

# TRADITION & MODERNITY



Selected Articles of

András László

VOLUME 2

# **BERSERKER**

---

## **BOOKS**

---



pg.4-Metaphysico-trāditionālis principle– Unity and Diversity

12-Gods, God, Deity

18-What is Astrology based on

28-Astrology as a science and approach

36-Metaphysico-trāditionālis principle– Unity and Diversity

44-DOGMATA PRŌTOKANŌNIKA/DOGMATA PRŌTOCANŌNICA CRITĒRIA  
METAPHYSICO-TRĀDITIŌNĀLIA-RELIGIŌNĀLIA

48-Līberālism contrā Lībertātem

55-Man, society, state

66-Some comments on the current possibilities and needs of restoration Era  
paradigms

70-A disappearing state, a disappearing society, a disappearing people

80-WHAT IS METAPHYSICAL TRADITIONALISM?

91- EXISTENCE AND CONSCIOUSNESS IN THE LIGHT OF THE METAPHYSICAL  
TRADITION

103-THE REGULARITY AND ESSENCE OF METAPHYSICAL REALISATION

108-SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE TEMPORAL FRAGMENTATION OF HUMAN  
LIFE

118-TANTRIKUS YOGA

130-THE WAY OF LOVE

140-TRADITION AND PRESENT

145-SOME COMMENTS ON THE NATURE OF SATANICITAS (DIABOLICITAS)

153-Occultism & Metaphysics

158- POWER AND ORIGIN

167-On questions of our sovereignty

171-METAPHYSICAL SPIRITUALITY - METAPOLITICITY - POLITICITY - APOLITICITY

In this article, we cover the most important principles. This is related to the naming, orientation, with the categories in which we will continue our investigations, our insights. Let us deal first of all with what we call metaphysics, in the closest connection with what we think of as transcendentalism. Transcensionality is a generic term in this case, and has two degrees, which also two degrees of metaphysics: the first degree is called trānscendentia or trānscendēns. This is one degree. The second, higher degree of transcensionality or metaphysics is called trānsscendentăle. If is used as an adjective, as an adverb, then trānsscendentălis in the masculine, and trānsscendentălis in the feminine gender, and trānscendentăle in the neuter gender. Trānscendēns is trānsscendēns in all three genders. So, trānsscendentia and trānsscendentăle are the two degrees of transcendentalism, or the two degrees of metaphysics. degree. What does it mean? The lower degree means, refers to, those things that are beyond the categorical existents. The categorical existents are Aristotle's ten categories. What is grasped by these is the categorical existent. Here it is a matter what is beyond the categorical existents.

And trānsscendentăle is that which is beyond all existence. Ta meta ta physics itself is related to this. It literally means two things: 'those that are beyond the natural', the other meaning is 'those that are beyond the existent/existent'.

These two meanings of transcensionality and metaphysics are extremely important, and trădițiōnălităș metaphysica focuses on both degrees, with the emphasis on the second.

What do we mean by occult (hidden)? The occult is that which connects the full manifestation of existence and the lower level of metaphysics or transcendentalism. It is hidden in relation to and for empiricism the strict sense. These are hidden degrees, that is what occult-occult-occultum means. At the same time, occultum means hidden, and occultē hidden or concealed. The word occultism probably comes from Eliphas Levy, the great Christian Qabbalist. Not with absolute certainty, but it is a fairly plausible claim.

So it makes sense and is justified to examine the occult spheres, to focus temporarily on the occult levels, without being fixed on them, since the is not metaphysical. As

just as physicality has to do with metaphysics, it is obvious that the occult states of being have to do with the metaphysical, nevertheless occultism is explicitly and in all respects and in all respects and in all respects reservedly directed towards that which is obviously samsārai, hidden to empiricism, and of course there are many degrees of this. There are pseudo-occultist tendencies. Our approach not against occultism, but it is definitely not occultism, and we take the fixation on occultism to be anti-metaphysical. It is possible to be born with lower degrees of occult ability, and those who are born with such ability can develop it on their own with very little effort.

So abilities such as aura-seeing and the like are certainly interesting, and may have some positive aspects (we don't rule this out completely), but they have nothing to do with metaphysical to qualify. Metaphysical vision or knowledge has nothing to do with aura vision or anything else, and in fact the possession of these abilities is mostly a higher realization of are among the factors that make more difficult to. They are therefore not an advantage transcensional cognition, or they are unheard of, mostly neutral and very significant. in number and degree are harmful, atavistic, detrimental, and backward, even retrogressive. The existence of occult states of being is, of course, most fully recognized, they are. If they are revealed, they exist. They gain their existence in emergence/emergence. The metaphysical orientation, the metaphysico-traditional perception can deal with the occult, so it can see through it to the extent that it should be valued, it values it, if it should not, it does not value it. So it is perfectly comprehensible to occultism, to the metaphysical traditional view. For the occultist view, metaphysical traditionalism is, one might say, inaccessible. Are we occultists? If the occult is merely than acknowledging the existence of occult states of being, then we might as well say we are occultists. But since this means much more, we are adherents and followers of metaphysicality and we want to be representatives and teachers and interpreters and experiencers of the occult, not defining ourselves as moving along the line of the occult. What is occult is largely samsārai, that is, bound to the vortex of being, for even the level of trānsscēndēntia is bound to it. The trānsscēndēntia (i.e. not the trānsscēndēntāle), though it is of a much higher level than what we call occult, is in fact of the samsāra.

Samsāra means a vortex of existence or being. It means the world of existential being, not the world of being-ness. Existential existence is important because it is real. It is important because it is the medium of permanent experience, but it in no way to mastery, power, freedom, immortality. Let us stop for a moment at the word immortality.

Surviving death not immortality in a metaphysical sense and in a metaphysical sense. It is called supravivēntia, and it is not immortality. We can call it a supramental survival, which is otherwise subject to cessation. The Buddha said that what has a beginning has an end. That which has a beginning in time has an end in time, that which has its beginning in the supernatural

has its beginning, it ends in the supertemporal. In this context, we can - and have spoken many times- - that there is creation or coming into being in tempore (i.e. in time), and there is creation and coming into being (and of course cessation) cum tempore ( time). There is a reference to the time, but from above, in the sense of the transcendence of time. Thus, what has a beginning in time has an end in time, while if it has a beginning with time, it has an end time. So in this way there is mortality, *suprāviventiā*, and there is *immortālītās relativā*, relative immortality. This relative immortality is called *aiōni* immortality, which is the same as *aiōni* mortality. this case, the two mean the same thing. *Aiōni* immortality = *aiōni* mortality. And infinitely above these we can establish the *immortālītās absoluta*. The absolute is existence in timeless eternity, which has beginning nor end, neither in time nor with time, in any sense. For it is that that which has a beginning has an end also means that what has no beginning has no end.

In Christianity, unfortunately, there is a rather generalised downgraded view of this, which is completely unacceptable in relation to Buddhism, Hinduism and other traditions. It is this (taught by the Catholic Church and the Calvinistic Reformed Church, and by Eastern Orthodox Christianity): the immortal spiritual soul is created at the moment of conception and is attached to the zygote that is being created. This is doctrine. And it then becomes eternally immortal. For Buddhism, Hinduism, and other traditions, it is unacceptable that what has a beginning is a beginning, it must not end. What has a beginning has an end. One way or the other. Not to mention that a creature cannot be eternal, the timeless absolute eternity and in the sense of immortality. Creation cannot be eternal. In fact, according to these teachings, even the creator cannot be eternal, only he who is above the contingencies of all these degrees can be eternal and immortal and unconditional. So, not only the creature, not even the creator is eternal in the sense in which we can define eternity in absolute eternity. These are very essential, the most basic considerations to understand our points. So, what is the *trānsscendentiāt*, but rather the *trānsscendentālet* we want to make it happen. Let's say through *trānsscendentiān* the *trānscendentāl*. This, from this point of view and in terms of the principles of our teachings, is fundamental. There are other ways of looking at it, and there are forms of contemplation that are in some way connected to the relative, that the relative in some way with the highest dignities. These views may be whether they are religious or not, they have nothing to do with the pure metaphysical-traditional view, nor can they have anything to do with it.

