence of the spirit in the world is manifested as power and dominance. Dominance and power are fundamentally traditional categories; however, anti-traditional powers may modify these, creating a pseudo-form of power (an opposite form), giving it a direction that is opposite to the original stability and to the original movement of power and dominance.

The foundation of true power is 'suprēmātia', a superiority that may only be real spiritual superiority that comes from awareness of one's metaphysical origin. The essence of this issue is the presence of 'suprēmātia'. Without true 'suprēmātia' only pseudo-dominantia may be realized. In lack of spiritual supremacy dominance is not dominance and the power that is connected to this is usurped power. Dominance is different from power in that it stands above it and possesses it. Indian traditions address this in an ontological sense; they call power *sakti* (a feminine word) which corresponds to the magical power active in the world, while the possessor of power (*sakti*) is *sakta* (masculine word). Dominance comes from possessing power. The ruler has power and his sovereign being is based on true supremacy. He rises above other beings and people; his dominance that's based on his supremacy can take full possession of power and sustain it. Pseudo-dominance can only keep the violent aspect of power, i.e. its most external form; it usurps power but not the totality of power, but only its lowest form, which is violence. No usurpation of power is imaginable that may extend to the full spectrum of power. Usurpation may only aim at the most external and the lowest form, aspect and methods of power.

The presence of the spirit in the world means the awareness of the presence of the center. Thus if the awareness of the center is not present in the world, the world is not spiritual. Spirit means center-awareness in the sphere of man and his world. It is the center and the axis that supremacy, as the culmination of dominance and power, must be based on. By his essence, the ruler is motionless; he's like the center and the axis. Operational power is always lower than the power directly possessed by the ruler. Directly possessed power aims at founding, moving and stopping. The ancient king (Jupiter Stator) means "Jupiter that stops". Stopper also means founder and mover: it moves and stops things; lays the foundation, creates a solid base and rules. The worldly equivalent – as primary metaphysical manifestation- of the spirit is monarchy, whereby at the top of the state there stands the king, the emperor or the monarch who actively possesses the totality of power, without limitation.

He holds everything in his hand that may be symbolized horizontally and vertically and that extends to these areas, and possesses them without limitation. Just as God possesses existence (being present in existence as the ruler of existence), is the king, the ruler, the monarch present in the earthly manifestation of existence. Traditionality must extend to the various areas of life and it must show the paradigms (patterns) according to which a traditional state may develop.

We must be aware that in the current age – not to mention the future – the possibility of such development is extremely minimal. Traditional empires ceased to be spiritually permeated already around the 7th-6th-5th Centuries BC. There was some spiritual intensification in the Antiquity and the Middle Ages when traditional states were actualized (although not perfectly). The Roman Empire was a traditional empire; later the Eastern- and Western Roman Empire, also, just like the Western Roman Empire revived by the Carolingian dynasty, as well as the German-Roman Empire. Hungary was also a traditional state in the age of the Turul-dynasty –at the time of the rulers from the Arpad – House – in parallel to the German – Roman Empire of the Saxon and later of the Hohenstaufen dynasty.

These were conserved longer in the East especially when we consider the Chinese and especially the Japanese Empire, where the sovereign presence remained manifested until modern times. The highest form of monarchy is the God-kingdom when the godhead –as an *Avatāra* (that descends) appears in the world and occupies the position of the King of the World which in Sanskrit is *Cakravarti*, i.e. “the one who turns the wheel”. Only the one who is in the Center and who rises from the Center may be the “turner of the wheel” or the “lord of the wheel”. In a later stage the God-King is replaced by the sacred king whose mission is from Heaven. These are followed by kingdoms that are kingdoms by the grace of God. This is already a degradation but the spirit is still present, alive and active here. The forms that come after this already lack these powers and a state-form appears that demonstrably represents the non-manifestation of the spirit. They specifically represent not being the representatives of the spirit (of heaven, of transcendence). Such state form is the republic.

Although traditionalism is primarily not dealing with earthly domains, it also has a definitive position in questions of the world, since the world must ensure that people may return, reconnect to the spirit (to the origin). Thus the state bears the imprint of the spiritual world while in the same time being its paradigm in which the internal order of the spiritual world comes to expression, and which provides the pattern for man to build his inner and external world by. Dominance, which is based on supremacy and which possesses power, may only be aristocratic, autocratic and theocratic. Autocratic means that the ruler has unlimited power and that this power is based on himself. Aristocracy means that the rulership of the best prevails. Theocratic means that aristocracy and theocracy draw their origins from the existence of the Godhead, and that in autocracy a divine principle is at work, and that the autocrat expresses a divine principle in all respects, and that aristocracy manifests the rulership of the best (most eminent) based on divine dominance.

Theos means God, aristos means good, the best, the superlative of agathos, auto means self. Theokrateia and theokratiā (theocracy), aristokrateia and aristokratiā (aristocracy), autokrateia and autokratiā (autocracy) are Greek and Greco-Latin forms. These constitute the foundation that enables the ascent back to the spirit. The rulership of the dēmos, of the people is dēmokrateia or dēmokratiā (democracy). "Democracy" would mean a degradation in comparison to the preceding stages even if a true spiritual authority manifested itself in dēmos; but ordinarily it doesn't and thus dēmos is nothing more than a mass. Today all political lines want to speak in the name of democracy, their goal is its affirmation and exaltation. From a spiritual point of view democracy and democratism must be refuted, they have no *raison d'état*. The Ruler's one single responsibility – an inner one, not a principle to follow- is not to rule against the people. But he doesn't have to rule in the name of the people because the people are immeasurably below the true Ruler.

We must define how traditional world-view (which concerns mostly spiritual spheres) manifests itself in the domains of politics and society. The unalienable political aspect of the traditional world-view is a political world-view which we call right-wing (dextrism) and from this follows the most radical right wing orientation. Democracy has no place in the radical right. When we talk about dictatorship, we must know what it means. Dictatorship means a temporary state; it means that the autocrat (the ruler) exercises executive power by giving orders, for example through a dictator. Temporariness is an integral part of dictatorship which may be negative or positive. The dictatorship of the proletariat or of cliques of certain circles and groups of people that lack any superior determination is not and may never be acceptable.

If a dictatorship doesn't manifest the truly superior -but the opposite, the inferior- it represents the dominance of darkness, of skotasmokratiā. A dictatorship that applies terror and behind which skotasmokratiā prevails, must be refused. Such a dictatorship is left wing, similarly to democracy, liberalism and socialism. Terror and liberalism are left wing and so is terroristic dictatorship and democratism.

When it comes to societal-economical considerations, it's obvious that socialism and especially communism are extremely anti-traditional. Communism is a political world-view that we may rightfully call satanokratiā, satanic dominance. Communism (Bolshevism) is the unequivocal expression of satanic dominance, and so is bourgeois democracy and capitalism on the plain of economics. Neither of these are traditional formulas. The last traditional phenomenon in the societal domain was feudalism – the original one that was still unspoiled by burgeoning money economics. The negative off-shoots of feudalism are always connected to the powerful unfolding of money economics; this is when for example the serfs are forced to work increasingly more than absolutely necessary. The essence of feudum is that everything belongs to the king, but not in a capitalistic sense but as his true royal possession. Whatever he grants becomes private property but not in a capitalistic sense.

The land that was granted by the king as feudum may not have been sold because in the hierarchy of proprietary rights it belonged to the king. This process continued down the hierarchy (from a feudum a new feudum was created) all the way to the serfs that "owned" estates. The word serf originally didn't have any pejorative meaning (it's Latin form is *jobbagus*). Everybody was the king's serf. The serf owned the property, it was his private property but not in a capitalistic sense, but in the sense of the hierarchy of property rights. It was his private property, but he received it in the form of feud-ownership, i.e. his private property was simultaneously the property of his lord and mainly that of the king.

The pure forms of feudalism prevailed in the 9th-14th Centuries; after this (with burgeoning money economics) the pure forms of feudalism became more and more obscure and they also took on characteristics that we may and should judge as negative. While capitalism is anti-traditional (state capitalism is even more so), feudalism – in its pure form – is traditional.

Leftism is always anti-traditional and rightism – if it's truly rightism – is traditional. We must note that many right wing schools were infected by leftist elements in the course of history. We may expose strong leftist – actually contra-leftist – influence even in the far right currents and these (from this perspective) also appear to be anti-traditional. (In today's political spectrum there are 53 parties in Hungary that are trying to manifest themselves; all these are, without exception, leftist. No matter how they define themselves, they are leftist because in each case they are related to some form of democracy and all democratisms are leftist. That from the point of view of M.S.Z.M.P (Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party) all other parties are rightist or of the far right, we may simply ignore.)

There are two factors traditionalism considers to be indispensable. One is that feudalism must prevail, irrespective of the chances. The other is what may be called imperialism; since this term already evokes some confused, negative connotations, let's call it rather imperiumism ("empireism"). If we take a look at Hungary's history, after the Arpad-House died out, following the dominion of the Anjous, the following is characteristic of the Habsburgs (the manifestations of the Jagellos and others were only episodic): Hungary was in personal union with the German-Roman Empire. The Kingdom of Hungary was never part of the German – Roman Empire, since the Hungarian king was a king with the rights of an emperor (unlike for example the Czech king) and he was connected to the German-Roman Empire (from the beginning of the last Century to Austria) through an "unio personalis".

The Hungarian nobility had a much deeper feeling for the essence of feudalism than others in the German – Roman Empire. From this point of view the position of the Hungarians was much more traditional than the various parts of the other empire in the personal union. However, in the German-Roman Empire (later in Austria) people had a much deeper feeling for the idea of the empire and from this point of view this was more traditional. These two conditions (feudalism and imperialism) should have been in perfect synergy.

Although the symbiosis of Hungary and the German-Roman Empire – in retrospective – may not be considered unequivocally positive, but the usual attitude that rejects the essentially positive aspect of the Habsburg Empire is completely false.

This personal union – although not perfect – was a form within Europe that we must not reject.

In connection with the spiritual manifestation of dominance and power, we must also speak of nationalism. Nationalism – not without antecedents – was born at the time of the reformation and it was unfolding more forcefully in relation with the 1789 French Revolution. This form of nationalism is anti-traditional and leftist because it is based on nivellation which always means leveling down. The essence of nationalism is that whoever belongs to the 'nātiō' is essentially of the same rank and it is precisely this that provides cohesion to the nation. Historically, nātiō used to mean various things; in Hungary for example, for a long time it meant only the nobility. Everybody was an inhabitant, a subject (rēgnicola) of the kingdom, but only the nobility and nobody else was part of the nātiō.

Internationalism may also be led back to the leveling nationalism that unfolded in the French revolution. The premise of one is that everybody is French, German or Hungarian, the rest doesn't matter, this is what provides cohesion, the spiritual and all other foundation, this is what keeps the nation together. If we continue the same train of thought, this may be extended to the entirety of humanity. Nationalism, however, also has a positive and rightist form. This nationalism assumes an internally structured nation; a nation that is structured horizontally and vertically; a nation that is differentiated, capable of integration and not aiming at livellation; a nation that is spiritually led from top to bottom, and that is spiritually oriented upward. This is what corresponds with right wing nationalism. Although in case of internationalism we can't exclude a right wing internationalism, but this was and is being used by the darkest anti-spiritual and contra-spiritual powers to such a degree that cooperation with them from a spiritual point of view is impossible.

On the base of a restricted nationalism it is also not possible to strive towards the spirit. There is a spiritual trans-nationalism (or supra-nationalism) that unites based on principles that transcend nations. This takes on particular forms, like for example churches or orders that stand above nations (there is a radical party that calls itself trans-nationalist, however this has nothing to do with trans-nationalism, because it is a typical internationalist, cosmopolitan party formation.) True trans-nationalism and nationalism in the positive sense are connected by connationalism (a positive position on the side of national communities). Connationalism is based on the idea of nation-community as opposed to internationalism, meaning a simultaneous nationalism, i.e. the unification of nationalisms and nations.

Right and left are expressions that may be led back to the end of the 18th Century which originally referred to the positions of the representatives in parliament. The representatives of the conservative government parties were positioned on the right side, while the representatives supporting the subversion, on the left. The expression is not the best, but since there isn't a better one, we can apply it thousands of years retrospective, to the current days or to the future.

If we want to name a truly right wing politician from the past 250 years who the most purely represented this ideology in the political domain, it must be Metternich, much more so than, for example Hitler or Mussolini. Metternich represented a right wing ideology that didn't allow for any anti-left contamination. Due to the manipulative education system, for 99.9% of Hungarians the name Metternich rings as negatively as that of the basest criminal. This position is fundamentally flawed, even stupid. Metternich represented the almost completely pure traditional state ideal and never in his life exhibited one single anti-Hungarian sentiment. (Various careful and probing historical research unequivocally prove this.)

Sometimes in the Middle Ages and before, everybody and all currents were unequivocally "right wing", since all currents were essentially traditional. Anti-tradition could only manifest itself on the peripheries, in the form of marginal forces. Differentiation may be made retrospectively; such was the case of the Guelfs and the Ghibellines in the Middle Ages. Guelf was a dynasty whose original German name was Welf, while the German equivalent of Ghibelline was Hohenstaufen. The positions of the two dynasties were fundamentally different. The Guelf dynasty fully acknowledged the pope's primacy and supremacy above all. Their position was that the pope – if he wanted to – may become the emperor, but even if he's not an emperor, he stands above him. According to the Ghibelline dynasty on the other hand, supremacy belongs to the emperor and the emperor – if he wanted to – could take over papal power, but even if he doesn't, he still stands above the pope. This was well founded since there was a time when the German-Roman emperor was called Vicar of Christ – *Vicārius Christī* – while the pope was called Vicar of St. Peter – *Vicārius Petri* –. This was the case for long centuries. Using current expressions, it's obvious that both the Guelfs and the Ghibellines were "right wing" currents; this aside, the Ghibelline line was "more on the right", because the ruler, according to the traditional conception, stands higher than the high priest. Priesthood always has something lunar about it. At the Aztecs, for example next to the king there was the main priest whose name was "Snake – Woman" and, although a man, he appeared as the wife of the king. In India, at the king's side – the *Rāja* – there is *Purōhita*, the high priest, a brahmana who, during the ceremonies, despite being a man, related to the king as though he was a woman. This had no sexual connotations; it was simply the external manifestation of an inner rank. Although the ruler himself is a high priest, he nevertheless stands above the high priest.