So it's very important to distinguish between the two and strictly speaking, in relation to *ta meta ta* physics, this means the natural, and the natural is something that is actually related to categories, it's usually related to space and time and some kind of substantivity. They need not be strictly spatial or temporal, for the entities of the occult sphere are not related to space and time and substance in the sense that they are in the physical world. So it ceases there too. But any relation to space and time and sub-substantiality is enough to make it absent in the second degree, and not

mix it up as if it were still present. So the first stage of metaphysics is to look beyond the natural and the second refers to beyond the existent, that is, beyond the existent. The difference between the two is essential.

The whirlpool of existence is samsāra, and the flame of the forces generating existence is the flame of nirvāna (which means flame of existence), *dēflammatiō trānsscendentālis*, *dēflammatiō*, i.e., one last flame of disappearance, flame of existence. It is not the extinction that is the important point, but the flickering, the cessation in a flame. Therefore, the flame above the padmačakra, symbolically represented on the top of the head, the flame that flares up and bursts out in its precipitation and expulsion, represents the realisation of nirvāna. In this sense, the connection between samsāra and nirvāna

the difference is infinite, and it must be said in the strongest terms. Diversity is infinite. This is reflected in the Pāli-language Thēra-vāda Buddhism, and is the basic teaching of the Hīnayāna degree of Buddhism as a whole, and this basic teaching must be accepted in the fullest sense. It is a higher teaching, related to the Buddhist Mahāyāna, which fully accepts what we have just stated, at the same time states that, in the ultimate degree, nirvāna and samsāra are one and the same.

With full acceptance of the former. It obviously follows that this unity, to put it aptly is true, say, from the point of view of nirvāna. It is not true from the samsāra point of view. The oneness of samsāra and nirvāna, therefore, is true only "from the point of view nirvāna", otherwise it is not true. So it means degrees: the Hīnayāna degree, the Mahāyāna degree, and then there is the Vajrayāna degree. The Vajrayāna stage fully accepts both teachings, and goes one step further: to concentrate on realisation, and at the ultimate, ultimate stage of realisation, the realiser comes to a supremacy and mastery and power in which he transmutes samsāra into nirvāna, nirvāna into samsāra, samsāra into nirvāna again

in infinite eternal unity. With the simultaneous and complete acceptance and assumption of infinite diversity and total identity.

In addition to the fundamental issues, the question of diversity and unity must also be raised, because it is closely related to this. Existence is the universe of the world of differences itself. Every entity is different from every other entity, everything is also different from itself, as if in continuity. So difference and change are elementarily connected. But diversity is by no means a negative. Existing beings are different from each other. In metaphors: there are horizontal differences (beings on the same plane of existence) and vertical differences (also metaphor), vertical differences symbolized by verticals, and vertical differences are the ranks of existentials in the diversity. That is why there are symbolically horizontal and vertical differences between beings. According to the old conception, already rooted in scholasticism in the West– and later put forward by many, including Leibniz, for example, others, if there is no there no difference, then the two existents would be one existent. There is no finite identity in which difference would not appear. Even at the level of abstractions it is no different. Guénon warns that the theorem with  $A=A$  already carries with it the inherent incomplete equality. Because the complete equality cannot be described by  $A=A$ , but by  $A$ . And, if I say something about this, it is already the incomplete equality of  $A=A$ .

the sense of equality and unity is stated in the direction of. So, again, if there were no difference between two existents, the two existents would be one existent. And the differences between the existents

symbolic differences between horizontality and verticality. All differences, in different senses.

However, difference and difference and distinction are also expressed on an even more powerful level. Kaczvinsky calls the highest and Absolute and Self simply Soul. This designation is not felicitous, but what he says about it below is all the more so. He says that the purpose of the yōga and the essential nature of the yōga is to distinguish from the Spirit all that is not the Spirit.

This is expressed in other symbolisms as "to disconnect the world from myself". The world completely separate as other and different. And in the next beat (not in time, but inner being), to take the world back into myself as myself. This is how we put it to detach the world as heteron, as other, from myself, and then to take the world as a recognized car back into myself. Because one of our basic assumptions is that the heteron is in fact the unrecognized auton. This unrecognition persists even if I know theoretically what it is. I know that this heteron indeed myself, but it is a theoretical knowledge. You could say that a knowledge stuck at the level of nomenclature. Worthless? If I can move on from this, then even I can't call it worthless, it's still a valuable thing. If I remain here, it is not only worthless, it is a damnable and absurd and utterly defective thing. No degree is a negative if I can move up from it. That's the most important thing, that's the to step away, the ability to move on.

So the biggest difference is the difference between the absolute and the relative, which is actually is the same as the distinction between Auton and Heteron, the distinction arising from the distinction between Absolutum/Auton and Relativum/Heteron, it precedes and supersedes all other distinctions, and belongs to the essence of realisation operations. The total equality between the individual existents, the within its universal scope-and from the point of view of beings-is a blatant nonsense. That is why, from a metaphysical-spiritual point of view, that tries to present this nonsense as reality and to validate it all its consequences is unacceptable. So we do not accept any kind of, any kind of democratism, any kind of liberalism and certainly no kind of communism. These are the most radical anti-metaphysical, anti-traditional and anti-spiritual tendencies. They also have philosophical presentations and political presentations. If one were to say to oneself,

that I am an adherent of Vēdānta and a supporter of democracy, would testify to nothing other than the extreme principium disorder in itself, but to this principium disorder by far. Equality is therefore not possible, but unity is very possible. We know that the wisdom of non-difference surpasses the wisdom of distinction, but the wisdom of non-difference can only be reached through the wisdom of distinction. So there is unity. This unity is a disarticulated unity. It is through seeing the differences and transcending the differences that one comes to this supremacy. The seeing of the articulated unity, in which the whole unity prevails as well as the existence of the differences. The articulated unity. A human organism functioning normally, near normality, for example, shows this. (An animal organism too.) A human organism



shows this, a human unit is a structured unit, a unit structured by differences that can be grasped. Not everything has the same function within an organisation. The liver cannot replace the pituitary gland and the pituitary gland cannot replace the liver. It cannot be substituted, it cannot be switched from one to the other, there is a close, intimate relationship between them, because unity implies coherence. Unity implies coherence. It implies the far-reaching recognition of differences, the possibility of transcending, and the unity that transcends differences, and even the transcendence of differences.

In general, intellectual formulations that conceive of the spirit in terms of some kind of general dissipation are unfortunate. It is as if the spirit were penetrating everywhere. This is not the case at all. Spirit is the action, the act of the auton as subject. The auton as subject in the act. It is the manifestation, the spirit itself. It is the manifestation, which in philosophical language can be called self-casting, is the spirit. A self-creating action and action of the self as subject is the spirit. The spirit is such is not a , the spirit is not a very subtle substance, but a subject in the act of self-creating. It is a subject centred in the car. This is the spirit. And the more it is a subject, and the more it is an act, and the more , the more it is spirit. This is the spirit. All other approaches in this field are either the result of a deviation or the precursor of a deviation. The two are not mutually , for in someone they can be, and they can be abundantly, both, even together. So the auton and the autoniā transcend not only the body but also the soul and the spirit. It transcends the spirit in the highest sense. Not in the sense of separation, of course. The auton first posits itself as subject, and then as subject it further posits itself, holds itself in act, and this self is in fact the selfFor, apart from sōlipsisism, there is no other legitimate approach form cannot be on this plane. In this respect, we can make temporary concessions, verbal relaxations, but ultimately this is where we start from and this is what we must always return to.

Metaphysics and metaphysical traditionalism are absolutely inseparable from metaphysical realisation. There is an intimacy and interconnection between doctrines and realisation that is unlike any other in any plane of existence. The doctrines are a means of tracing a descent: this is the tradition in fact. It may have other functions, but this is its main function and characteristic. This is the doctrine.

Again, let's use an analogy. It is a very crude, indirect and imperfect metaphor, but it can be to highlight certain realities and truths: realisation is the ascent back down. This is one possible formulation of realisation. formulations.) So it's a backwards way of doing something. To walk backwards through the descent.

We combine this with other forms, such as the one I prefer to associate them with: reduction. In common parlance, reductiō is a reduction of something to something simple and smaller means, reduction. The original meaning of reductiō is not a reduction, but solely and strictly to

feedback. So I am myself who has to be led back. To whom? Myself. I am myself leading my self back to my self by my self and through my self to my self. Why?

Am I not there already? Of course you are. Just not enough. Am I not the same as myself? I'm identical to myself. But still not enough. From a metaphysical point of view, this is the extent of it. unacceptable. I have to go back from myself myself to myself more and more intensely and intensely. Who is the starting point here, the whole process, the goal, the point of return and it is all me being me. There is no other besides me. In this regard, unfortunately, Western adaptations of Eastern teachings demonstrate an ecstatic level of non-understanding. An ecstasy of non-understanding is displayed. A frenzied celebration of non-understanding, and a flood of slogans. We often encounter the doctrine of "not-me", "there is no me", when it is not really possible to say "there is no me", but only "I am not me". Such as "I am not me, I am a appearance". This is as valid a statement as "the peace camp is invincible." That's about the extent of it. These statements that "The peace camp is invincible" and "Knowledge is a weapon in the fight against the imperialists..." That's it. They are slogans. Slogans in which there is in fact some particular truth, but not there, and not in the way it is used. For example, selfhood as selfhood becomes transcended and becomes only selfhood in such a way that if everything is integrated into selfhood, then there is no distinction of self, and then it is left behind, it becomes transcended. But not so that the experienter of realization disappears.

So reality and illusion. They keep claiming that it's an illusion. Otherwise, countless times I have said that *reālītās illūsōria* is as much to be assumed as *illūsio reālis*. Reality and illusion are not two different things. Reality has illusory nature, and illusion has its real nature. They are all realities. Every reality, every experienced level is reality, but at the same time every experienced level is illusion. Every dream is reality. It does not refer to reality, it is reality. I dream that I am walking in a meadow among poppies, and then they explain to me: no, you were sleeping there, I saw you. Anyone who says is a dwarf in need of care. The reality I experience is the only reality. And, if I wake up from my dream of the poppy meadow, I go into a new dream where someone tells me I was lying in bed. When I was walking in the meadow with the flowers: it was a dream and it was real. When I'm informed that I was lying in bed: it was also a dream and reality.

There is an absolute awakening, which Buddhism calls *bōdhi*. Metaphysical awakening is not enlightenment, *illūminātiō* is the lower and intermediate stage. The metaphysical awakening (*redexvigilātiō metaphysica absolūta*) awakening from all dreams and all reality. In comparison, what is almost nothing. It is not a denial of what is. Let us examine these questions more carefully: I say that this chalk is real, everyone understands what I have said, and I say that this chalk is illusory (you get that too) there is no difference between the two. There is no difference that can be practically grasped, interpreted or qualified. That there is, or actually appears to be but in fact there is not. What is the difference between the two? Nothing, so to speak. So, anyone who says such things is crying wolf because they have heard or read something ,

say, in oriental texts that you don't understand, you don't understand them essentially (even if you read the texts in the original.)

There are "great Eastern masters" who don't understand any of this. Nothing. "Great Eastern masters" like Vivekananda once, or in more recent times, say Osho, that just "my favourites": Punja, Ole Nydahl, Chin Moi. Not only do they not understand enough or zero understanding, but their understanding takes on something of a negative value in this regard. They have a minus value, a negative value of understanding. Total lack of understanding is a condition to be cherished in comparison.

Authority means a lot to me. but authority should be authority. Let authority be established, just because it is authority I don't care. I want to see the foundations the foundations by which authority is given to those who are perceived to be. Just because you are an Indian pretty boy, or an Indian big bearded shaggy-haired man, does not make you an authority. None of these things. At some point here a person named Poorna was prowling around. He was a prowler. was rumoured that he was seventy and eighty and two hundred years old, but he didn't look more than forty. Somebody -- sneakily rummaging around -- found your passport. He was actually 35, which is why he looked 40. And, when asked, how old he was, he said, "I won't tell you because I don't want to influence you." So he doesn't want fact that he's so old and he looks young to influence them, because he just wants to influence. And here he' saying, "when I was walking in the garden of the UN with this...", they're like recurring things, how important he is, and how much he gives his word, and how much the world is defined by yōga. As much as it defines him, indeed. Well, Poorna didn't usually drink spirits, but sometimes he did, and he would talk about he used to cheat women in England, how he used to take a lot of money from them, and then he would lock them in a room and left them... This is from him. Because he rose above, but "he was sincere." Master... He could be sincere. Here they were shouting around - poor, since deceased, Váradý Hédi - and others, "Swāmi Ji! Give us a teaching!" A bank robber is better in my eyes. Only those who respect them are lower than that. If they are, in a peculiar way, deserving of recognition-- not from my side-- but if they are, their fraudulent, utilitarian qualities would be worthy of mention in this regard. It is, for example, a complete misrepresentation of authority.

Authority must be realistic. So, someone does not tell the truth because he is an authority, but because he always tells the truth, therefore he is an authority. That's why it's authority. I consider him to be an authority because of his professionalism, not because of his authority. This would of course be a long way off, because authority and wisdom recognition and so on, are also very weak. I used to say how much Eastern peoples, for example the Chinese, value the respect for authority that still exists today. And how despicable it is that they have no sense whatsoever of grasping authority realistically. But Mao Tse-tung and I don't know who the authorities are. The respect for authority is a positive in itself in these people, but there is no authority cognition qualities present in them.

András László

Gods, God, Deity

Let's look at some of the designations. Let's look at the Greek name first. Theos. Theos has three one was God, the second one was one of the gods, the third one was a man belonging to the divine order. So, in fact, it also meant a man, a man of the divine order. The Latin equivalent of this was Deus. In Latin there are actually more varied designations here, because the Deus meant one of the gods, and meant God. The word Divus, or on a lower level Divinus, was substituted for the word belonging to the divine order So they spoke of Homo Divinus, in whom the divine was manifested, Homo Divus, who was already in fact God, and Homo Deus, the full God-Man. (This was the case with Christ, and some other similar And they talked about Divinificātiō, Divificātiō and Deificātiō, these were the stages of becoming God and becoming God. In the Greek there were also two words, one of which was Theiōsis, divinization and the actual becoming a god was theōsis.

Deity, in a sense, can even be supra-divine. Meister Eckhart and his followers of the the Übergöttlichegottheit very much a concept of the Supra-Deity. Metatheos, or Hypertheos, is in fact a theological concept, even though Christian denominational theologies deny that it is such. In certain forms of contemplation, if not at the level of absolute impersonality, but the introduction of some kind of high god would be very justified, in the framework in which it is discussed, for example, because of redemption, or because of the death on the cross as a sacrifice, because the sacrifice, the sacrificer and the one before whom the sacrifice offered are not on the same level of existence. And in this view the Father sacrifices himself as his own son. But to whom is the sacrifice presented? Why should suchdone for redemption, since the divine will could solve it in a moment. It takes to forgive.

But let's look a little at the most interesting of this, the Indo-Hindu approach, and the Sanskrit terminology that arises here. The highest truly transcending is Ātmā. Let us describe the word itself. Base form: Ātman and singular masculine subject case:. This is roughly what Selbst means in German, Self in English, Soi in French. It means roughly what in Hungarian could be translated as Önmaga(m). This is the the supreme and all-embracing. In Sanskrit, there is a word pāda, which means both foot and quarter. Hence it is said that Ātmā has four legs, or the Ātmā has four quarters. Each of the two means something expressed in a particular sense. These quarters, from the bottom up, always so that the first, the first quarter, the second, the first and second

together, the third, first, second and third together, and finally the fourth, first, second, third and fourth together. So the completeness of Ātmā is the fourth pāda, because then it includes all of them. And these are different degrees of deity-deity. From the bottom up, the lowest and first pāda, the Saguna-Brahmātmēsvara-Trimūrti. So the Divine Selfhood with qualities expressed in three faces, so quasi as a trinity. This trinity is Brahṁā, Vishnu and Siva.