Even retrospective we can differentiate between stronger and weaker "right" currents while, using contemporary and last century expressions, both the Guelf and Ghibelline positions -as we noted- were "right wing", together, as well as individually. When it comes to Hungary, both Koppány and St. Stephen represented traditional views.

There was a time when the powers of anti-tradition (although they existed) had only peripheral significance. They couldn't penetrate man's world, they couldn't permeate it, but internally they were already at work invisibly, through decomposing consciousness they had achieved a lot, but they couldn't upset the prevailing order yet. The states of the Middle Ages (although by far not perfect) were still nurtured and sustained by the penetrating power of residues that essentially meant the representation of tradition. Even in their residual state, these still dominated and (even in such a state) they could force the offensive forces aiming at subversion, to marginal and extra-marginal positions. Revolutions are fundamentally left wing. The 1648 English, the 1789 and 1830 French, the 1848 French and European, the 1870/71 French, the 1917 Russian and the 1918-19 European revolutions were all -fundamentally, extremely and more and more extremely- in the hands of the ruling powers of anti-tradition (skotasmocratic, representing darkness) and this is what they fully expressed. 1956 is different, we may not even call it revolution. It was an uprising for freedom and a freedom fight. What happened in Hungary in 1956 was not a left wing initiative; it can't be connected to 1848, to 1918. 1956 was infinitely above these by rank, by honor and dignity, and by orientation. This doesn't mean that in 1956 effective traditional powers manifested themselves – since such powers exist only sporadically in the world -, but its orientation corresponds to the orientation tradition would have taken this initiative. When the Bolsheviks called this counter-revolution they wanted to mark this Freedom-uprising negatively. If this was not concocted by the Bolsheviks, we may as well accept the 'counter-revolution' stamp, since counter-revolution -as fact, as possibility, as concept- always contains something positive. All in all however it's more correct to stick to the terms Freedom-uprising or Freedom fight and under no circumstances should we confuse it with the manifestations triggered by dark forces that are concentrated in revolutions.

Viewing the facts, the events, the happenings and the tendencies of the past from the point of view of traditional politology, we may rightfully say that Hungary is still a kingdom today. From the side of powers only injustices happened in Hungary in the past 46 years. For 46 years the country was under enemy occupation and an enemy occupation may not produce national assemblies, governments, parliaments. Juristically (dē iüre) Hungary is still a kingdom where there has been an interregnum for 46 years, thus there is no legal head of state, no parliament, or government. The power in Hungary was de facto usurped by a power that stood in opposition with the interest of Hungarians, assisted by puppet figures. This was not changed by the 1990 "election" either, since the currently "elected" power is based on succession from the previous one and it originates itself from the previous one also.

Similarly it's fully besides the point what is accepted as crest: the one with or without the crown. Hungary's crest is the crest with the crown and no legitimate organization has revoked this, since no such organization has operated since the beginning of the Soviet occupation. (The crest is the small crest with the crown; a middle crest with the crown may be used, as well, or a large crest with the crown, if it will ever be created. This one has only had drafts; it's been being designed for centuries but it hasn't reached a final shape, since it contained territories like Serbia and Jerusalem since the Hungarian king is also the king of Jerusalem and Serbia. The crest without the the crown is not a crest but a escutcheon. Even above the crest-shield of the counties of the kingdom there used to stand the crown, generally the crown with nine branches.)

At this time, the chances for de facto traditional structures to emerge in Hungary or anywhere else in the world is immeasurably small. The chances are similarly small for the emergence of forms that are reminiscent of such structures. However, how much chance there is for restoration should not affect the principles themselves. What's needed is the development of principle positions, while we may assume that in the life of a world that is becoming increasingly dark, there are relatively bright periods, so called lucidum intervals. In these cases it is not the original, traditional light that is awakened, but these are still relatively brighter periods in which restoration may at least be attempted, even if it may last only for 24 hours. If it may be realized only for one day and only partially, we should still live, act, operate, think and feel under the aegis of making this happen.

Political orientation, in comparison to spiritual orientation is secondary at most, but this doesn't mean that this is not deeply and penetratingly important, for example from the point of view of the individual. It is characteristic even of high caliber people that they contain a confusion of principles, i.e. they lack an internal coherence. Karoly Kerenyi, someone who enjoys our respect to a somewhat lesser degree, made a good remark, namely that due to a confusion of principles, the man of our era – including people and their views who operate in science and in other higher areas – are 'incoherent', 'incompetent' and 'inconsequent'. If somebody considers himself spiritual but in the same time sympathizes with the political left, his internal integrity will unavoidably become compromised. The acceptance of all hierarchical setup is indispensable for traditionalism. If somebody considers meditation as a goal, but rejects the raison d'état of hierarchies, he should also reject the ranking order of levels of consciousness since all hierarchies originate from the hierarchy of levels of consciousness: the world itself is the reflection of these.

If somebody says that all people are fundamentally the same, he can't think this seriously and he has likely never thought this through earnestly. This is a very special position; one may sacrifice his life for such an ideology without truly believing that it is true. He may surmise that this should be true, but he doesn't know why people should be equal. Life always belies this kind of egalitarianism, since the nature and spiritual level of people are to a large degree different.

There are people on more or less the same spiritual level, but independent of this, egalitarianism has no actual foundation. Further: the principle of equality doesn't represent anything morally good, anything that should be so because if it was so, it would be better. Precisely because this is not so, it follows that all leveling is based on sinking lower. Aiming at full equality in rights may lead only to equality in the lack of rights.

Dominance and power must come to expression organically. If a state is only a totalitarian state, it is not in the sign of traditionality. Totality must be supported by organicity, by the inner order of values that receives its powers from the spirit and from the domain above life. This order must be central and infused by the spirit and this center (from which this infusion originates) is in the same time the center of the goal which may be pursued by the community and the individual. Each and every single human individual carries in himself the status, i.e. the image of the state; if he doesn't have such an image, then by confusing and darkening everything. Such a person may only strive towards such a state, i.e. towards the non-state. Current states are to a very large degree non-states and current societies are non-societies, as long as we use these terms in their original sense. From the point of view of the original ideal of state and society, current states and societies should be called masses, sets, apparatuses, inorganic organizations operating as tools for exercising violence. Traditionality is based on a true state and social ideal, one that is alive, which receives its life from powers of the highest order, which is organically and hierarchically structured, in which there isn't and can't be opposition between the individual and collective, and where everybody is in his place, everybody is oriented towards Heaven, i.e. everybody is progressing towards his higher or lower, but mostly more complete self.

One can't find tranquility who lives among the people to pursue worldly goals, or the one who lives in isolation to pursue spiritual goals. Tranquility is achieved by those who live among the people to serve God.

Only by getting rid of the confused notion that the material world is real and important may one understand and fulfill his true calling.

Fear of death is born from people considernig the small part of life that is restricted by their own imagination to be everything.

We know the divine law from the traditions of all religions and from our consciousness, as long as it's not disturbed by passions and pose; but we may know it also from experience if we apply it in life. All the requisites of the law that give imperturbable salvation are in the same time the requisites of true law, as well.

* * *

We may consider somebody who is seeking wisdom clever, but if he thinks he has found it, he's a fool.

Tantrism & Sexuality

What's generally known about tantra is that it connects sexuality with a path of realization. We need to look at to what degree this is true and what this means exactly. The concept of man as an androgynous being in his primordial, non-materialized state is reflected in many myths; androgynous refers to a being who contains both sexes fully, and not to a being that is half man and half woman.

According to the androgynous myth, androgynous men, who were trying to besiege Olympus, were cut in half by Apollonian gods; since then, the two halves are occupied with trying to find each other, so they can't succeed at the siege. The Latin word *sexus* itself originates from *secare*, "to cut" and is thus related to a state of being asunder. According to this, the original purpose of sexuality and sexual union is supposed to be the recreation of the androgynous in order to occupy Olympus.

Ordinarily, however, sexuality points into a different direction: instead of aiding spiritual realization, it specifically hinders it by misdirecting one's internal orientation. By developing a special internal orientation, the tantric paths made it possible that sexuality itself may become a path, a magical path, according to its original purpose of restoring the androgynous state, while eliminating all aspects of sexuality that leads one off the path.

What we may call ecstasy plays a significant role in both Hindu and Buddhist tantra, as well as in certain Dionysian paths, which also had a tantric aspect. This is natural. Ecstasy may be achieved as much by drinking wine, as through fighting or through sexual practices. The objective on the tantric paths, or on paths of tantric character, was not to minimize the ecstatic element, but to the contrary, to intensify it infinitely – in parallel to also infinitely intensifying self-awareness. The simultaneous, infinite intensification of ecstasy and vigilance: this is the almost impossible task the yogi undertook on the tantric path. In other words, he undertook the most superior human actionality of connecting perfect concentration-meditation-contemplation with the highest intensity experiences on the human-ontological level, which happens to be connected with fighting and sexuality.

Tantric paths attempt to connect and unify the most superior human actionality and the most intense experiences. Without this, sexuality and fighting will foster the gradual immersion into the vortex of becoming, instead of liberation from it; namely, ecstasy – in its ordinary state – is the opposite of vigilance and the presence of the former evidently extinguishes the latter. However, there is also an equally great chance that a cold tranquility evoked during the praxis will prevent the intensification of forces aimed at ecstasy. Thus, these two forces must be connected in a way that neither of them should be weakened during the process of realization. Let's note that using fighting and sexuality on the path of realization are quite extreme examples. There are other, quite specific paths or possibilities within the scope of tantra like, for example, the path of tea rituals or flower arrangements (ikebana).

Everything that is otherwise either not helpful or, without proper control, specifically harmful for realization becomes an instrument on the path. This is what “turning venom into elixir” means, according to tantric terminology. What's ordinarily a lethal venom may be transformed into medicine or even into a life-giving force. Since with the passing of time more and more processes become negative in the sense that they hinder self-realization, the relevance of tantra keeps on increasing. In the current stage of Kali-Yuga even pure gnostic, i.e. transcendental abilities are undergoing such a decline that they ordinarily become the very obstacles of realization. This concerns thinking most of all, which, whatever the path may be, is the most obvious tool of realization. The functional transformation of thinking is the first objective on all paths, without exception. In earlier times, thinking could not be considered to be of a tantric character; in its current state, however, it has undergone such a fundamental change and – especially in its rational-discursive form (not to mention automatic-associative sub-thinking) – has become tied to the body to such a degree that it should be viewed more as a negative, rather than a positive factor; in other words, it has become a force that I no longer experience under my control, but I experience myself to be dominated by it.

Shakti & Shakta: Sexual Bipolarity

Some of the terms of tantra must be clarified; one of these is the concept of Shakti. The Indo-German etymology of the word is not entirely clear. Its direct meaning is “power” and “force”. Shakti is a force and power behind consciousness and existence that while it precedes all generative, sustaining and transformative processes it is also extant in all of these. Shakti is also present in episteme as the force that builds its foundation. Tantric symbology considers Shakti as feminine. What possesses Shakti is the masculine Shakta. Shakta is the ruler, the one who possesses power (since, by principle, dominance is above power, dominance means power over power). Shakta is essentially Shiva.

Thus, the objective of the yogi on the tantric path is to unify Shakti with Shiva by gradually taking possession of it. Unpossessed Shakti, i.e. unpossessed power, appears as an unbridled, destructive and raging force, the symbol of which is the tiger.

Shakti is also connected with kali-yuga itself, since the name of one of the goddesses representing Shakti is Kali, which means "black" or "dark". Kali represents the principle of destruction and devastation and in its non-dominated form this is what Shakti is related to.

The objective of the tantra-yogi is to dominate Shakti or, in other words, to realize the special position of the Shakta, which is the position of the ruler. This illuminates that when we relate Shakti to femininity – partially symbolically, partially due to a deeper insight – we are not dealing with a duality merely on a biological level; it's about a duality of ontic nature at the depth of existence that finds manifestation in all domains and on all levels of existence. In the totality of existence, this duality manifests itself as the duality between the spirit (purusha) and the principle of the manifest world (prakriti).

Biologically we may only find rather weak arguments as to why sexuality, i.e. a biological bipolarity, is necessary. This necessity may not be proved merely on the level of biology and the arguments in this respect evoke an explicitly a posteriori impression. The sexual bipolarity we find in the world corresponds with the totality of (conscious) existence, which also finds a bipolar manifestation and depicts duality within unity. The restoration of unity also includes the totality of realization. Therefore, the more primordial a particular form of existence, the more bipolar it is. This is supported by the fact that the extremely simple life forms, which are void of bipolarity, were never superior, but constitute the final products of an involutionary process.

Therefore, the more blurred sexual bipolarity is, and the more the qualitative differences between the sexes disappear, the more we may count with an involutive degeneration. Among people, however, sexual bipolarity is normally extant and the tantric paths considered this, to a large degree. Although we won't deal with the details now, we must, however, emphasize that in the course of tantric praxis, one's own sex must be realized first of all; a man must be maximally man, a woman must be maximally woman. Bipolar unity, namely, is not achieved by the two sexes gradually nearing each other, but by the two, following complete separation, "exploding into one another".

The Essence of Life and Death

Becoming is eventually followed by decease and passing. Only that which is incorruptible and immortal has neither a time-bound nor a principle beginning, since what has no beginning will not have an end, either. We have to examine some terms in order to clarify forms of eternity and temporality.