A sharp distinction must be made between the male Brahṁā. Base form Brahman. The singular masculine subject case is Brahṁā. For the neutral gender word, the base form is also Brahman and the singular subject case is Brahma. This means a much higher existential reality than Brahṁā, the creator God. So the first is Saguna- Brahṁātmēsvara-Trimūrti. Saguna, it means having qualities. Guna is the primordial quality so Saguna is the one associated with it. So Saguna-Brahṁātmēsvara-Trimūrti.

The second pāda, this also means, and what follows here is Saguna Brahṁātmēsvara only, and not Trimūrti, but all three together. These, though in a wholly supra-personal sense, yet express some personhood.

And the third pāda, Nirguna Brahṁātmā. In the sense of supra-qualitative, unqualitative Brahma Self(m). This is actually already a supra-divine degree. This was understood as Metatheos and The degree corresponding to Hypertheos and Divinity Supreme. He has no attributes, even One.

The highest concept of the Greeks is Hen the One. Above all God-entities is the One, the Hen. With the suffix to Hen. The Indo-Hindu view in Sanskrit does not even say this, only that it is not twofold, so with a negative attribute: advaita. It's not divided in two. Which also means, of course, that it is not divided, not split, and therefore not even One.

But is a fourth pāda. Ātisagunātinirguna-Sadasad-Brahṁātmā. So it is all qualities and even beyond unqualities. Sad or Sat means being, pure being. Not the Being Being, but Being per Being. And it also means Being. And Asat, non-being, means absolute non-being, and obviously the existence of the substantial non-being.

If you put them together, you actually end with something that is, and more than the combination of both. So that which is beyond Being and Non-Being, and also beyond the unity of Being and Non-Being. This is the

the fourth pāda, which of course implies the lower pādas also, this is the highest degree, and of course it is also highly supra-divine.

The latter two are associated with the Supra-Deity, the first two with God. It is not the With one of the gods, God. So, Atisagunātīnirguna Sadasat Brahmātmā. At the same time, this possession is also called Sadasat-patitva, the Lordship over Sadasat. The one who realizes this is called Sadasat pati, that is, the Lord of Being and Non-being. Or perhaps Sadasat- patipati is the Lord of Being and Non-being.

They in fact, in the sense of intensification, the same.

Hinduism is not explained in any of its branches in such a supposed detail, but our aim is not to give a professional account of Hindu teachings ( can look elsewhere), but to assert certain principles with radical force.

The Indo-Hindu approach is, of course, not polytheistic in the sense that polytheism is usually spoken of. The one who-which cannot even be called one, in contact with being, manifests itself in an immense number of guises. This immeasurable multitude of images is in fact the multitude of gods. This is how the Romans and the Greeks understood it. Of course, the Yōga paths, metaphysical realizations. A realisation that is the transformation and completion of the the different ways and degrees of worship. As I spoke about Homo Divinus, and Homo Divus, and Homo Deus, Divinification, Divification, Deification, or even Teiosis or Theosis, by adding auto tag, so Auto-Teiosis or Auto-Teosis, so becoming God myself.

Already in the philosophy of the scholastica, the essentially Aristotelian conceptual pair appears, which distinguishes between contingency, contingency, and necessarium, necessity. A necessity can be divided into two parts, necessarium assertorium and necessarium apodicticum. The necessarium assertorium is necessary because it is, in fact it is, and the necessarium apodicticum, on the other hand, cannot be not. Of course, theologia et philosophia scholastica says that necessarium apodicticum is God. If you take your own inner experience then I have to say that it can't be I'm not. So it is an absolute certainty that is unquestionable. If we take the previous necessarium apodicticum conception and combine it with this, it means that I am God. In my ultimate essence, that is, not here and now, not in my current state, but in my ultimate essence. And this has the most extreme relation to realization. If my ultimate essence is this, then my ultimate essence is the same as the ultimate essence of the universe, and if I can reduce myself completely into myself, completely, then I actually achieve who I am according to my ultimate essence. So what the Greek calls Theantrōpos or Antrōpotheos, God-man or Humanist, is in this view an end. Indeed, Metatheantrōpos can also be an end. The Deity above God is a human state of being, and of course not simply human, but infinitely human. superhuman implementation, an implementation whose external starting position is, let's say.

exōtericus starting position, the momentary human condition. And each realization is, let us say, the starting position of esōtericus, the target itself. The exoteric starting position is the state I am in.

Undoubtedly, in a certain sense, I am an existent among existents, I am a person among persons, I am a man among men. I am an existent as a human person, I am an existent as a human person between the existing. But that which I grasp as my own person (Propriō-Persō), there is no more of it, and if I establish Myself as Alany, then there is no more Alany, am alone. Because any other person I point to is Alany because that's what I call him. And I myself am Subject because I experience myself as Subject. So, let us now look away from who I am. I can only call you, Alany, in terms of experience, I can only call myself, nobody else in the world. So I am unique as my own person, and it is only in my own Subjectivity that this becomes so intense that something has to be admitted here.

That is, it has to do with the fact that although I am a part of my body, I am not I in my body. Myself even. Not even in my soul, not even in my spirit. Much more than in my soul, and much more than in my body, but I am not fully and absolutely myself. Only in myself am I completely myself.

So if I were to call the Selfhood Auton, on a Greek basis, this Auton can only be experienced as Egōn-Auton, or Egōm per Auton. I as Self. Not as Self in general, but as I-Self. Egōm per Auton or Egōm per Autoniā or even in the Latin form Egomet-Ipsum or Egomet-Ipsitās. And in Sanskrit, by the way, Aham Ātmaka. Aham, means I,, is Ātmaság, or Self-ness.

These are designations of absolutely fundamental importance. The significance of the person, Persōna or Prosōpon, Svatva or Svatvaka, is undoubtedly great. The person as Persōna Individuālis. Individual

I experience myself in the form of being, as Persōna Individuālis, and Individuum Persōnāle, that is, as an Individual Person, a Personal Individual.

My own person is when I actually start to come to my senses. And this completed in the discovery of the Self as the Self. You could say that I am first and foremost an Auton, and as an Auton, I manifest myself first and foremost as a subject. As the subject of all being. But from me follows all particularity, and all objecthood too.

Of course, we have never denied the objective reality of objective reality. Only, objective reality is the objective reality of the subject-self. That which I possess. Because my self is primarily a subjective a reality, then as an action reality, and finally as an objective reality. That is my objective reality. And without me, there is none. So objective reality independent of consciousness, respectfully of my consciousness, I deny and reject in the strongest terms. This is something that, in a completely different context, that certain naturalist (Pauli) said something to the effect that it is not even wrong. So this statement

is not even wrong, it's so low. It is an objective reality that exists independently or independently of me, my consciousness. What Lenin identified with matter. But it is no better to identify it with God, or the spirit, or whatever. The very suggestion that there is an objective reality independent of or independent of my consciousness is to be rejected in the extreme. Objective reality, my objective reality. Nem úgy, hogy én objektív valóság vagyok, hanem az általam birtokolt és uralt és is an objective reality.

Moving on. I have "forgotten" myself as a creator. Myself as a creator I forgot. I also forgot myself as a sustainer and transmuter. Myself, I have only I am a constator, with very little functional scope. This does not mean that this is my ultimate essence. I am, here and now, a creature. But in my ultimate essence and potentiality I am a creator. For example, the creator of Myself, and the creator of everything. So I am a creature, I am a creature among creatures, but this is not my essence, and I do not this essence in others, I see only the creature in others, and I see the creature, and I see the creature, and I can assume that he is not only creature, but I do not experience.

But in myself, I experience, I intuit that although I am a creature, I am not only I am a creature. I am not just a creature. In Buddhism there is an interesting concept, I will come to it, Anātma vāda or Anātmaka vāda is the doctrine of Anātma. The denial of Ātma. What it actually means. Would Hinduism and Buddhism contradict each other that much? I don't think so. There is one basic concept in Hinduism and Buddhism, and that is Samsāra, the existence vortex. And there is the Self-Self manifesting towards the vortex of existence. Samsārātmaka or Samsārātmā. The doctrine of Anātma means that the Samsārātmā, that is, Ātma manifesting towards Samsāra in Samsāra is Anātma. So there it cannot be called Ātma. The Selfhood in it is of so little intensity that it cannot be called that. This is what it, this doctrine. And this is actually the strongest, though indirect, confirmation of the Ātma vāda. So it is its confirmation, its consolidation. So as not to mislead you any Samsāraism with this unconditionality.

The other complement is Heteron, which means other, someone else, or something else. The other that can be experienced or not directly experienced, the Heteron. The Heteron of the world Heteron exists, let us say collectively Heteront. The Heteron, unrecognized Auton, but until that recognition, it's a hard-core Heteron, and a hard-core Heteron world.



That is to say, one of the basic tasks of spiritual realization is to detach the world, everything, as Heteron, and then take it back into Myself as Self. So to detach and to take back. These are metaphorical statements, but statements that point to this deep reality. Anyone who has read József Kaczvinsky, East clarity (Kaczvinsky callssoul, but let's that), you may that the purpose of the Yōga is formulated as distinguishing from the soul, all that is not the soul. In quite different words, this means about the same thing.

The soul itself, the, cannot be known. It is beyond all cognizability and cognition. It is the difference, that which is still knowable, to the highest degree. It is cognizable. It is cognizable because it is not the same and because it is the same.

(Presentation in Esztergom, 7 March 2008)

András László astrological articles

What is Astrology based on

What is astrology based on? This elementary question must be asked of all believers and opponents of astrology, of anyone who is just beginning their astrological studies, of anyone who is just beginning their astrological studies, of anyone who is just beginning their astrological studies. has already made progress in his studies, but even those who have teaching astrology at primary, secondary and higher levels for decades should not shy away from asking questions.

Among astrologers, the intrinsic validity of astrology– is an obvious fact. The assumption of the evidential validity of astrology does not close anything,– on the contrary, it is an opening, an opening to towards problems that need to be solved and clarified.

The absolute validity of astrology cannot be proven. For those who are against astrology and does not budge from them– the validity of astrology cannot be , and even the most convincing argument will not be accepted as truly convincing. Although the acceptance or rejection of astrology - and the motivation for these - is also an issue that is of serious may be of interest, the recognition of the validity of astrology is a prerequisite for the discussion of the present issue.

What is the basis, the reason and the background for fact that, for example, a schematic picture of the constellation of the date of birth in relation to a certain place can provide far-reaching information about the possibilities of the character of the native, about the possibilities of the development of his or her life destiny, and even, through prognostic procedures, about the can the likely possibilities of external and internal events in life– be in advance– tied to exact dates?

The positions on grounds and justifications are different. Some of them cannot be taken seriously, others can be taken seriously, but because of their particularity they cannot be taken as real reasons.

At one time– certainly– knew what astrology and its validity were actually based on. This knowledge gradually faded, and by the time of the revival of Western astrology in the late 19th century and the At the beginning of the 20th century– , no one was aware of what the bases of excavation could and

should be accepted. Nevertheless, – or, for that matter, – a number of grounding and grounding theories have been put forward.

In the present century, there have been and still are many proponents of the idea that astrology actually belongs, or rather should belong, to the broader natural sciences.

The proponents of this line of thinking assume explicitly physical influences coming to Earth from the physical cosmos, and further effects and changes in living organisms on Earth, trigger processes and process chains. These effects are identified partly with known and unknown cosmic rays and partly with a combination of gravitational and other - unexplored - effects.

The most extreme versions of these "theories" effects of an energetic nature, and the validity of astrology; proponents of more "subtle" theories prefer to talk about the importance of non-energetic influences, the importance of informational triggers, and the importance of the effects, the modification of the "code" of the biological program in the organism, and that either at the time of conception or at the time of birth, in this respect, there is a kind of "saturation" and "closure".

We do not doubt for a moment the importance of the effect of cosmic rays; it is likely that there may be unknown radiation effects that could be even more significant than the are known; similarly, we recognise that the effects of gravity can be very important, and we also believe that there are as yet unexplored, as yet completely unknown, effects. They are certain we are also convinced that, in addition to the significant energetic effects, there are also effects of a quite different nature that may be even more important.

In spite of and in spite of all this, we claim that to base astrology on these is nonsense. In fact, these effects have nothing to do with what astrology is concerned with, even if certain effects can be described astrologically. They are a completely different - indeed natural sciences - a branch of science, cosmobiology; a branch of , the importance, importance and interest of which are readily we admit, but cosmobiology and astrology are two – extremely different – disciplines. This is so even if some schools of thought, such as the Ebertin school of astrology, wish to discard astrology as a discipline and propose cosmobiology as a name.

Others speak of occult effects, effects that the natural sciences have known, will never know, and that scientific knowledge of is in principle impossible.

There can be no doubt before us that there can be and are such effects, but the validity of astrology cannot be predicated on their existence.

There are many proponents of the coexistence of physical (energetic and non-energetic) and occult influences foundation, complementing these with "intermediate" parapsychical, parapsychophysical and parapsychological effects.

We repeat: we acknowledge the importance of all existing and possible effects, we are interested in the research on them, but we cannot base our arguments for the validity of astrology on them.

The effects are processual. Effects affect - in the case of humans - the parents, the fertilised egg, the embryo, the foetus (and not the foetus), the newborn, the infant, the child, the adolescent, the adult and the old age person. It is an implicit claim that either at conception or at birth there would be 'saturation' and a 'closure' associated with them - but if, assuming but not allowing it would not mean and would not cause anything special, especially not that the saturation- and the celestial saturation at the moment of the saturation of the earth would be why a constellation would express the differentiated possibilities of character development, of the interrelationships of life destiny.

The effects- however we relate them, are always- as we said- continuous, processual in nature. The effect of the sun- is primarily in relation to "sunbathing". All other effects are similar, though not as strikingly so.

Furthermore, as we know, astrology can be applied not only to people, animals and living organisms in general, but also to events, the founding of cities and states, associations and societies, and the establishment, the "incoming" news, the receipt or opening of letters, the formulation of inspirations, intuitions, time-bound initiations, sudden questions, awakening from dreams, contracts, a wide variety of- natural and non-natural, directly related and unrelated to humans - disasters. In the case of these, known or unknown

"filling up" with "radiations"- would be an absurd claim that would be beyond any critical approach.

So: we must reject all theories of effects - as validity-justification theories - in the strongest terms.

There other- much better-grounded- theories, ones that do not provide a global explanation at all, but are definitely worthy of attention in detail. These the traditionally known and recognised theorem of Carl Gustav Jung and his followers about the known as the theory of synchronicity. The essence of the 'principium synchronicitatis'- in short- is that there is an extremely close intrinsic connection and analogy between simultaneous manifestations.

The recognition of the real existence of the 'principium synchronicitatis' is inseparable from an astrology scientific and suprascientific and from the astrologer who wishes to practice such astrology. At the same time, however, we must also acknowledge that the principle of synchronicity does not provide a satisfactory explanation in terms of explanation, and that it must also be to say that other principles - including higher - are valid alongside and above the principle of synchronicity. Without even attempting to discuss this, we should point that in astrological prognostics- at least for certain methods- the principle of synchronicity- although not eliminated- is in itself insufficient even for detailed explanations, there are other areas in which the inadequacy of the principle of synchronicity is also shown.

In rejecting theories based on effects, we must turn to the question of the rejecting constellational sub-relationships as causes. For example : In X.Y.'s chart the recurrence of the quadratura 'transitionalis-between Mars and Saturn through reciprocal conjunctions caused the serious accident that befell X.Y.

First of all- the constellation and the transit-constellation relationship between it and the constellation are not "caused" anything. It is always the whole and the whole the constellation, and in this case the transit constellation, that expresses and marks the actualizing possibilities. Neither the part nor the whole causes anything, the part and- by itself- is not a marker, if it to be a marker, because in many contexts like the example above, there is no physical or psychological trauma, i.e. something that follows from the context, nor anything else that could follow from it.

The "stars" do not determine, nor even predispose, but through their coherence they mark, indicate and express,– not something, but many things, above all the possibilities of tendencies.

In the spiritual 'space' beyond any spatiality, the principals (in personal terms: gods, spirits, geniuses) are placed in different relations with each other; to use metaphors – cooperating or fighting with each other, – differentiated and multifaceted. The signatures of the principals are expressed in the physical cosmos, and the relational signatures are expressed in the relations of the entities of the physical cosmos, i.e. the constellation, in relation to the principle of synchronicity and other principles.