The word for absolute, timeless eternity is 'aeternum' or 'aeternitās'. The word for the special and relative eternity that refers to becoming and passing together with time is 'sempiternitās', or occasionally the term 'aevum' is used. The quasi "eternity" that refers to a prolonged extension in time is called 'perpetualitās'. The expression 'aevum' could also mean all of these together. "Aeternum" is timeless, supra-temporal, absolute eternity, 'sempiternitās' is a relative eternity, an appearance and disappearance together with time; 'perpetualitās' is full extension across time. Finally, 'perennitās' expresses the appearance, the imprint of 'aeternum' in time. Religiō perennis, sophia perennis (eternal religion, eternal wisdom) or philosophia perennis (eternal philosophy) for example are not eternal in the sense of being fully timeless, or that they appeared and disappeared together with time or even that their content has no end. 'Perennity' means that it appears in time but it represents timeless eternity within temporality. The human form of existence is directly connected with 'imperpetualitās', the opposite of 'perpetualitās', i.e. to appear in time belongs to the natural form of human existence and this results in passing also in time. But man is not simply human. Man is a person and Subject. In addition to his mortal part there is also a spiritual being present in man that connects to 'sempiternitās', i.e. to becoming 'cum tempore' (with time) and passing 'cum tempore'.

In the same time, in his own subjectivity, in his own Auton-being, he's fully immortal, completely eternal. Man is the representative of "aeternum" under all circumstances. In such sense, his manifestation is in the sign of perennitās – this is man's Subjectivity. The actual condition of man is always determined by what he identifies with. By his identification man may relate to his own mortal or immortal spheres of existence; for example to spheres that are fully subordinated to becoming and passing in time. Such is the essence of man's body: not only his physicality in the strict sense but all those more subtle physical levels, as well that man experiences as his own and that also means the conditions of his current (strictly physical) mode of existence. If man identifies with his mortal part, he has to share in the fate of the body. If he identifies with the higher spheres of existence he carries within himself, his fate will take on the special conditioned state of these (between mortality and immortality) and following the death of the body, he'll pass on to another world according to these; and if he fully identifies with himself, he is immortal in the sense of absolute, supra-temporal eternity.

The Hindu and Buddhist traditions consider two basic 'post mortem' possibilities in regards to man. One of these is pitṛ-yāna. The first part of pitṛ-yāna literally means father, in a broader sense it means ancestor, thus the whole term means the path of ancestors. The other possibility is dēva-yāna. Dēva means god, dēva-yāna means the path of gods, the divine path. Pitṛ-yāna contains two sub-possibilities. One is that consciousness ceases in death (or shortly after death). This is the most common possibility today and it presents a grave situation since, from the point of view of experience, this means the end of experience itself, i.e. annihilation, similarly to how an animal dies. An earlier -and today much more rare- version of pitṛ-yāna is what pitṛ-yāna literally means; the larval remains of human consciousness looming after death which goes through various types of experiences (this is the domain of Hādēs) and after a while this looming presence gradually withers. The individual consciousness at this stage experiences itself embodied in the root of a world (of beyond, the world of origin), the "breast of Abraham" in which, thus returning to its ancestors, it gradually withers. From this stage, the tendencies that an individual carried over to this other world and state regenerate themselves and lead to various human incarnations, embodiments. Not only does it return to its ancestors, it becomes an ancestor. But it doesn't become an ancestor in the sense that the individual itself reincarnates but in the sense that it gives birth to processes that generate new entities through the ancient stock: this is pitṛ-yāna.

Dēva-yāna also presents additional possibilities. One of these is that consciousness ends in the transitory state, but much later – still, this means a fall back to pitṛ-yāna. The other possibility is that a journey in the other world begins: the kernel of the psychic-spiritual remains goes through various states of existence. It may happen that upon entering one of these worlds (lōka in Sanskrit, related to the Latin *locus*) it gets attached to it, fixing itself to a state of existence that corresponds to the eternity of 'sempiternitās' where its own existence doesn't have a temporal beginning; in other words it doesn't begin when it enters but when the lōka begins simultaneously with the beginning of time and it lasts until time ends, together with the lōka. This however is not measurable by units of time, like 10 years, 2 trillion years or a thousandth of a second, since in this sense it doesn't have duration, considering that such things can't be measured in an order that doesn't fall into the realms of 'perpetuity' or 'imperpetuity'. This state is the relative eternity of 'cum tempore' existence. So the psychic – spiritual kernel may attach itself to such states (worlds) or it may also happen that it reaches the human state of existence and attaches itself to it in a 'cum tempore' sense, since the scope of the human state of existence is much broader and more encompassing than is generally known or assumed. It may also happen that it approaches an incarnation and an extract of its being that corresponds to a demon (grandharvas, kentauros) enters the incarnation. The Subject-carrying consciousness that made it this far will dissolve once the incarnation has taken place. The subjective ray (the ray that emanates from the Subject) that has reached this point will retract and a different subjective ray will create a new human being.

Metaphysical Awakening in death also belongs to the realm of dēva-yāna (to its periphery). There is Awakening connected to the body, i.e. it may take place in life. This possibility is called jīvan-mukti or jīvan-māksā, meaning liberation in life. There is also the possibility of jīva-vidēhamukti (mōksa) – which means Awakening in the moment of death, on the border between the living and incorporeal states. There is a possibility for 'post-mortem' awakening (after death), this is called vidēha-mukti mōksa. All these are already at the limits of dēva-yāna, since they are states that transcend it. Human births are mostly fueled by pitr-yāna and secondarily, in exceptional cases, by dēva-yāna.

These are man's possibilities in terms of death, full Metaphysical Awakening in life, in the moment of death or following death being the most exceptional ones. Dēva-yāna requires initiation; even the conscious attachment to a state in the realm of hell presumes a certain degree of initiation. An uninitiated man is destined to pitr-yāna; those with the highest qualities among these will face the withering of consciousness in pitr-yāna, while the consciousness of those with lower qualities will flame-out in death or directly after death. The state of clinical death is not death and this doesn't mean that -to use medical terms- death means biological death, but that death is "that" death and not the one from which somebody may "wake up". If somebody "wakes up" (meaning that he is brought back from death), that person did not die. Despite of this, the states described in the books and research of R. A. Moody and others are interesting to us and show that even average people (whose connection with the body has been loosened) are capable of achieving much more significant conscious experiences than may generally be assumed. If the right conditions are available, the loosened connection with the body may enable special conscious experiences. The research, as well as the opinions concerning all this are all valid as long as they don't draw too far reaching consequences from these. The fact that in the state of clinical death man goes through such experiences doesn't mean more than just that: man may have quite extraordinary experiences near death.

In these states death doesn't actually happen; it doesn't happen either in experiences since the survivor generally reaches some kind of light or a sort of being, perhaps a gate and whoever returns, never goes through it. Exposed to a certain influence, he/she decides not to go through it or doesn't want to go through it. The state that follows death would be the one after the experience of passing through, but the scope of research doesn't and can't include this. In terms of death, if man doesn't go through a fundamental transformation previously, he can't experience death consciously, or he can, but just to a minimal degree.

There are various assumptions regarding death. In his book "Mysterium Mortis", the catholic theologian of Hungarian origin, Ladislaus Boros, explains that in the moment of death everybody receives an illumination on the base of which they can decide on their 'post-mortem' existence. Naturally, he raises the issue in a catholic theological form which here means that man either chooses the road to salvation or to perdition.

The final decision (*optiō finālis*) takes place in the illumination, not excluding the possibility that everybody opts for salvation. Concerning whether or not illumination and *optiō finālis* actually takes place, tradition doesn't provide an answer. But it does say that in the circum-mortālis moments of consciousness, for an extremely short period – so short that it doesn't produce any external manifestation – it is possible that a light flares up which may be followed by some voluntary, willful act. Tradition doesn't teach that this flaring up necessarily always happens and accordingly, since this is beyond control, no definite position may be taken concerning this illumination and the *optiō finālis*. For those who represent the traditional world view it is not salvation and perdition that depict the strongest polar tension in relation to death, but annihilation on the one hand and absolution in Awakening on the other. The smallest tension is between the ceasing and subsistence of consciousness. *Salūs* (*salūtio, salvātiō*) means salvation and healing, just like *Heil* in German means both; this is how *salūs* should be understood. *Salūs* or *salve* used to be a form of greeting. Full "healing" is salvation which is more than the mere realization of a celestial state. *Salūs* is the prerequisite of Awakenining, i.e. of ultimate realization. It is not the guarantee of it and it is certainly not identical with it; it's only a precondition of it.

In the great historical Christian denominations salvation is the highest achievement (rank) which may have various sub-ranks. Realized salvation is salvation with the resurrection of the body but this is still not identical with absolution. The opposite of salvation is really perdition within the *dēva-yāna* order of 'post-mortem' experiences. Within the possibilities of *dēva-yāna*, the difference and the tension between salvation and perdition (like the most extreme state of hell) is truly extreme. But in comparison to the metaphysical tension in which there is complete annihilation (in Sanskrit: *nirguna-mūla-prakṛti-laya*, the complete dissolve in the non-qualitative root-nature) on the one hand and Metaphysical Awakening on the other, it is still quite insignificant. Full annihilation, the dissolution in full potentiality may only take place due to extreme and exceptional mistakes during realization.

The general and common possibility –without any positives– of man is that in the moment of actual death (or after that) his individual consciousness ends and this doesn't mean that his impersonal, sub-personal or supra-personal consciousness should remain. Supra-personal consciousness could only remain if the person's consciousness does not end in death. There is no such thing that there is subjectivity here, there and everywhere with the same intensity of identification; although to some degree even this is true, but there is always a special identification. This is decisive in regards to post-mortem possibilities. Wherever I am mainly and primarily in my identification (to put it in first person singular) becomes (practically) exclusive in the critical moment. What happens with man's 'post-mortem' possibilities is determined by his whole life on the one hand, and the period preceding death, on the other.

There is no precise measure in this regard: this may be a year, a month, etc. – the quality of this period, and finally the moments near death is most decisive, but not from a moral stand point, so it doesn't matter if the person was "good" in his life or not; what matters is what level of intensity his consciousness is able to sustain. Existence after death is not of moral character, it has no ethical connotations; it only depends on the presence of forces of consciousness. This is much more of a reality of intensity than a reality of morality. From a higher point of view man doesn't achieve a given state as a reward or as a punishment; from a lower, religious point of view it is valid that one's fate after death is a reward or a punishment, but if one pursues goals related to metaphysical realization, this position is not sustainable because in his case only the forces of consciousness will play a role and thus a man's position after death is not what he deserves but what corresponds to his state; justice of injustice is not even an issue from this point of view. From a lower point of view this issue is decidedly valid, but from a higher point of view it's not even an issue.

Correspondences decide; everybody connects to a state that perfectly corresponds to his self-identification. Generally, there are no possibilities of transmutation after death, but in exceptional cases there may be. The highest form of *yoga*, *rāja-tantra-yoga* knows a certain type of ascesis that may be continued even after death. This is fully outside of the scope of most *yoga* methods and generally outside of the scope of human possibilities. This means that identifications and de-identifications, transmutations may be performed after death in exceptional cases – provided of course that identification during life highly transcended the domain of the body.

These possibilities may only be raised in case of high levels of identification with the spirit. The human mode of existence is determined by death in several ways: death has not only an extinguishing quality but also one of possibilities. Death has a positive aspect but in order for this to open up, quite exceptional conditions are necessary. Regarding realization we must mention a special form of tantric practices that were known in Inner and Easter Asia. In a certain sense the method itself is related to the tantric versions of Buddhism, as well as with the tantric versions of Taoism: riding the tiger. The tiger corresponds to a special power in the Inner and Far Eastern symbology. This power, a magical power called *śakti*, is active in existence as creator, sustainer and destroyer. Not all of its forms and manifestations are symbolized by the tiger; mostly its uncontrolled, unbridled manifestations are symbolized by a female tiger. The symbolic, educational situation is the following: the man on the path hasn't acquired yet the powers that are necessary to conquer the tiger. Due to his low or high level of realization, he's also not in a position to escape from the tiger or to avoid facing it. He's facing the tiger because he can't defeat it and can't escape from it; so he sits on its back and spurs the racing tiger for an even wilder run and starts to control it until it becomes his carrier and domestic animal. The story has various variations: the tiger eventually collapses and the man kills it or it remains his carrier animal.

The point is that man creates for himself a method of realization by applying powers that otherwise work against his realization. As the world "progresses" everything becomes the tiger – not a recognized, but a recognizable one. Fighting, sex and many other areas that generally don't belong to the lines of realization may be turned into such areas in exceptional cases but in such cases the tiger nature is normally known. But for example thinking didn't used to have a tiger nature: it didn't used to be moved by an unbridled, confused force. But in the current era –especially in most recent times- the tiger nature is more and more dominant in thinking, in addition to everything else. In the same time this tiger nature may only be recognized with an intuition that is evoked in an exceptionally heightened state since if it is revealed to somebody theoretically and one understands it, this still doesn't mean that one will be capable of recognizing the tiger. While everything is taking on a tiger nature, the recognition of this is becoming less and less typical. It is quite possible that the time will come when man may face only one single tiger and this one will be the greatest, the tiger of death. Death is the Greatest Tiger man may face in his life and at the end of it. It is possible that there will be a time when death is the only possibility that may be ridden. This will be an extreme situation since there is no chance for correction: one either succeeds or not. When it comes to other methods there is always a chance to attempt something else: one goes through trials but here the trial is ultimate and it presents a situation that can't be corrected.

"Par excellence" man is a mortal being which means that his mortality is cast in time. Man is able to reflect on death. Animals, although they sense approaching death, sooner and sharper than man can, are not in such a conscious-reflexive relationship with it as man is. In case of animals, everything is happening on the level of feelings while in case of man conscious reflections mean an additional level even though in most cases this is not utilized and man becomes conscious of his own death only in exceptional moments. Thus man is in a tragic situation since he considers himself fully mortal while he lives life as though he was fully "immortal", not reflecting on his own death.