There is no "influence–in astrological terms– from the celestial bodies. The celestial bodies and their various relations to each other– for example, their angular relations– to the surface of the sphere, are expressions of relations which are not internal, still less external, and in which principals– if you like, impersonal forces, or, if otherwise, gods– are involved.

To the rest clear, we need to make a brief digression.

We have to turn to the philosophical-philosophical supra-philosophical line of thought of which the author of these lines is a committed author and cultivator, and which is called: solipsism (sōlipsismus). The essence of this, in very brief terms – that there is only one Ground of Being, and this is I-Magam – 'Aham-

Atma', I am Self– . In Being there are many persons, one of them is me– as a person, but deep down in my being I am not only a person, but also a Subject infinitely beyond persons – and persons. Not as a person, I am the Mother of Being, but in my supra-personal and sole subjecthood, i.e. as 'Aham-Atma'. As the Alanya of Being, I am also the Lord of Being, and the fullness of Being. I-Magam– as Subany– am the Subiectum of Being, all Actio of Being is the Actio of I-Magam, and all Obiectum is the Obiectum of I-Magam. As a Person, I am one of the multitude of human persons, but as the Subject, there is no one else, and nothing else but me. As a person I am a man among men, but as a Subject I-

I am also the World and the God above the Worlds. This solipsism<sup>1</sup> is equivalent to a magical conception of Beingnot a daemono-magical conception of Being, but a conception of Being, i.e. 'solipsismus theourgico-magicus'.

In the sense of 'solipsismus theourgico-magicus', the principia are principia of the self - I-Magam - and although the difference between the Subject and person - as a difference in dignity - is infinite, the difference between the person and the subject cannot be separated in the face of infinite distinction, and all the constellation - as a subject in addition to my own expressions - and among these there is a personal my own constellation. This subject-personal constellation universally, but also individually-personally, my own expression. The assumption of this implies, alongside and 'synchronicitas', the principle of 'hypersynchronicitas', that is, the principle according to which not only synchronous manifestations are synchronic, but there is also a simultaneity between 'diachronicitas', - the separate simultaneities, which transcends the general temporality, almost completely supra-temporal.

The 'symbologia' and 'logia analogica' of astrology, i.e. the symbolic-analogical expressions of principle - the science of signatures, and orientally the supernatural science, which is related to the natural sciences, including astronomy, only in so far as astronomy provides the data from which astrology and astrologers can draw, the data on natural objects, which in the field of nature are the interrelationships of principles and principle-signatures, - but astrology and the astrologer must a largely qualitative - predominant approach, keeping away from the otherwise highly respected and highly valued natural sciences and from all "naturalists", indeed all attempts to "de-scientificise" and discourage science, not to mention attempts to "de-scientificise".

Rejecting theories of impact is therefore an elementary task. Instead, only the symbolic-analogical approaches of the expression-signification-marking theories can be accepted, in close connection with the strong premise of the 'principium synchronicitatis' and the 'principium hypersynchronicitatis'.

"Impact - as a word and concept - is used only in a figurative sense and as a figure of speech. We can talk about - for simplicity - e.g. the Jupiter effect, which - say the ninth house but we cannot - talk about the influence of Jupiter on the Earth within the framework of astrology - .

We know that the correct 'angle of light' or 'ray' (here, so, in this sense, we can talk about rays to speak of), or according to the 'aspectus' (adspectus/aspectus/aspectus) approach, e.g. a large or continuous-trigon context includes - as a fourth point - either the geocentre or - and more likely - the topocentre, and the latter is e.g. the centre of the body of the native, - but this does not mean that this radiation link would, or could, mean actual radiation reaching the Earth. 'Impact' and 'radiation' are legitimate astrological concepts, but always applied only to relationships, to the exclusion of any

physical, semi-physical or occult influences that exist but have nothing to do with the 'causatio' of astrology.

According to the author of these lines - assuming that very few will agree with his statement - the basic principles of the philosophical-hyperphilosophical philosophy of being of 'solipsismus theourgico-magicus' are also advisable for anyone who wishes to cultivate astrology in the sense of opening up to astrosophy, but no one can avoid a thorough reflection on these principles - and this is certain.

The 'exhaustive' explanation of astrology, the 'comprehensivist' grounding of its validity- by rational means- is not possible, but not necessarily, because the foregoing provides the support- that those who are able- to do so can use to arrive at a supra-rational grasp of 'causatio'.

Having said all this, if only one person has been helped by this paper to understand the validity of astrology- - and that requires no more than two careful readings of this short and deliberately simplistic paper - the author of these lines has achieved his goal.

1 The Latin solus, sola, solum means to be alone; solum means to be alone, sole means to be alone; ipse, ipsa, ipsum means to be oneself. Solipsism- with approximate literalism- means 'sole-self-ism'

András László

ARS POIËTICA ASTROLOGICA

Astrology- in the eyes of the writer of these lines- is both a science (scientia) and a suprāscientia (suprāscientia). Consequently:- the 'ratio discursiva' is suitable and sufficient to describe the surface of astrology, or the astronomical, geometrical and mathematical minimum can be grasped, understood, cognized and mastered by the possessor of this faculty- but only the actual quality and functional presence of the 'intellectus intuitivus' enables the depths and heights of astrology in the true sense of 'gnōsis', that is, 'cōscientia trānscendentālis' the real sense of the word. Astrology (and astrosophy) is an adequate and true



cultivation of– can be said to be gnostically oriented– requires the inventive intuitive realisation (and the concentrative-meditative and transcensional deepening of this realisation) - expressed in the first person singular - I am part of the Cosmos: I am in the Cosmos, but at the same time the totality of the Cosmos is also entirely within me; in my personal human form it is contained as Microcosmos, and in my supra-personality the totality of the Macrocosmos is also experientially is present as reality. The universality of the Cosmos pervades, and the universality of the Cosmos with and through my universality. The reality of the cosmicity of the supra-empirical empiricism is an objective which, in a certain sense and at a certain level, is also a precondition. The astrological deepening must start from this and must– reach a much higher– degree. To this, but not only to this, but also to that whose intuition, whose intuitive anticipation must possess– and this that in my first and ultimate essence I am more than a cosmic being: my central subjectivity is what the Greek tradition calls 'Hyperkosmiā', 'Metakosmiā' or 'Hyperouraniā', the 'Metouraniā', which in the language of philosophy is 'Metaphysicum Trānsscendentāle Absolutum'.

The centre of subjectivity: the centre of my subjectivity– is the centre of Being Beyond Being. There are many beings, many persons, many people; I myself am a being among beings, a creature in the created world of creatures. But at the same time I am not only a human person, but– and this is decisive– I am the Alanya of myself, more than being: I am Being itself, even more than Being itself: I am Being beyond Being centre, the beyond-consciousness centre of universal Consciousness; not merely 'creātūra', but potential (and actual-transcendental when realised) 'Creātor': but only 'in aliō', because– 'in se–my essence is the Creator-supernality, the 'Suprācreātor', the beyond-state, the beyond-reality of all states.

The astrologer– as a theorist– must know everything that can be known theoretically. There are teachables, but there are also learnables that cannot be taught, although they can be thought and further thought; there are also levels of theoreticity that can only be approached and mastered meditatively. But the astrologer must also be a practical researcher: a scientist, a thinker and an artifex, that is, the science of a master of the craft and the art. The highly practised and cultivated combination of 'diagnōsis' and 'prognōsis' is the beginning of (meditative) cognition, but also its origin and 'draining'. A insight (ideally meditative insight) into someone or something from their horoscope, is on its analysis; no doubt, in the process of 'cognizing cognition', the one to whom or to which the horoscope refers also becomes cognized, but the potential is much higher than that. to enter into the coherences of cosmicity, which is never simply homogeneous, but complex and differentiated– as a cosmic being, to differentially traverse the infinity of the Cosmos, and the Cosmos differentially traverses my being, which is infinite in essence.