If somebody becomes ill and the illness is severe and it runs its course quick, he becomes acutely aware that he will have to die. This may weight on him so much, as a thought, that he may commit suicide, etc. Yet, he doesn't really grasp an even more certain basic situation, i.e. that he has to die at all. The difference between these is not as extreme as it is usually perceived emotionally. The basic problem is that one has to die at all and this prognosis has far more validity than any death-prognosis in regards to illnesses. Although man doesn't experience himself as immortal but as mortal, his behavior toward himself –due to a lack of reflection despite the possibility of reflection- is such as if he'd never have to die. One of the fundamental tenets of all superior spiritual schools is that "you should view each day of your life like it was the last one"; without any pessimistic undertone.

In regards somebody who has no intentions to transmute himself towards superiority, all this is almost fully meaningless; such a person -to put it somewhat bluntly- can be "written off". From a spiritual point of view we are only interested in people who want to transform themselves into higher states. From many other points of view anybody may be interesting but not from this one. The historical Buddha said: " I am addressing those whose eyes are covered only by a little dust"; thus not those "whose eyes are not covered by dust" or those "whose eyes are completely covered by dust". No other spiritual teacher or guide (incomparably smaller than Buddha) could say anything else. Those "whose eyes are covered only by little dust", are people who dimly intuit their own origin, essence, path and goal; but this intuition may be called dim only in metaphysical perspectives, otherwise it means a remarkably sharp consciousness. All theoretical and practical teachings are directed at such people. Only about such people can be said for example, that in relation to themselves they are responsible or irresponsible. It would be superfluous to say the same about those in full delirium since in their case delirium and deviation have a substantial, all-encompassing and fulfilling significance. Responsibility is a no factor in their case so we can also not talk about them being irresponsible. All dark and light prognosis, all (almost) threatening warning and all encouraging remarks are meant only to people who want to transform their state and condition into a higher one.

Hindu and Buddhist tantra (mostly these) acknowledges a human type they call paśu. Paśu means "sacrificial animal" which may only be a domestic animal, mostly ox or goat. The human type that corresponds to sacrificial animals is also called paśu: the type that -when sacrificed- only becomes part of human regeneration and nothing more. The current paśu is not even a real paśu since in the real paśu at least the awareness of the sacrificial animal or the human consciousness that's analogue to this, is in some sense awakened. Paśu is man whose consciousness flames out in death, or thereafter. A paśu also has dignity and significance, but not in terms of realization, because in this sense, he depicts man incapable of realization. A paśu is anārya in the deepest sense. The āryas normally denote the top three castes while anāryas the ones below these. Paśu is who doesn't transmute himself and who -if born into a higher caste- doesn't realize his prenatal possibilities and doesn't go through caste-initiation and also doesn't set out on the path of true yōga. Even if they are born in a lower caste, they don't set out on a true yōga path.

True yōga has nothing to do whatsoever with popular "yōga" -the term is terrible and stupid in this context- that is being pursued en masse today. Yōga is the ascesis of spiritual transmutation. For us, this term has weight. Nowadays, certain dark spiritual currents that are active either in the name of export-import Buddhism or "transcendental meditation" abuse the term "initiation"; "I went through an initiation" they say, although absolutely no fundamental change has taken place and the person remained exactly the same as he was before.

The initiate is different from an uninitiated person to the same degree as a human is different from an animal: in his own innate, internal world. These are not mere words; this means a serious and real discrimination of consciousness. An initiated person stands above an intelligent common man roughly to the same degree as an intelligent man is superior to a gorilla for example – in terms of his mental qualities. This is not a visible thing but not because it is kept secret and especially not because the person concerned is not aware of it, but because on the common level of human communications a manifestation that is as superior to the human mode of existence as the human mode of existence is to the animal one, doesn't make sense. Being initiated doesn't merely mean being smart (that too, of course), but that there is something supra-human in man which is related to his experience of origin and existence.

The overwhelming majority of people (9,999 out of 10,000) are paśu – unless of course a group is assembled that consists exclusively of people who are not paśu. The path of realization a man follows who realizes himself, is leading away from the paśu state. The superior counter-pole of paśu is paśu-pati which/who is the lord of paśus. The Indian tradition identifies paśu-pati with Śiva. There are people who –in different ways- stand between paśu and paśu-pati and walk paśu-pati's path of realization. One type of these is called divya – divine; In Europe, in traditions with Greek fundamentals this was called theos which means God, those who belong to gods and man who represents a godhead. The other version is vīra which corresponds to hemitheos or hēros, or vēros in ancient Greek, thus the correspondence with vīra, vir. Vīra is somewhat lower (its meaning is true man and hero) than divya but possesses more intensive possibilities and powers, in other words greater virya and heroic powers. In case of divya, the level or grade and quality itself is called divya, while in case of vīra this is called vīra-virya: these depict two basic types that are progressing towards paśu-pati, getting farther away from paśu. Today almost all people appear in the world as anārya and paśu, save extremely exceptional cases – even by their essence they are paśu. There are some people who by their essence and possibilities are not paśu and some of these are capable of rising from the paśu-anārya state by transmuting themselves through metaphysical self-realization.

As a state, paśu-pati means the state of consciousness identical with the Subject; paśu, as a state, means man who identifies with a common state of consciousness. The Subject, the realizer is present, he is here, although his separation from the person is in cosmic magnitude. There can't be any other goal in a metaphysical perspective than this kind of realization and this possibility is available only to mortal man who contains the potentiality (possibility, virtuality) of immortality.

The representatives of modes of existence that are superior to that of humans (angels, semi-gods, gods, archangels) dispose over much higher possibilities of realization than man, they are in a much higher state, but due to the blissful, bright, free nature of their state, their need of or drive for realization is much lower than man's; thus, their possibilities are eventually not greater, because their drive is lower. We are talking about people with a drive to transmutation here (thus not about *paśus*) who already left the *paśu* state behind by transcending it. Even a small degree of transcendence in this respect means a very high spiritual achievement, since all one has to do is observe one's own state of mind and psychic condition and the changes that directly manifest (or don't manifest) themselves in it and thus one may find one's own greatest enemy in these; especially the greatest enemy of one's own nature of realization.

Man is unable to realize himself and to lead himself back to himself due mostly to his own psychic and mental conditions. It's about a true internal battle and not about a simple attack (or counter-attack, or defense); it's about a full series of complex, sophisticated, internal operations that must be applied against the dark, inferior powers that manifest themselves in the soul. In the type of death that leads to the end of consciousness, the inferior powers are victorious; in death these are unleashed and they extinguish consciousness.

Consciousness that's left without support can't subsist in death – not only because loosing its support (that carried it) but but also because of the assault of powers that turn against consciousness.

Man who represents Auton must conquer the heteron he carries in himself which is essentially also Auton, but unrecognized Auton. The path toward this end is partially of Gnostic nature (based on knowledge, recognition and knowing) and is partially realizable by destroying heteron and heteron qualities and nature. The two are not in contradiction, since the recognition of heteron, just like the recognition of Auton, doesn't contradict the elimination or even the destruction of heteron. Man must find strength and a proper vantage point from the existence of death, from its innate nature, from the tension between survival and non-survival and from the considerations related to this, specifically for the sake of realization. This is the essential function and task of spiritual man in general, but especially in our age.

The Evolutionary Self-Understanding of Man

Both tradition and science consider man the fruit of evolution. Their views often correspond even concerning the relation between "proofs", as well as regarding other partial issues and mechanisms. But regarding man's origin, source and purpose their views are in polar opposition to each other and their conception about the hidden path of man do not overlap in any way.

It's well known that each epoch expresses itself through its arts. Art is a mirror through which – through the image of its projected self – a given epoch may view, recognize, even wonder about itself. Arts provides a good opportunity for collective self-knowledge; its almost limitless subjectivity is in fact in service of this objectivity. This applies to all branches of art, but especially for its most communal one: to architecture. It's enough to picture a typical Japanese, Chinese, Arabic or a Christian building from the Middle Ages, perhaps a modern Western one; even if we can't articulate the differences easily, we can perceive them quite intensively. The cultural distance between two monumental buildings of the Middle Ages and modern times, the Cologne Cathedral and the already non-existent World Trade Center, respectively, is quite remarkable. Both are the expressions of something that is inside, in the minds and hearts of people of the given eras. Right now we don't intend to examine what this difference is, because with this work we want to approach the same thing not from the point of view of art history, but from the point of view of the history of science. The same thing, because art is only one of the tools of self-expression of a particular era and culture. Just like it's not only his physiognomic features that reveal the particularities of an individual, but everything he thinks, says and does, everything that he shows interest towards, all the expressions of an era and culture is characteristic of that particular era and culture; and what could possibly be more typical of the modern West than science and its most characteristic product, evolutionism?

Evolution as man's evolution

Evolutionism is without precedence; so much so, in fact, that there is no appropriate word for it. The Latin term *evolutio* doesn't mean what is meant by it today but it refers to the unfolding of potentiality from a seed-like, germinal state. Thus, in the original sense of the word, evolution means ontogenesis, the evolution of the individual being. Phylogenesis, on the other hand, which is behind the modern conception of evolution, doesn't mean the unfolding of a potentiality from a seed-like state, since the original cell, from which –according to the general assumption– all beings developed, including humans, did not contain the potent potentiality of all these beings.

When from an evolutionist point of view, quite recklessly, a parallel is drawn between ontogenesis and phylogenesis and it is pointed out that during the stage of ontogenesis that takes place in the womb the human embryo goes through animal phases, similar to those man went through during his phylogenesis, it is forgotten that during all this it has always been human and the initial form is only different from the final one in as much as the former is potentially, while the latter is actually human. So the parallels between ontogenesis and phylogenesis only point out that the human being during his phylogenesis is not an animal, but only appears so and in actuality he goes through ever higher stages of his human actualization until becoming an actual human being. For such a process we may rightfully apply the term "evolution" or "unfolding" – but for a process described by evolutionist theory, referring to some kind of gradual quantitative development (like how a small snowball may become, through rolling, a large one) and not to the unfolding of an innate potential, well, such a process may only be described as "additive". This way it would be more appropriate to call evolutionism addition-theory.

The reason why no appropriate word has been found for the phenomenon called evolution is quite simple: man has never witnessed the evolutionary process in the modern sense; never in the past, not today. It concerns a misinterpreted expression that lacks empirical reality and this can't be helped by modern scientific efforts since true evolutionary change has never been observed or triggered by them and thus evolution, up until today, hasn't managed to transcend the realm of pure theory. Gilbert K. Chesterton was right when he quipped: a miracle –i.e. that a primitive animal form becomes human- is not any less likely just because it happens slowly.

I have already addressed the internal inconsistencies of the doctrine of evolution in another work(1) supporting an alternative explanation of scientific evidences from several angles. Such explanations may be called e-volution, i.e. gradual unfolding of man through fragmentary but more and more complete levels. The essence of this process is that evolution – the only evolution – is the evolution and unfolding of man from a seed-like potentiality precisely according to the pattern of ontogenesis. The still unspecialized original forms of animal species broke off of this evolving stem in a given point of vertical human evolution and, remaining on roughly the same evolutionary level, they spread horizontally, i.e. they produced various forms through non-evolutionary modifications.

Thus the animal species are the by-products of human evolution and in the same time each species depicts an evolutionary dead-end, in other words each is an evolutionary final product fully incapable to serve as the source for further evolutionary processes. Precisely as in the case of a pine tree: the tree doesn't grow through the branches but through the trunk. Once the branches branch out from the trunk they loose their vertical "momentum". Only the trunk grows vertically – but the trunk needs the branches because they provide the conditions for growth.

Modern evolutionist scientists believe that evolution (the vertical growth of the tree) is the characteristic of the whole biosphere, but it is only characteristic of the human evolutionary trunk (the trunk of the tree) and the entirety of the biosphere comes into being through the branching out from this evolutionary trunk, i.e. precisely by "losing" the evolutionary momentum. This also shows that the various evolutionary levels are not connected to each other directly: what connects them is the trunk of the tree: the unfolding of man.

Let's notice that the higher evolutionary level we look at, the less abundant the animal species are. On the level of anthropoid apes, the highest animal level directly preceding humans, we find only three species (orangutan, gorilla, chimpanzee), while on the level of one cell organisms there are approximately forty thousand species (1); this shows that variability -quite "unnaturally"- is reversely proportional with simplicity. This, however, precisely corresponds with the pine tree analogy since the lower branches of the pine tree are much more numerous and longer than the upper ones. We should also not forget that the hiatus between humans and anthropoid apes has been filled by at least a hundred species; with some exaggeration we may say that each fossil found means a new species. This means that the evolutionary section between the last animal branch from the human evolutionary tree and homo sapiens again exhibits an increased richness of species. At this point we find an interesting phenomenon that may not be explained by natural causes: each of the species that had already transcended the animal level but didn't reach the actual human level yet, all died out - more precisely, as reject humans they had to go extinct. When it comes to animals, their existence had an independent foundation: they were perfect in their closed specialization as evolutionary side-products, since on their own level the individuals of each species are complete and perfect; however, in regards to humanoids, i.e. the species whose fossilized remains are researched by human paleontology, these are actually the unsuccessful experimental products of human evolution - imperfect human products that are neither animals nor humans. This is why each and every one of these species had to go extinct; not because they were not fit for survival but because they lost their foundation of existence as soon as humans came to the scene and realized what these species represented in an imperfect form(2).

In fact the extraordinary abundance of fauna and flora could only develop because the species don't develop further, since, if evolution was universal, no inferior species would have remained and with a slight exaggeration we could say that in that case only humans would populate Earth. This characteristic evolution-resistance of nearly the whole biosphere is well observable on the American and Australian continents that had split from the main Eurasian continent where evolution got stuck on the same level where it was at the time of the separation. (So "marsupial man" in Australia is not the product of autochthon evolution but the result of a more recent migration). But jokes aside, we can only talk about evolution where the only evolving human trunk-line is present, since evolution may only happen through this.

This way it's not man that originates from animals, but the opposite: animal species originate from man. The last and highest level of branch from the vertical human evolutionary trunk is represented precisely by anthropoid apes. Indirectly, this is also confirmed by the most recent scientific concepts, as well: "It is likely that bipedal walking...developed in the common ancestors of early humanoids and the current anthropoid apes" (Hungarian Lexicon – "bipedal"). What this means is nothing less than that the ancestors of current anthropoid apes were bipedal and only later did they switch to a hanging mode of life required for trees; in other words: it was not the monkey that came down from the trees in order to become human, but the human – a not yet perfect, but already bipedal human- went up to the trees in order to become monkey(3). This way the whole biosphere serves as the environment of human evolution and this biosphere was created by man for himself – from himself.

People of previous eras were of course not interested in the origin of man along these lines although, through the book of Genesis, both the Jewish, the Christian and the Muslim traditions were aware that first the water animals, then the animals of the sky, then the animals of land, and only last did man appear on earth. According to traditional views man was first of all a spiritual being (since his being human is determined by his spirit and not by his body) and as such he had a divine origin reaching his current state only through a gradual descent. This descent is the gradual increase of distance from God, in other words, from his Source. What's important here is, of course, not the temporal distance, but the ontological one.

According to sacred traditions this gradual sinking was occasionally accelerated by immense falls. The last such fall, according to Judeo-Christian tradition, -not counting certain pre-historical and historical lapses that occurred later- was the original sin and being cast out of paradise. We can speak about two processes that are in a certain sense in opposition to each other: on the one hand, there is an evolutionary process, the phylogenetical unfolding of man which may be viewed as a process of ascent; on the other hand there is a process of descent, the gradual sinking of the man of heaven, of man near God as non-physical being which may be viewed as the de-actualization or potentialization of the man of heaven, something that may be described as a process opposite to that of unfolding in an evolutionary sense. These two lines meet in a certain point and this point is the appearance of the actualized man of earth, i.e. the appearance of homo sapiens. This is the point where the unfolding of man as an earthly being reached a stage where he was capable of accepting the man of heaven who spiritually "engendered" him. This is the point where the heavenly being reached the stage where he had to immerse himself into the dense material world, i.e. when – to use orphic-neoplatonic terminology- he lost his wings and fell into the material world, or when – to use biblical terminology- he received a garment of skin.

Thus man is an angel that fell on earth and is enclosed into a body, standing at the intersection of two worlds: matter and spirit, body and soul. And as the ontogenesis of earthly man is in analogy with his phylogenesis, the "ontogenesis" of the man of heaven is also in analogy with his "phylogenesis", since according to various sacred traditions, the individual human being goes through roughly the same pre-existential and pre-natal levels during his descent into his bodily form as the stages through which the descent of man as a non-physical celestial being took place.(4)

It would lead too far to show the traditional illustration of these processes, nevertheless it is worthwhile to draw attention to two texts of fundamentally different nature: to the Mayan creation myth and to Poimandres, a hermetic text from the Hellenistic period. Regarding the former, when two proto-parents, Tepeu (the Creator) and Kukumac (the Shaper) created the various animals (with the exception of the monkey) they saw that even though the animals can emit sounds, they can't remember and pray to the creators. This is why they created man, first from mud, but when they saw that he's no good ("because he dissolves"), they destroyed him. Then the second time they created man from wood. These were "similar to man, they spoke like man and populated Earth...but they had neither soul nor sense. They didn't remember their Creator [didn't know religion]. They populated Earth in large numbers but [then] they were destroyed...their fate has become death". On the one hand, they were destroyed by the flood, on the other hand the elements of their natural environment revolted against them and attacked them: the animals, the caves and their tools: their mill stones, their clay pots, their baking pens, their houses [these already possessed some material culture]. "This is how- continues the text – the created man with a bestowed form, destined for ruin and extinction, deteriorated. All of their mouths and faces got ruined (5). It is said that these became the monkeys of the forests. Monkeys are the remnants from those whom the Creator and Shaper made of wood. This is why monkeys are similar to people as the remnants of creatures who were only ... puppets made of wood" (6).

The creation of man as we know him today could take place only after this. While this creational myth illustrates that the path leading to homo sapiens leads through more and more perfect pre-human stages which, due to their fragmented nature, partially went extinct and partially, due to a dehumanization process (cf. ruining the mouth and the face) they became the sources for apes, the above mentioned hermetic dialogue talks about how celestial man descended to the point when, immersing himself into material nature, he became earthly man. The essence of the dialogue may best be summed up with the words of Mircea Eliade: "The highest androgyn Intelligence, nus, first creates Demiurge who creates the world and then creates Anthropos, the celestial man. This one descends into the lower sphere where, seduced by the love of a t'a, he unites with Nature (Physis) and begets earthly man. From this point on Anthropos ceases to be an independent entity because he bestows a soul on man: his life becomes a human soul, his light becomes a nus.

This is the reason why among all earthly creatures only man is simultaneously mortal and immortal. Through knowing, however, man may become god" (7).

Modern man in the mirror of evolutionism

How a culture conceives the origin of man speaks about how it perceives its own ultimate essence: how it views itself, how it thinks about itself. Each and every genesis-conception -starting with the first chapters of the Book of Genesis to the theory of evolution of modern man- is the special expression of this; even more: through its genesis-interpretation of man each culture is seeking its own identity. Because the beginning, the origin, the source also depicts a norm and this is quite visible in the different origin – interpretations of tradition and modernity.

According to the former, man comes from above. This doesn't only mean that man has a divine origin (since ultimately everything has a divine origin (8)), but also that he is theomorph, his form is god-like. This becomes blatantly evident even in such a religion as the Jewish one that presumes an almost insurmountable distance between man and God since according to the Book of Genesis, God created man in his own image. According to the main religions of the Far East the ultimate essence, the true self of man is none other than the Absolute itself, and thus not only has man as a constrained creature cast into space and time his origin in the Absolute, but his ultimate goal is also in knowing and experiencing his absolute nature.

So being in "the image of God" is a special privilege within the category of being of divine origin: it shows that the entity doesn't only originate from above but also contains a certain imprint of the Above in himself. Also, the Above is not only a Source but also a Magnet. For what / who comes from above, his origin – knowingly or unknowingly – becomes his ultimate point of orientation: ultimately everything is striving towards this divine source; as Saint Augustine put it: "Our heart is disturbed, oh Lord, until it finds solace in you". Thus the ancients saw themselves as having a divine origin, because when they viewed themselves, what they saw was not their animal-like physical being, but that specific feature that only they possessed: their spiritual soul (9).

The soul is striving upward, it wants to unite with its source. The intention to align up, the will to correspond to the Above or the specific desire to reintegrate into the Source is quite evident in traditional civilizations. The former resulted in a social order and sacredness that determined all traditional cultures, including those that were more or less still alive in Europe quite recently: peasant culture; regarding the latter, it resulted in spiritual paths that lead man to experiencing his own divine being. Tamás Nyíri's words apply not only to Christian civilizations of the Middle Ages: "The whole essence and structure of the Middle Ages was rooted in religion and they unequivocally stood on the side of the spirit."

This applies to all traditional cultures, be it Indian Hindu, Tibetan Buddhist, Saracen Muslim, Inka, Maya, Khmer: they all stood on the side of the spirit, i.e. on the side of transcendence as a definite normative factor and ultimate point of orientation.

To paraphrase Tamás Nyíri we can also say that the whole essence and structure of the modern era is rooted in science and it unequivocally stands on the side of matter – namely on the side of economics, technology and consumption; in other words on the side of the body. When modern man views himself he doesn't recognize the image of God in himself, but – looking in the distorted mirror of the faces of anthropoids of our era – sees instead the image of his animal and ape-like ancestors. With his science he continues working towards minimizing the distance between man and anthropoid apes. They emphasize for example that there is merely 1% difference between the protein structures of man and chimpanzees, but they never mention that when it comes to social life, it is not the chimpanzees – who live in hordes – but singing birds, living in stable relationships that are closest to us (and that – horribile dictu! – are bipedal, similarly to man (10)). Yet, through targeted experiments they try everything to turn apes, especially chimpanzees, into humans. If what's human is not defined in terms of a transcendent reality, it is necessarily prone to be defined by sub-human influences. "Giving up a value opens up the gate to something inferior" – says Gábor Czakó. Denying the supra-human automatically gives way to affirming the sub-human since man can't be the starting position by himself – if his origin is not sought above, it may only be sought below. And whatever originates from below, will necessarily carry the mark of their origin. Man in an evolutionary sense is just an ape that rose up (by coming down from the tree) or if we follow man's origin even deeper, he is just a "pile of atoms". The superior is essentially humiliated when explained from the inferior; in the current case it is in fact lowered to dust. If somebody thinks of himself in an evolutionary sense, he may rightfully say to himself with the words of the Catholic liturgy: "...dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return" (11). Furthermore, the concept of evolutionism simply implies that the ultimate source of everything is dead matter: if we are seeking the ultimate conclusion of evolutionism then its starting position should not be matter, but nothing, since nothing is decidedly more primitive than matter. And truly, according to the most recent – and rather daring – cosmological concepts the proto-seed of the universe from which the whole world came into being quite simply emerged from nothing.

To consider the acceptance or rejection of evolutionism to be merely a question of world-views would be quite superficial: those with an atheist and materialist world view accept it while those with a theist and idealist world view reject it. No, the differences here are rooted much deeper since positions on world views often contain a certain theoretical contingency. With some exaggeration we may even say that world views often come down to education and family background. The ideology of evolution doesn't supplement or oppose the ideology of creation; this is supported by the cases of many scientists (the best example in this regard is perhaps Teilhard de Chardine).

What stands in opposition to evolution may probably be only what the Judeo-Christian holy scripture calls falling into sin which is essentially a gradual drifting away from the divine Principle and principles. Modern man doesn't want to see himself fallen into sin, as turned against the divine will, as a creature in the state of being cast away. The reason why modern man so desperately holds on to his own animal nature (12) is because this way he feels emancipated from everything that may offer him superior, normative values. Modern man wants to be his own master, he wants to set his own laws; he's not willing to recognize anything superior above himself. "There is no God and even if there was, he should be shot down" – declared one of the rather honest slogans of the Paris Commune. He should be shot down because he disturbs man through the moral order, even by his very existence. Explicit atheism is implicit anti-theism and materialist atheism, which is based almost exclusively on negation, managed to find in evolutionism something which is not merely an empty denial but the essential anti-image of the sacred world-view.

Just like the state form of modern man is democracy, in which power originates from below, i.e. the legitimate source of power are the people above which power is exercised, evolution may also be interpreted as a "popular initiative" of nature: nature "produces" the "power-elite", man, from itself. By siding with the Below, modern man sealed his fate. Those who are not willing to commit to serving things superior to themselves, are forced by inferior things to serve them instead. To originate the superior from the inferior is the same thing as considering the inferior superior. Modern society provides a million signs of this confused view, of the apotheosis of the inferior, of the overall materialization supported by a sophisticated, chiseled, high level technical apparatus: "How human can a society be where the value of man is determined by markets, like that of a sack of potatoes" – as Gábor Czakó summed it up. Similarly to how the Above hidden in the Below, the immanence of transcendence meant the possibility of ascent for the ancients, the Below hidden in the Above triggers the necessity of descend for all those who/that internalize the soil-smelling values of modernity.

So the fundamental question is: what is the Source since Source has the power of creation. The god of modernity is Matter. Nietzsche said it using the Platonic terminologies of "becoming" and "existence": "What we need to do is bestow becoming [the universe] with the characteristics of existence [God]". Becoming, i.e. Matter, this antigen of modernity is what keeps the "theo"-logie of the modern era mesmerized: natural sciences. Science, as it is practiced today, i.e. the obsessed and minuscule research of immanence unequivocally results in turning away from transcendence. The man of past eras didn't feel the slightest inclination to research nature since he saw, besides the nature side of nature just as clearly if not more clearly the decay side of nature, as well. Nature and decay are the upward and downward paths of the same reality, more precisely – since the word "reality" was reserved for God- of the same process. So natural sciences may be rightfully called the science of decay since whatever is supernatural is also – and this is the important point – above decay.

It is quite natural that such a mega-context as modernity, in order to understand man and the whole biosphere reached to a theory that corresponds to its own preconditions. All fundamental parts and elements of modernity is conditioned by modernity itself and it's prepared to accept only whatever corresponds with its world-view (13).

The facts – especially the fossil remains- could be interpreted differently, even in the opposite way; in fact, they could be more seamlessly interpreted as the evolution of man – but for this, modernity would have to give up on itself. Instead of reaching for a radically different theory that is more in line with the facts than evolutionism, they keep on patching this one up; only a large scale project in scientific history could gauge, for example, how many times they had to re-write the evolution of man in light of new facts, not only always re-classifying the fossilized remains of various types of anthropoids, but adjusting even their age to the theories popular at the time. While all new scientific theories imply – sometimes openly declare- that the previous ones are false, and while among all the theories about the same thing maybe one is correct and the rest are false in the best case scenario, science has managed to create the illusion of being infallible and possessing the truth. Nowadays everybody is convinced that if something is stamped with "Science" there is no more room there for doubts and hardly no intellectual label imaginable is more serious than declaring something to be unscientific – so much so that modern man is much more forgiving about scientific mistakes than about truths that are unscientific.