The differentiated and integrated qualities and qualitative hierarchies of substantivity, of time and space, are revealed on the path of reducing myself from my person to my Subjecthood, because the path leads through the whole of the Cosmos; through the totality of the Cosmos, of which the Cosmos– studied by the discipline of physics is only a part and a level, but in which the imprint of the totality of the Cosmos is nevertheless present.

Astrology is the knowledge of what lies between my person and my ultimate-ultimate-Basic-Being-beyond-Existence.

and this is the fullness of the Cosmos. Cognition of the Cosmos: bridging cognition, cognition of that which connects me as a person with my Substantiality, and cognition of that which separates me from it.

The writer of these lines is firmly convinced that both the will, the action and the context of events are strictly determined, but that at the same time total freedom– as power– exists. This antinomy can be resolved only if and when the Subject– first and – As a determinator, it becomes empirically realised, that is, it becomes realised that in the trans-degree of my supra-personality, I myself determine the existence of my person and all that is between the person and the Subject, that is, universality.

I am completely I-magam (Aham-ātmā) free, immortal, eternal, omniscient, always and everywhere present, beginningless and infinite, possessor of omnipotence. As a person, I am a creature of subject self-myself-myself. Definite being, with unlimited potential freedom, and the realised 'identificātiō existenciālis' with an actual freedom corresponding to its actual level and nature.

Astrology requires and deepening in astrology allows us to recognize the relations of the past and the future in their totality, as this totality is four reveals itself in context. These four contexts :

closed    past–    open

future,    closed    past    -

closed future,

open past–    open    future,

open past - closed future.

The joint and unified - intuitive-meditative - realization of these four relations: the temporal relation of possibilities and actualities and the supratemporal resultant of this relation as an even higher realization - is the key.

The exclusive acceptance of the 'closed past– open future': a superstition, in fact, from which either determinism, or indeterminism, or some bastardized mongrel of these– can follow, certainly not the experiential experience of the reality of the 'trāns-complex' and 'trāns-simplex' of Being – based on the knowledge of– .

The astrologically imperative principle of 'synchronicitās' must be complemented and fulfilled: the 'diachronicitās' and 'synchronicitās' - the principle of 'hypersynchronicitās'. This principle goes beyond the fact of simultaneities and simultaneities, revealing a differentiated and integrated higher simultaneity of simultaneities and simultaneities: the unity of being together and at the same time. Astrological diagnosis and prognosis must be based on these principles, and these principles must lead to an even deeper and even higher experiential insight.

Adequate astrology must go beyond 'astrologia prō astrologō' and 'astrologia prō aliō' contradictions. A true astrologer practices astrology for astrology, for the astrologer himself (in the sense of continuing a spiritual and cognitive journey) and at the same time for others, for others.

Astrology is a science and superscience– this can be, indeed is essential for the sake of the for science, for supra-scientific knowledge, for self-knowledge and knowledge of existence. Astrology is an inner spiritual journey that the astrologer undertakes for himself, as an astrologer, as as a searcher of spiritual depths and heights, a tireless wanderer, a seeker of the absolute goal. Finally, it is the task of the astrologer to advise and to give guidance– above all in spiritual opportunities and obstacles– to those who trust and seek it out, and who are deemed worthy and suitable to receive astrological opportunity exploration and guidance the framework of astrodiagnostics and astroforesight.

The writer of these lines is convinced that theory and practice are separable, but that should not be separated. The astrologer must be a theorist, both within the boundaries of rationality and transcending the boundaries of (mainly) rationality– : a possessor of living theory that can be transferred into practice.

Finally– and most importantly– the astrologer must live astrology -at all times and at all levels.

András László

Astrology as a science and approach

Astrology, or should we say Astrosophia, has been around since the beginning of the human world. When it developed is not a question. "It has always been". It was not, it is part of being human. It is based on the fact that the physical macrocosm (macrocosmos/macrocosm) corresponds to the very being of man. A correspondence. In the sense of a correspondence and an adjunction, they correspond each other.

Astrology, even practical astrology, does not deal with so-called effects. Astrology is not cosmic effects, but cosmic signals. These signals indicate trends, trend possibilities. The principles of existence, and principle-signatures of existence, which are graspable in a basic structural sense, can be associated with certain celestial objects. So the Sun, the Moon, the planets, the stars, the intersections of different structures, and so on. So such in the sense of a planet expressing some principle-signature ensemble, which will indicate certain things, tendencies.

Once upon a time, Astronomy and Astrology meant roughly the same thing, so there was almost no any difference in meaning. Later on it meant something different, but astronomers were astrologers, and astrologers were astronomers, that is, interpreters of the stars and astronomers were once the same people. Astronomy, in its own respects, has developed to the extent that the two disciplines have become separated. Nevertheless, an astronomical minimum astrologers must have knowledge that astrologers do not usually have, mainly the so-called astronomia sphaerica, i.e. the knowledge of spherical astronomy and this of course also includes trigonometry sphaerica, that is, trigonometry which is also related to spherical surfaces, so there is a certain without knowledge, astrology is simply uncultivable. Of course, it is very gratifying if the knowledge of astrology goes far beyond this. Indeed, astrology uses more celestial spherical coordinate systems than astronomy. Astrology needs to localize celestial bodies. It takes into account certain systems: the Ecliptic coordinate system, Equatorial coordinate system, the Horizontal coordinate system. These are sufficient for astronomy. For distant objects, the galactic coordinate system may also be taken into account.

In astrology, since astrology deals with qualities, several coordinate systems are needed. Indeed, astrology is based on a qualitative, highly qualitative approach. There was a German magazine, perhaps still in existence today, *Qualität der Zeit* The quality of time. It is concerned with the quality of space and time, and the quality of the reality behind celestial objects. Quantitative aspects also have a role to play, but quantitative aspects are actually relevant to the spatial definition of certain things, because physical reality is some kind of projection of a reality above physicality, say a hyperphysical reality, and the hyperphysical is a projection of the metaphysical reality. So in this way metaphysics, hyperphysics, physics. They are expressions.

Physical situations, physical laws, physical realities, are always expressions of something higher, hyperphysical, and ultimately metaphysical. And the expression of man in relation to the somaticus, psychicus, pneumaticus and noëticus realities that constitute man. It is therefore the expression of man in a triple or quadruple order. What it expresses of man most of all? Obviously it expresses best what occultism and occultologia call astralitäts. Let's look at the word itself. The word astrology, on the one hand, is the Greek word *astēr*. *Astēr* means star. *Astron* means constellation, or constellation. The Latin equivalent of *astron* is *astrum*.

Constellation, constellation. From Greek *Astrologiā*, in Latin *Astrologia*. Or *Astronomiā* or *Asrosophiā*. In Latin there was a word for star, which no longer exists, actually *stērā*, later *stēra*, which became a word with a diminutive ending, *stērula*, or *stērla*. And finally *stēlla*. It actually comes from *stērula*. That's the Latin.

*Astrologiā* from the word *astron*, related to the word *astēr* star. So *astrālītās*, *astrāle*, is something that has a particular connection with the astral world. It talks about the occultology is also about being an astral body. *Astrālītās*. About spiritual and physical *astrālītās*, and even spiritual *astrālītās*. It is very deeply connected with the world of feeling and in general with that which has the closest relation to it in human existence. So it can be related primarily to *astrālītās*. But not only that, the aethericity, or physicality in its most narrow sense, the spiritual spheres and to some extent indirectly the spirit.

The more earthly a human being becomes, the less relevant astrology becomes. It will never completely disappear, but today, astrology is not as valid as it was thousands of years ago or even centuries ago. It was about much more valid then. The celestial connection of man was much more significant and pronounced. The present celestial bondage is not extreme. It is minimal.

Astrology will never cease to exist in this sense, but there is no doubt that its validity has declined, that's why in astrology the most earthy celestial factors are the houses. These greenest celestial factors are the divisions of the celestial sphere according to the different aspects of the spherical space. Houses can be mapped to their corresponding representations, and the importance of houses is relatively greater today than it has ever been. And houses have a particularly prominent role in contemporary astrology. That's because other factors, such as the zodiac itself, have been somewhat relegated. It is not as significant as it once was. The Sun, Moon and planets are still very significant, and in fact the stars as a whole, individually and collectively, are of great importance.

van.