The supposed preciseness and exactness of natural sciences reflect a similarly false suggestion. Natural sciences may only be exact as long as they don't deal with nature itself, but with its mathematical or geometrical – in other words with a quantified and abstract – segment. To measure: this is the ideal of man with a good rational but with a medium or rather weak intellectual disposition. Since man takes possession of the world through measuring, this is what he developed to perfection. Nature however is full of qualities that not only don't lend themselves to exact examination, but they are not even observable by the modern, reductionist natural sciences; and this is precisely what makes nature what it is. The way natural science describes "nature", the way it tries to squeeze it into the straight jacket of its mechanistic and quantitative categories is that if we translated the scientific description back to the language of reality – i.e. if we tried to reconstruct nature from its scientific description – we would get a world that -as a sort of phalanstery- would not only be intolerable for man, but it would be decidedly virtual. The world of man and the world of science are not even similar to each other. The scientist, as natural scientist, doesn't know anything about what the natural scientist knows a lot about as man. For example, mechanics constitute only a small part of nature. Nature doesn't work like a mechanical machine, it doesn't contain geometrically perfect "ideal bodies". The laws of mechanics work only on paper, in theory, but in reality they may only be applied approximately.

It is not mechanics that's truly a natural science, i.e. that par excellence deals with nature but, for example, meteorology - and as far as the exactness of meteorology is concerned everybody has their own experiences.

But if we stay in the domain of pure observation, here's another classical natural science, the other pride of modern man, astronomy which – when it comes to areas outside our solar system –, due to huge distances in space and time, doesn't examine the current state of the universe, but the projected image of the past that remained visible only due to its own inertia, a sort of mirage-image that is "shifted" if not in space then certainly in time. Because where it thinks it is witnessing the birth of a star, that star may be dying right now, if it is still there in the first place. Astronomy is in a constant and necessary phase-delay; a phase – delay that's often several millions of years big.

So what comes from below essentially always stays below: it conserves this baseness. Man creates big works, or a new world in vain: ultimately he'll remain dust. If the starting point is below, the destination will also be below. Even if the Below may keep man on a long leash, with this leash eventually it will pull him back. If the origin is below, so is the final resting place. If, however, somebody or something originates from above, he will essentially always stay above: he'll indelibly conserves the sign of his superior origin. But, since when it comes to man we are always in the domain of awareness and freedom, no such automatisms may emerge here, as in the case of materialistic immanentism. But while man conserves in himself (in his existence) – to use the terminology of Judeo-Christian tradition – the sign of the image of God, he'll only become such in his consciousness too, if he makes himself such. But he can only make himself such in his consciousness because he is already such in his existence. If he doesn't achieve this, then although in his existence he returns to his divine origin, in his consciousness – in his knowledge, in his self-reflection, in his awareness – he may drift the farthest away from it.

According to the Hindu conception, divine reality has three aspects: existence (sat) – consciousness (cit) – bliss or salvation (ananda). One of the saints of India of the 20ths century, Nisargadatta Maharaj says the following about the relationship of these three elements: "The awareness of existence is salvation"; and precisely this is the solution that the spiritual traditions of the ancients represented: to lead man back to the blissful experience of completeness by making him conscious – through its de-potentialization and re-actualization – of original existence, that he lost during his descend. Because just as only the one may become man who is – even if only potentially – essentially already man, so may man only become once again a divine being, because he once used to be.

The question of the origin of man is of fundamental importance but not for learning where man originates from but for learning what is in fact man: a fallen angel or a risen ape – a sleeping God or a pile of atoms; and there is no doubt that a man who considers himself of animal origin builds for himself a fundamentally different world than somebody who is aware of his divine origin.

Notes:

1. Az emberré vált ember. Budapest, 1999, IGEN Katolikus Kulturális Egyesület, pages 7–75.
2. If we assumed that they went extinct for lack of fitness we'd encounter another mystery that could not be solved through natural means: why did all of the several dozens of species between humans and animals go extinct after being fit for several hundreds of thousands, or millions of years? We have already answered this: because they were neither animals, nor people: they were reject humans. According to the accepted scientific position neither of the animal species living today is identical with any species that would belong to the line of human phylogenesis – in other words, all the direct and indirect progenitors of humans died out.
3. We must mention here that the known scientific notion whereby the transition from the arborealis (hanging) mode of life to the bipedal one played a significant role in the evolution of man is a typical evolutionary myth. It is obvious that on a flat savanna, a monkey that comes from an arborealis mode of existence is sentenced to death in two ways. First, because it lacks its normal food (fruits) and it's not suitable to eat any of the two main food sources offered by the savanna: it's not suitable for grazing because of its internal digestion system and it's also not suitable for hunting because it lacks speed and appropriate weapons. Second, because of its way of moving on the terrain, the monkey would immediately become prey for predators, considering it can't move as fast as the other plant eating prey. Being bipedal means a specific disadvantage from the speed point of view (if they need to escape, the apes today also always run on all four). If, for example, – ad absurdum – birds could not fly, thereby taking advantage of this path of escape, they would immediately go extinct. From this point of the view the tree for a monkey means the same thing as flying for a bird, thus a monkey transitioning from the trees to the flat terrain would have immediately gone extinct.

It is, however, very likely that the progenitors of the higher apes of today that branched out from the human evolutionary trunk were gradually dehumanizing and, losing their skills necessary for the flat terrains, they were seeking refuge and food in the trees. Only the strong (predators), the fast (plant eaters) or the hiding (rodents) animals are capable of surviving on the savanna – and, of course, man, through his intelligence and auxiliary skills (like the use of weapons), can not only compensate for his physical disadvantages, but can even dominate the animals of the savanna.

4. Regarding the descend of the individual see: Buji Ferenc: *Genezis. Egy gyermekrajz metafizikai tanulságai*. Magasles. Ezzék és reflexiók a tradíció távlatából. Budapest, 2003, Kairosz Kiadó, pages 149–190.
5. The Maya – K'iche' language often uses the expressions mouth and face to depict the I, the subject. *Popol Vuh. A maja-kicse indiánok szent könyve*. Budapest, 1984, Helikon Kiadó, 168. old. (notes from Lajos Boglár and Péter Kuczka)
6. A világ teremtése. Amerikai mondák és legendák. Budapest, 1990, Nótárius Könyvkiadó, pages 7–15. cf. *Popol Vuh. A maja-kicse indiánok szent könyve*, pages 7–17.
7. Mircea Eliade: *History of Religious Ideas, Volume 2: From Gautama Buddha to the Triumph of Christianity*.
8. As Andras Laszlo says: "Man's origin is essentially not natural, which can also be said about nature itself". Andras Laszlo: *Solum Ipsum – Metaphysical Aphorisms*, Aphorism 424.
9. Many of the pre-modern religious and spiritual texts call the physical aspect of man decidedly animalistic. Ancient man was fully aware that the physicality of man –even though it doesn't originate from them- is closely related with animals. It's enough to remember how Saint Francis of Assisi called his body –not without humor- "donkey brother". We should not forget also, that animals, in the eyes of the ancients, were not without soul (cf. Lat. anima ["soul"] and animal ["animal"]), although they considered the soul of animals to be of different nature than the soul of man.
10. Being bipedal, by the way, is quite an ancient feature of animal life: even the first generation of land animals, the dinosaurs were mostly bipedal.
11. The liturgy applies this of course only to the physical part of man
12. "Theories of descent not only declare that man originates from the animals, but also that man is an animal." András László : *Solum Ipsum*, aphorism 598.
13. To what degree knowledge and science may be conditioned by the historical-societal context is clearly shown by the fact that in Central-Eastern Europe dialectic and historical materialism, political economics and scientific socialism was scientific truths with armies of scientists behind them, all the way until the 1990's. And all this, with the collapse of Soviet Bolshevism almost immediately became history: what was previously unquestionable, from one day to the other became ridiculous. What would have happened if the Soviet Union had not collapsed but had managed instead to "socialize" the whole world? ... democratico-liberal modernity is also a megacontext like the Bolshevik variation; the difference is that due to its global presence no political alternative opposes it anymore (its only alternative is Islam) although its basic ideology contains not any less absurdity than socialism.

The Path of the Knights

(presented by the Andras Laszlo as a lecture on August 1st, 1998, in the Saint Mary Monastery in Szabolcs, Hungary)

The essence of all spiritual paths is to find the Center of Existence, the Center of Consciousness, the Center of Myself; to return to where I started from and to return there through Myself. The most diverse paths of realization are known in this sense: some attempt to walk and complete this path through the pure forms of solitude, silence and contemplation – walking is obviously meant symbolically here since essentially there are no movements in such process of realization. There are also various active paths related to the highest form of activity, above activities: the act, where the role of active knowing weighs as much as the role of the activity itself – quite similarly to all other autonomous paths of realization. Spiritual paths could be incredibly diverse, including those that are fundamentally different from conventional ideas, which conceive the methods of self-realization and self-transcendence of man in terms of tranquility, turning inwards, contemplation. There are, however, other possibilities that on the level of actionality take on extreme forms, going to the most extreme situations that present the very limits – both in the internal and external sense: fighting in battles and wars; in the sphere of such paths, the chivalric paths enjoy an eminent role.

The chivalric path is a spiritual path, a path of realization, a path of self-actualization. It may be conceived as a path that transforms the basic combative nature of humans into heroism; in the symbolic language of alchemy: it transforms the bellicose as *materia prima secundum quid* into *materia ultima secundum quid*. This is how we may sum up the essence of the warrior path, but we haven't exhausted its inner nature yet; it stands in the sign of fight.

Fight in the conventional sense may not be considered a spiritual path; in its common, vulgar form it is not a path of self-realization, but simply another way of stirring up the murky waters of existence gushing out from the vortex of becoming. What is it that turns fight into a possibility for the self-transcendence of man as the carrier of Subject? Let's have a look at what kind of basic natures, basic forms fight as such exhibits. The outcome of the fight is always decided between "darkness" and "light". When the ruling presence of spiritual light manifests itself in the enemy, he is a noble opponent; when the enemy is dominated by the powers of darkness, he is an ignoble enemy. The fight may only be fought against darkness from the position of light; this means that I am not attacking the powers of light in the enemy, only the powers of darkness present in him; the powers of light always mean allegiance for those who can actually follow the light. So the knight may face a noble enemy, but he'll be looking for the darkness in him, and he expects the noble enemy to do the same.

It is known that the Order of the Knights Templar regularly met with knights from Muslim Ismailite-Sufi orders and maintained intimate friendships with them knowing that the next day they'd meet in battle and the possibilities of death will open up and both sides will fight mercilessly; but they also knew what was the fight against; friendship means light meeting light, battle means to seek out the darkness behind the dominant light and fight against that. This is the meaning of the fight, connected closely to the essence of peace. There are two types of peace: 'peace after the victory of light' (pax post victoriam lucis) and 'peace after the victory of darkness' (pax post victoriam tenebrarum) the latter of which may never be accepted from a spiritual point of view. This is why all kinds of pacifism are fundamentally flawed, sinful, deviant and regretful and works toward the corruption of the world. Only the victory of the powers of the light means peace and nothing else is acceptable. Thoughts like "peace, no matter what", "no more war", "no more bloodshed" in such sentimental forms inevitably express the deification of the vortex of existence, the state of becoming; these are merely samsaric view points. The aspect of heaven, of the divine, of Nirvana are completely different: the single, fundamental aspect here is to reinstate the superior, the even more superior and not those that are related to circumstances and consequences that stem from changes in the various states of existence and becoming; in comparison to the former ones, the latter factors are insignificant. When we determine that the warrior path is a method of transforming the bellicose nature of man into heroism and we identify the types of possible fights including our attitude toward them, we must repeatedly draw into consideration that even if the enemy is ignoble (i.e. he represents darkness, he is the representative of the dominance of darkness) I am launching my attack only against the darkness and not against the light, however minimally it may be present in him. I only attack that which represents a downward orientation, a tendency of leveling, the corruption of states of existence – these are the factors that stand in the sign of darkness and with which no solidarity whatsoever may be taken. The paths of the knights have always most thoroughly considered this and brought it to the forefront at each and every occasion.

Volumes may be written on the history of knighthood. Here we must mention that knighthood has always existed since pre-historic times or since times within pre-historical states. "Horse" in such cases doesn't simply mean the animal which we call a "horse"; it means carrier, the ruled, dominated carrier and this is the meaning that was later related to the animal that most often played the role of the carrier. But in the Sanskrit language, in the Hindu tradition, for example, the carrier of the 'knight' – asvin – is the hamsa 'swan' – let's remember the Lohengrin saga in this respect. The "carrier": this is what horse itself used to mean and I refer mostly to the Indo-German languages, although this was in a sense valid everywhere. For example we could find a knights' order also in the Aztec culture: the Knights Order of the Jaguar; no matter how far we go back, with appropriate research and information we should be able to find this everywhere – at least in places with the kind of ethnic groups that were capable of representing the spiritual-metaphysical tradition.

We find this in Chinese tradition just as much as in the Japanese one, where in certain sense it is still alive, where the 'path of war', budo, or the path of the 'warrior knight', busi-do originally represented a high spiritual rank and it was as one of the paths of spiritual realization. By going through the fight and facing death, the warrior-knight path opens up possibilities for contact with states that are superior to death both ontologically and by orders of magnitude. The Japanese always knew this and this was also known in Europe when the idealism of knighthood was still alive, functioning and powerful, and it still played a significant role in life. We may go as far as saying that spiritual paths of the highest level were always related somehow to various warrior paths even if this relation was not that pronounced. A relatively recent example is the Cistercian Order within the monastic orders of the Catholic Church, which was the contemplative equivalent of the Order of the Knights Templar. Contemplative orders often appeared in parallel with chivalric paths; there was a bridge between these both in terms of practice and cooperation. Not directly, but based on some parallelism there has always been a fundamental and deeply organic relationship between inner paths of contemplation and other forms.

It is customary to separate knowledge and action and this separation is, to some degree, justified. René Guénon, one of the most significant figures of metaphysical tradition, said that action means modifications on a horizontal level, meaning it always remains on the same ontological level, while knowledge may be conceived along a symbolical vertical axis and as something that entails changes of corresponding magnitude. This is indeed so from many aspects, but what this personality – whom we hold in the highest regard – leaves out of consideration is the act. We must differentiate between the act and mere activities; in the act, deep and strong – gnostic – powers of knowledge are at work exerting their influence from the heights to the depths; when the activity is gnostically empowered, it is an act. The knowledge element is unconditionally present in the act, similarly to how in true knowledge and knowing there is a strong element of actionality. It is absolutely possible that a connection is formed between these, which means that not all forms of action are tied to horizontality and that there exist also vertical forms of action in which gnostical powers manifest themselves – and these in turn are manifestations related to actual acts.

To act is a spiritual path. The sequence of acts correspond to the gradual unfolding of spiritual paths. Not only are the spiritual path and the path of acts not in opposition to each other, they are tightly connected. We know that the interest of chivalric orders, besides fighting and transforming bellicosity into heroism, had a very strong gnostic orientation. In regards gnostic principles, the orders always exhibited the most intense interest and attention and made it a point to connect with these on an operative level, in fact these belonged to their very goals. The knights of the antiquity in the Western world had also reached such high levels since among the Romans, they stood on the second level of the patrician rank: starting from the top, the rank of the senator was followed directly by the eques, the 'knight'.

The senator was part of the ruling class, while the eques represented the class that was capable of actively maintaining, conserving, defending, extending and completing the empire. Even in later Centuries we find deeply spiritual orders: it's enough to think of the Order of the Knights of the Holy Grail; the Order of the Grail was a fully spiritual order that drew on and sustained a pre-Christian spirituality and which was led by the King of the Grail who was in the same time the top ruler of the country ruled by this order. While he sustained a worldly dominance, by his essence he represented a spirituality in his domain that drew on innate metaphysical powers and also served as a path of realization, religion and culture, permeating the world.

There always were so called secret orders. "Secret" means that the only thing known about them was that they existed and almost nothing more. A later version of the Grail was Rosicrucianism which strongly carried Hermetism, a tradition of Egyptian origin synthesizing Greek, Arab, Germanic, Celtic, Cabalistic and other forms. Hermetism later reemerged as so called later stage Hermetism or alchemical Hermetism; it was represented, sustained and carried by true Rosicrucianism. (Even today there are "rosicrucian" formations but these are all imitations that just usurp the name). Rosicrucianism was a knights' path, a gnostic path and a magical path simultaneously, bringing heroic knighthood, Gnosis and magic into perfect unity.

The heyday of chivalric orders in the strict sense was the XI-XII-XIII-XIV. Centuries. These were connected to the Crusades, the objective of which was for Christianity to reconquer the Holy Land, Jerusalem and the surrounding land, most of all the Holy Sepulchre. The purpose of the Crusades was mainly to reconquer the Holy Sepulchre, but these were accompanied by pilgrimages and the crusades themselves did not always reflect a knightly character.

The Order of the Knights Templar was brutally destroyed by Philip the Fair in 1314. (There were many attempts to revive Order of the Knights Templar, but none of these have been serious. Let's note here, that – however sympathetic their ideology would be – the revived Order of Saint George is also not serious; in the times of King Sigismund, during and after his reign, there were two chivalric orders in close relationship with each other: one of them was the Order of Saint George, the other was the Order of the Dragon, both representing a very similar orientation.)

A few words on the destruction of the Order of the Knights Templar. It is generally believed that Philip (the Fair) IV., the pope and chancellor Nogaret were after the treasures of the Templars; this is true, but this was absolutely not the main objective. There was a spiritual power present in the Order of the Knights Templar that transcended the general currents of power within Christianity. They were aiming for something more, something that had an initiatory character; in this context they focused on a gigantic spiritual figure called Baphometous which was probably the name of a divinity of initiation: I am saying this based on the "bap" root (baptismos, baptismia and baphometous); this figure was center-stage.

The Order also had a strongly gnostic and magical orientation and it is likely that their objective was the unification of the pope, the emperor and the grand master of the order (or a main leader above the grand master) in one single person: the emperor should have also been the pope and the head of the order, as well and he should have come from the Ghibelline-dynasty. This dynasty was actually the Hohenstaufen-dynasty which, after the name of their central castle, Waiblingen, was called, with bad Arabic, Ghibelline. In opposition to them stood the Welf dynasty, which was also called Guelf. The Guelfs recognized the unconditional superiority of the pope above the emperor; according to their views, the pope could also be emperor, but even if he's not, he stands above the emperor and they acknowledged the pope as emperor. The Ghibellines' view was that the emperor's rank was superior to that of the pope and thus he could take over the papal function and even if he doesn't do so, he stands higher than the pope. This was absolutely not impossible since the emperor carried the title *Vicarius Christi* while the pope only carried the title *Vicarius Petri*; this situation later changed. Chivalric tendencies, but especially the Order of the Templars were tightly connected to the aims of the Hohenstaufen-Ghibellines to the extent that the imperial nature of the chivalric Middle Ages was decidedly determined by the Ghibelline ideology in close relations with the Teuton Order, but even more so with the Order of the Templars as long as the latter one was extant, after which the whole Ghibelline world collapsed with the last Ghibelline that claimed the throne beheaded; this was especially painful since the Hohenstaufen-dynasty was Europe's most superior dynasty.

When looking at the inner nature of the warrior path we must mention the most crucial factor that captures the very essence of the issue: the relationship between the fight and heroicity with death. In battle, the knight was always striving toward victory while constantly facing death, constantly accepting the challenge of death in a way that he aimed at defeating not only the enemy, the opponent, but to also triumph over death itself. When the knight fell in battle and his fall was truly worthy of a knight because in his death he managed to transform himself into a heros, this death was called *mors triumphalis* ('triumphant death'); this meant that he experienced death as a transcendental act; the highest possibility was to experience resurrection, even metaphysical Awakening, Nirvana, to reach the ultimate goal, but at the very minimum the goal was to die in a way that transcends the very summits of the general states of existence, to ensure that in death there wouldn't be a decline towards a mere extinguishing of life but, again, toward transcendence, possibly resurrection, ascension to heaven for which the basis was provided by the very experience of death, a highly conscious experience with unrestrained intensity. The knight was seeking death so he could, in the high intensity tension this created, overcome the very forces aimed at extinguishing his consciousness and thereby to reach a state much superior to those he could have otherwise experienced.

The significance of the relation to death is fundamental. The North American Indians for example, among which the warrior spirit enjoyed central significance, generally would go to battle knowing that there was a chance of dying, but there were always volunteers who, after experiencing special inspiration of an initiatory nature, went to battle specifically in order to die: these wore different feathers and signs and they were called "those who never return". For them, dying no matter what, was a spiritual act of initiation. In fact, it was an act superior to the general levels of initiation: it was an act, and in the same time knowledge (gnosis), as well as magic that aimed at their Auton-being. The objective was to provoke death with such intensity that while death prevailed on the surface, internally, in the sense of a transcendent internality and in the sense of an inner existence that transcends man and his personality, they should eventually achieve victory (*mors triumphalis*). This was always eminently important for all warrior paths.

As a matter of curiosity, I'd like to mention that in the Second World War, there were high ranking Tibetan monks in Germany, some of which returned to Tibet, but others stayed until the last hour; they created a special force called Volunteers of Death who fought in SS officers' uniforms without rank and died when defending Berlin; all of them died and this was their objective.

We can always find "Volunteers of death" on the warrior paths; an adequate research would probably reveal much more about the rites and the selection which were normally kept secret, so such research would be rather difficult. According to traditional views, the quality of the post-mortem state depends to a significant degree on the entirety of life, on its terminal period and on the moments right near death (*circummortalis*) in context of consciousness and its intensity. The quality of spiritual-conscious powers that prevail throughout life are absolutely not irrelevant since these determine the terminal stage, the terminal stage determines the moments around death and the quality of the moments around death determines what kind of possibilities present themselves after death. So post-existence, the possibilities after death in terms of keeping up the powers of awareness depend to a large degree on the forces that determine the whole life or, even more so, the final period of life and the quality of the moments near death. Everybody who's open spiritually at least to some degree gives attention to this, especially if somebody specifically turns their attention to this. Anybody who followed the warrior path was highly aware of these facts, of these circumstances. A knight wanted more than just life, more than a high intensity life: he wanted first and foremost the domain above life, to transcend life; he wanted life from the vantage point above life, from beyond life and death. Deterioration is not sacrifice. People say that somebody died for this or that, that somebody "sacrificed their life" for something – in actuality they didn't sacrifice anything. To sacrifice life means to sacrifice it in the sign of this supra-life principle, since sacrifice means to create the bridge of transcendence from the general states of existence of the world to transcendent states, i.e. to the states that are rooted in Myself and that are connected to the innermost Subject of

Myself. If sacrificing life is not taking place in this transcendent sense, it is not a sacrifice, it is simply the termination of life; only for something superior is it possible and desirable to sacrifice anything. Operations that point to a degradation are not sacrifices but belong to the grossest forms of denial of spirituality.

It could be and should be the goal of everybody to stand at the peak when one dies; if this happens when one is 30, one should be at the zenith at that time, if this happens when one is 120, one should be at the peak of his capabilities then. To achieve this with conventional means is extremely difficult, but it was not easy on the warrior path either. However, the focus of the warrior's life was to die in battle by all means, in the moment of victory, possibly in the moment of inner victory and to be right at the top when this happens. It is not possible to transcend life and death from the position of spiritual collapse; to transcend life and death in the moment of death, a spiritual zenith position is necessary. The goal, when it comes to transmuting fight and bellicosity into heroism through an adequate fight – which is a fight against "darkness" not only in the enemy, but much more so against darkness in myself, in first case singular, the projection of which I face as the darkness manifest in my opponent –, was identified by the warriors as the ultimate self-realization through the fight against their inner darkness. In Islam they differentiate between al-jihad al-asghar and al-jihad al-akbar. The former refers to the war in the outside world, the 'small holy war'. The Prophet Muhammad said that after the 'small holy war' comes al-jihad al-akbar, the 'great holy war', the war against the powers of darkness in the inner world. The war in the outside world that is taking place within large extensions of space is still 'small', since it happens in the world of phenomena in consciousness, while the 'great holy war' happens in the world of powers of consciousness that create the phenomena, as well as shape consciousness itself. The warrior fought on all levels: not only against noble and ignoble enemies in the outside world, not only against the darkness these represented against the powers of light, but on all occult levels, even on higher, supra-occult levels. He conducted war against powers that emanated from himself and got somewhat, but not fully separated from himself, then turned against him and ultimately aimed at preventing the realization of a re-integrative Unity. In the view I represent, the most fundamental tenet is that I, Myself am everything, everything is Auton. Even things that are not I, Myself, i.e. heteron (something else) are Auton: unrecognized Auton; the unrecognized Auton functions, among other things, in the form of dark-powers in conscious existence. In conscious existence there is no fundamental difference between the external and the internal world and I must perform operations with these; in terms of approaches, one of the categories these operations fall under is martial operations; the paths that aim at fight, knighthood and heroicity capture the relation with heteron-powers with this symbology. There are other ways to conceive this relationship, for example, as merely a way of knowledge, as the sum of processes, etc.: the dimension of fight or war is one of many. It's not about the superiority or inferiority of the method, because verification becomes evident only in the results.

There could be operations aimed at knowledge that produce the same results as the paths that may be grasped by the symbolism of fight; the end result decides. These, and their combinations are all legitimate.

The metaphysical path in an Auton-Heteron context is the warrior path: facing death, facing the other, the relationship of myself with Myself, the relation of Myself with the Absolutum – these are the starting positions and not only for knowledge but as something with which I need to establish a high tension relationship. Transcending these tension-hubs depicts the various stages of the warrior path which may appear in external fights, in external struggle in general, in the concrete acts of the external fight, since true fighting operations have always been of initiatory character; but these may also appear in the sphere of spiritual powers and anti-spiritual powers in the internal space of the soul, among many other, additional forms.

The warrior path is a spiritual path; a path of self-transcendence. If we don't think in terms of paths, we may also say act: an act of self-realization, spiritual act, metaphysical act. All approaches are similes so instead of saying "walking a path", we may say anything. The approaches that are stuck struggling with questions like whether or not this may be called a path are all rather ridiculous; we may conceive it as a "path", we may conceive it differently, using different terms: there are many approaches and they all may be valid in parallel to each other.

I emphasize that the warrior path is one of the highest ranking paths, an actual path and the validity of knighthood prevailed almost until today. This doesn't mean that knighthood today is absolutely insignificant. The current knights' orders, in many respects, in various forms and in many ways have declined, especially after 1945. The powers that represent the dominance of darkness triumphed in 1945 and these powers have spread across the whole Earth and have also corrupted the specific forms of realities that are connected to the ideology and spirituality of chivalry; thus we notice a general and pervasive decline and this we may observe at each order. Current orders restrict their activities mostly to charity work, which we may appreciate, but this is not the true domain of knighthood in a strict sense; anybody can hand out humanitarian aid packages if they can acquire these and can control the logistics to distribute them – this doesn't require a warrior predisposition or capabilities. In the same token today the warrior capabilities no longer mean to go to battle on horseback with full armor, but rather to seek out the "dragon" in a much more subtle form.

The "dragon", the "dragon of waters" plays a significant role in the ideology of knighthood (in Far-Eastern symbolism there was a "dragon of the sky" which had a positive meaning; the "dragon of waters" of the West represents darkness, thus it is negative); to seek out and face the "dragon of darkness", fight it and defeat it. This, in the current age means a fight against mostly internal but sometimes external powers and forces that are, if not abstract, rather subtle.

This is the equivalent of the fight against the dragon of past eras, but this latter also happened on a spiritual level, it didn't mean defeating a dragon-like animal and even more importantly, the possibilities of the fight weren't exhausted in such an act. The fight took place against the dragon-powers (powers of darkness) on various ontological levels; today this must happen in a different way.

The warrior mentality and attitude is still valid. The probability of its appearance, however, has become almost zero; almost. The currently functioning orders, even the residual ones, still represent and sustain something, although very little; to go to a meeting and then go home and continue a torpid life does not represent a spiritual rank, it is not a spiritual, warrior life. Nothing is more important than the spiritual order. Nobody may say that his life doesn't allow him to live accordingly; if that appears to be the case, one must change his life. One must subordinate everything to this (in a spiritual sense of course). It's unconceivable to say that "I'd do it but I won't because I don't have the opportunity"; again, one must change his life. If one lives with somebody who blocks his spirituality, one must turn away from such a person; if one's lifestyle, work, activity doesn't allow this, then one must change his field of activities. We can't subordinate the superior to life, to samsara, because the current corruption of the world originates precisely from this; the main reason for the corruption of the world is that the superior is subordinated to the inferior. The inferior must be subordinated to the superior in all areas of life, in any context. This is what used to define the warrior path, just like any other paths of realization; to subordinate the inferior to the superior and to avoid that the superior is subordinated to the inferior even for a minute, in any area of life; this must not be allowed even in the most extreme circumstances under the biggest pressure; and again: if somebody experiences life like this, one must urgently change things. We don't address people who can't recognize this; it's arguable if somebody like this may be called human at all - I don't mean that such a person may not qualify as a superior man, but that he may not even qualify to be human. Nobody may think it seriously that he's not interested in what happens to him after his death; if somebody still says that he's absolutely not interested, all he did was that he proved that he doesn't understand anything of any of this. Such a thing can't be stated with seriousness; these things are not indifferent and if they are not indifferent, they require that one internally faces them.

Similarly to other true paths of realization, the warrior path never make concessions in this respect; and this was not even the prerequisite for an advanced stage, this was condicio sine qua non right at the very beginning. A life that defines itself as having higher goals and religious orientation, as seeking life above life is unconceivable if the lifestyle contradicts all this both in an internal and external sense. The circumstances are unfavorable? They must be changed.

The warrior path as a path of transcendence never allowed concessions. True paths or realizations, like true Yoga, true Zen in a Japanese context, true Taoism in China and the others never allowed compromises. There are people who run the course of decline in their life and end up labeling their youthful orientation for something higher as childish, because according to them a "serious thing" is founding a company, for example; attempting to rise above the vortex of becoming is "not serious" – these are the attitudes that develop during a life of decline, reaching a subhuman level. A subhuman being may have certain human qualifications (speech, conceptual thinking, bipedal, upright walking, etc.), but leads a subhuman form of existence.

A true path of realization, including the warrior path, dynamically and radically positions itself against all mediocre conditioning in life. These mediocre conditions are more dangerous than even the darkest conditions, because when facing those, some kind of resistance may be triggered, but when facing mediocre conditions and conditioning this typically doesn't happen; thus these depict the most basic opposition on all paths of realization.

If we think about the warrior path – what it used to mean – based on what I've covered today about fight, the types of fights, about seeking out situations at extreme limits, about facing the death forces of darkness, about conquering death, and awaken in ourselves at least a certain chivalric sentiment, then in this context we may count on the possibility of a certain advancement.

Tradition and the Current Age

The terms Tradition and Traditionality convey an ancient, primordial spiritual knowledge about the Origin, the Beginning and the Non-beginning since the very beginning of the manifest existence of the world; Tradition sustains this timeless knowledge in time as a permanent, incorruptible spirituality. When we use the terms Tradition and Traditionality, this is what we mean and not what is typically meant by them in a conventional sense.

The other term we need to address is the present age in a broader sense and its relation to traditionality; here I need to refer to certain doctrines that deal with cycles and cyclicity. As we know, Hesiod speaks about Golden Age, Silver Age, a third one that's called Bronze Age or sometimes Ore or Copper age and finally about Iron age that some authors, like Scaligero, call Lead Age.

This corresponds with a process of involution. When we treat certain doctrines, we often emphasize that in the manifest world we mostly don't encounter evolution but, in many respects, a process of decline; actual superiority doesn't correspond with a world defined by technocratism.

Superiority means that we are, or rather that I am closer to my Origin, to my Beginning, to my Non-beginning, to the Spirit and to God and ultimately to Myself. In this sense we're dealing with primordial factors (to use this word again) and these refer to essentially more superior levels of existence which, in terms of epochs, often point to antiquity, even to archaic times.

In order to truly grasp this, we must posit the possibility of involution and regression – an admittedly unconventional position today; in other words, we must allow the possibility that, in the process of its unfolding, the world in many respects severs its ties with its divine and spiritual origin; it doesn't get fully disconnected, but it's shifting further and farther away from it while it manifests the very tendencies that drive it away from the essential, from the state of the Self, from the Divine, from God. Again: these factors, these powers and forces manifest themselves in the world and they do so with increasing strength and intensity. The stronger they connect to space and time, to consistency, to matter, the stronger and more intensely this shifting away from the origin takes place.

The world of tradition sustains *sophia perennis*, an eternal wisdom and knowledge on all levels of existence. Sometimes it becomes lackluster or gets out of sight but essentially it always subsists. When we talk about the world of tradition what we mean is a world where to a great extent traditional-spiritual principles prevailed. In the world of modernity the prevalence of these principles becomes minimal and it seems that life is unaffected by them; destructive, dissolving tendencies, powers and forces manifest themselves in existence, distracting man even more from the fundamentals and from superiority, from absolute supremacy, from the hierarchical structure of existence, from eternal values, exposing his mind, soul and spirituality to fully temporal contingencies.

When it comes to relating modernity to specific eras, we have ample opportunities at our disposal. We may date the moment of drifting away from the Spiritual to the 7th, 6th and 5th Centuries BC., and it is likely that in times before this it would have been impossible for materialistic and atheistic views to emerge. All spheres of life were permeated by spiritual powers, which were impossible not to notice and which thus focused attention on where the manifest world descended from, on unconditioned, pure Existence, on the Absolute.

Obviously, the world of 2500 years ago still can't be called modern, but something had already happened then and with the progression of time, if we look at the period of the latest millennium, we can notice a definitive shake-up in terms of spirituality in the 1200's and 1300's. This was a period when strong influences had surfaced which diverted attention and views, as well as the powers these manifested away from the Principle of principles. This diversion of attention appeared to a large extent in Reformation where it's impossible not to notice a contra-spiritual tendency; it also appeared in the "renaissance", where the powers of death were much more prevalent than the powers of re-birth; it appeared in the phenomenon of darkening, which the anti-traditional mentality calls "enlightenment", since this "enlightenment" is a pronouncedly darkening process from a spiritual point of view.

The view that turned from God to Earth was called light. In our terminology this is a darkening process. We must recognize these preparatory tendencies in what we call modernity – and modernity is one of the synonyms of anti-traditionality and anti-spirituality. In fact, these tendencies were more than just preparatory in nature, since they had also carried that which was to a large degree directly related to darkness.

By modernity we don't mean the technical nature of the current world, although it is related to it; we focus on something else. Modernity means a world without tradition, a world against tradition, a world without spirituality and against spirituality; it means forgetting Myself – to put it in first case singular- to forget my connection to the Spiritual, to the Essential, to the Unconditional, to the Absolute.

The modern world depicts a distance. From whatever point of view we may consider the modern world to be more developed than the world of previous eras, it never means a superiority based on essential factors. Rather, we must consider what human consciousness shifted away from, what we drifted away from and what I have distanced myself from; then it will become evident that I have distanced myself from the Essential. Whatever may I have gained in this age, is insignificant in comparison to the loss the world has experienced. The world has entered into an anti-spiritual age; it is not fully void of the spirit, but it is tendentially preparing for anti-spirituality. When did this happen? In many respects centuries ago, in many respects in the 20th Century, in many respects in the 21st Century. Consider the French Revolution which carried very dark tendencies, or the revolutions of the 19th century or consider the current Century. It would be correct to say that we entered this state during WWI, perhaps at its conclusion, or that it happened during the time of the Bolshevik revolution or perhaps at the beginning of WWII or when that ended. All these are adequate considerations.

Fact is that this process began long time ago and gradually, in the last century and with increasing speed, it has reached the state of existence that in the strictest sense determines our days; the current age means the last 100-150 years since the characteristics that manifested themselves after the Second World War had already been present in a germinal state much earlier. Someone who is sufficiently alert to really give attention to the spiritual processes, can identify distinct stages in the darkening process every 5 years or so. The 1950's for example were, in a lot of respects, much more terrible then the years afterward, but people still had a mentality that was hoping for change, hoping that the previous value system may be reinstated [translators note: this refers to the special situation in Hungary in the 1950's.] It is precisely this mentality that becomes weak and that eventually ceases to exist in this world. As specific generations leave the sphere of human existence, we can identify, even within the world of darkness, a very specific darkening process. Hope won't die in the current age or in the future, but its perspectives are increasingly marginalized to eschatological levels only: hope may only have eschatological perspectives.

It seems that the well known principle of *Omnia vincit veritas* may only be true in eschatological perspectives, that this unconditional truth could not prevail in the sphere of strictly earthly events. However, truth has a supra-temporal, eschatological validity and this always subsists, incorruptibly. Hope in the strictly temporal, historical sphere, on the other hand, is becoming weaker and dimmer and with good reason: precisely because the truth is not prevalent.

The goals of a spiritually oriented man can't be defined within earthly, worldly perspectives; goals that are projected to earthly existence may only be transitory. If the objective is to reach the summit of a mountain – the summit being an analogy to the ultimate, super-human, transcendent goal –, earthly goals may only represent intermediary summits from which I must continue my journey. Even such worldly goals, which, although never equaled the ultimate goal, but were at least oriented towards it, have become hopeless in the age of darkness; when at least some values were still manifest, an adequate, hierarchical structure prevailed and people were in their proper place, performing the role they were born to do, irrespective of whether or not it was comfortable or pleasant. When dark, let's say satanic influences came to dominate the world, this meant first and foremost upsetting the fundamental order: confusing the order of hierarchical structures so that it was no longer possible to know what and who is superior, what are the functions of people, what must be done in order for earthly life to reflect a spiritual order.

Earth may only represent heaven to some degree, it can't replace it; this representation is what disappears in the modern world or in the current age in a broader sense. This disappearance is a process, it has been happening for a long time and it will continue to do so, probably for a considerably long time. Whatever its outcome may be, true hope that points beyond the human world, toward transcendence, may only be rooted in me: in the fact that I am connected to transcendence, that my spiritual soul belongs to transcendence.

Whatever is possible, must be of course done in order to create order, knowing that this is not the ultimate goal and knowing also that in the Iron Age of Hesiod or in the Dark Age not only are all such hopes dim and constrained in general, but even the specific hope of realizing these general hopes to some degree, are more or less lost.

It is adequate to maintain hope for a better world, but the validity of such faith is conditional; the unconditional validity that never disappoints can't be realized in Earthly conditions. The modern world tends to forget this and it can't give attention either to Alfa or to Omega; it can't orientate itself to the Origin, to the Beginning or to the Non-beginning; in fact, it is part of its nature that it's not oriented to these. Some people may be oriented to these in some exceptional cases, but this is so extremely rare, that we can't deal with them within the scope of general tendencies, be they prevalent or failing. It is likely that these cases have always been rather rare, but in the present age, although they still exist, they are extremely rare. I repeat: it is justified that one orientates himself and strives toward a better world.

But only those things have incorruptible validity that are connected to the transcendence of earthly-human existence.

Not only was in the world of tradition such a transcendent orientation within the frame of earthly-human existence legitimate, everything was organized accordingly. By its natural dynamism, by providence and by conscious effort, the world was structured in such a way that it maintained, helped, strengthened and supported this spirituality, surrounding it with protective bastions, so to speak, and keeping it alive so that it could, even if not perfectly, significantly eliminate destructive tendencies. The world of anti-tradition, which is the world of modernity in a broader sense, stands in opposition to all of this. It inhibits, blocks, and limits true spiritual initiatives, while it fosters and supports the manifestation and prevalence of demonic, satanic powers, subordinates itself and others, as well as the world and the general structure of life to these. Yet, we must not forget that we live in this world, where observable (not in the sense of proof, but in the sense of manifestation) tendencies that accelerate decline, dominate. We may consider other worlds with more ideal structures, but we must stay pragmatic and can't forget that we live in this one. With the dominance of destructive tendencies we must stand our ground in the earthly domain and find ways and possibilities for maintaining an orientation that doesn't lose sight of the ultimate goal.

In this age, in the current age of anti-traditional modernity, in the domain of activities aimed at dissolution and destruction, in the general process of darkening, we may experience an undeniable challenge; we may. Since the greater the darkness, the bigger the challenge (and this is valid all the way to an extreme stage, beyond which not even this is valid anymore), the challenge we're facing is stronger than it has ever been in history. In certain individuals, the greater the darkness, the bigger the need for the spirit. "Blessed are the poor in spirit" means that they recognize the world devoid of the spirit and a yearning for the spirit is burning in their soul. They are poor in some respect and they want to eliminate this. What this means is an opening of the dimension of possibilities in the Dark-age. Facing the void and the challenge on the one hand, and a world filled with the power of darkness on the other. We must see this and face this and perceive this as a challenge: no matter how strong the powers of illusion, distraction and degradation are, I am going to face them. The stronger they are, the stronger my opposition will be since I am aware that if I don't do this, I set myself up for a fall.

It's not enough to realize that following an age filled with light we are now in a darker age, but we also need to see that we really are in this one and the paradigms of a bright past, although indispensable, are not enough for determining a future; for this we need to find possibilities in the current age even if everything seems to be against this, keeping in mind that there is always a way out even from the greatest or nearly greatest darkness: precisely when what we perceive, we perceive it in the sense of a challenge.

Thus, in this sense, in this spiritual view, we must evaluate the relationship between tradition and modernity in a special way, recognizing that this relationship is atypical; however, the recognition of this must not result in tear-filled nostalgia for the past (however justified a nostalgia by itself may be) but it must awaken an inner mental and spiritual activity. The past may have pragmatic validity for the future and the present situation appears in the sign of the sharpest and most extreme challenge – as long as we're able to perceive it with utmost awareness.

BERSERKER

BOOKS