The number of stars is thought to be in the hundreds of millions. Each star is an independent signifier and promissory. Since all of these cannot be taken into account, certain groupings have been made and must be made. But it is also certain that at one time the number of constellation sectors was 21 600, and the number of houses was also 21 600. Not twelve, but 21 600 were taken into account with separate meanings.

There was one India, and the Greeks also had one called myriogenesis. Interestingly, only fragments of each have survived. were discussed independently and in detail, and the practising astrologer had to be familiar with them. Why 21600? The number of the first minutes of the angle or arc, 21 600. The number of minutes of angle or arc 1 296 000, the number of minutes of angle or arc 77 760 000. The number of angular or quarter 4 665 600 000, etc. And according to a certain breakdown, these are still significant even in this breakdown.

At one time, nuances were given much more attention. And that means that today, with a minimum of 360 stars should be taken into account. Because at one time 21 600 stars were taken into account. In all cases. And that's a tiny fraction of the existing stars. And each star has its own significance. Practical astrology is necessarily oversimplified. It must be necessarily oversimplified. It can't be anything but oversimplified.

Let's actually look at how astrology, the validity of astrology, is usually explained. We call this causatiō. Causatiōnologia, if something deals with it, so this is the doctrine of astrology. There was an ancient conception, an ancient spiritual conception, which was then strongly put forward by Carl Gustav Jung, who I think had a questionable authenticity. This is related to synchronicity, or synchroniā in Greek. Synchronicitās with diachroniā is simultaneity as opposed to simultaneity. This ancient principle, which Jung has the merit of emphasizing, means that the simultaneous between manifestations, there is a deep inner connection, a correspondence, in the case of a beginning in time, say the birth of a human being, and synchronous manifestations. So if they throw up 8 pebbles at the moment of birth, it's somehow connected. It just doesn't make sense. But you have to look at that celestial situation, overall situation, cōnstēllātiō. The cōnstēllātiō is the situation in relation to a particular place and a particular moment in time. Cōnstēllās are the stēllās of the celestial

together. The constellation will express, according to the principles of astrology, a cosmic picture of who or what has then manifested into the world. You can also do a horoscope for conception, if you can get the time, but you can also do one for birth. This means that at the moment of birth, in terms of character development, there are the tendency possibilities that arise from the symbōlums and symbōlum can be read in relation to the context and princīpium signatūras.

But synchronicitās does not explain everything. It must be said that metasynchronicitās must also be calculated, that there is not only simultaneity and correspondence between contemporaneities, but in fact there is some hidden correlation between quite distinct contemporaneities. So synchronicitās, though essential to the causātiō of astrology, is insufficient. It is totally insufficient. So there are other aspects to consider here. It is very important that astrology is actually can be divided into two large chapters. One is called astrological diagnōsis, that is, astrodyagnōsis. The dya means through or across. To know through, to know through. This comes up primarily in the psychological, characterological aspect. The other is prognōsis, astroprognōsis is astrodiagnōsis in addition. A thorough explanation of astrodiagnōsis can be followed in practical astrology by astroprognōsis. It expresses the unfolding of tendency possibilities over time. So it is forecasting, in a sense foreknowledge, not vulgar divination. It is the foreknowledge of tendentious possibilities.

We must then discuss a chapter that is most closely related to the basic questions of prognosis and what can be raised in this respect about the relation between past and present. These are the following possibilities. The one that is currently accepted is the closed past, open future. The past is fixed, it cannot be changed, but the future is completely open. A philosopher named Garaudy once said, back in his Marxist days (since then strongly anti-Marxist and Muslim), that what Marxism or materialist Marxism accepts as the only transcendence is a future open to infinity. To this I say that there can be such a thing: Closed past, closed future, Open past, open future, Open past, future closed. We argue that these four possibilities are both valid and existing realities. In such a way that either the first or the second or the third or the fourth comes to the fore. So one of the images. These must be understood as images, but what is not brought to the fore remains valid. It is certainly possible to look back and see that future events have been decided from the beginning. Or that even the past is not decided. Or that one is yes and one is no, or one is yes and one is no. So these are abundantly possible at the same time. And then where is free will? Because in astrology, it's very strongly emphasized, in addition to the right laws, there's a huge role for free will.

The question of dēterminātiō and indēterminātiō arises in the context of astrology. That is, whether there is determined by the will itself, on the one hand, and by life itself, for example. The will, through it, action, and life in general. That which states this determination in all respects is the

determinism. That which asserts indeterminacy, and through it freedom, is indeterminism.

The Trāḍicīonālī view, which I hold, takes a different view of this question, and in connection with this I have made the definitions that are needed here. It like this. It is not the question of determinism and indeterminism, or of determinātīō and indeterminātīō, that is really decisive. It is preceded and superseded by a much more significant context. That is, auto-determinātīō and hetero-determinātīō. Adding that auto-determinātīō can only appear in sharp focus as egōmper-auto-determinātīō. That is, my self-determination by myself. If it is sharp, then only

I can use the singular first person, if I "relax" I am talking about autodeterminātīō. So I am the determinant, or someone else is the determinant. In life in general, there is a mixture of auto-determinātīō and hetero-determinātīō. The more powerful a spiritual being one is, the more the stronger the auto-determinātīō and the less the hetero-determinātīō. The more the less significant, the less auto-determinātīō, and the stronger the hetero-determinātīō. By the other, heteros, hetera/heterē, heteron, the other to heteron, and the self, the auton. The auto-determinātīō, in relation to heteron, is indeterminātīō. I am so indeterminated by the heteron, the more I define myself. So the determinātīō indeterminātīō, determinismus indeterminismus precedes this question, and we do not that autodeterminātīō is an absolute all-embracing. Obviously, the absolute, the Ātmātmāt as absolute, cannot be determināl by anything. But in each being the two are mixed. In their lives too, in their personalities, and in general.

On the one hand, it is the past, the future, the aforementioned fourfoldness of relations that we necessarily be aware of, and on the other hand, not independently of this, but in a more essential way, the distinction between auto-determinātīō and hetero-determinātīō, and the awareness that they are in fact intermingled in human existentialism. It is just like the question of immortality. I myself as I myself am obviously immortal. I myself, as not myself, am however mortal. So in general human lifemortality and immortality are, as it were, interrelated.

The questions of traditional metaphysics are crucially important questions. And anyone who doesn't deal with them is such a dolt that he can't really be called human. It is completely independent of what the most prevalent in one's own area, these cannot be ignored.

Life, death, mortality, immortality, immortality, these are not abstract questions. And neither are auto-determinātīō and hetero-determinātīō abstract questions. These are not problems that one has to deal with in theoretical moments



but must be faced by everyone, regardless of their interests, profession or occupation, who wants to be worthy of being called human. One cannot stare into the world. The single animal individual can do so, because above the single animal individual there is a species spirit on guard. But the species spirit of man is in fact already individual, every human individual in some sense a species. There broader categories, but in the case of humans, there is no such sense of protection. Man cannot stare into the world. He stares without looking at anything, and you don't see anything, because that's the point of staring. He doesn't want to see anything, actually. Semi-animal "humans" (and that's majority of humans) live out their pathetically vegetative lives in an almost complete and defenceless world of babbling dullness.

To return to our basic question, the causationology of astrology necessarily involves the question of diāchronicitās and synchronicitās, the metasynchronicitās that transcend them, which at the same time means metadiāchronicitās, the four kinds of articulation of the relationship between past and future, the four kinds of the full recognition, acceptance, and respect of the articulation is crucial, and crucial importance of the correct interpretation of autodēterminātiō and heterodēterminātiō, always bearing in mind, that autodēterminātiō is sharpened to egōmper-autō-dēterminātiō, i.e. ego-self-related dēterminātiō, thus in the first person singular. These are actually rather astrosophic questions, rather than astrological ones. But astrology cannot be interpreted and practised without astrosophical foundations, and astrosophy cannot be conceived without taking these into account.

Instead of the usual names, I would use the following for the disciplines: what is called astronomy, I would call astronomy. It is the study of the laws of the astro-world. science of. Astrophysionomologia would be the correct name for Astrophysics. Astromanteiologia, that's is commonly called Astrology, the study of the interrelationships of the stars. And at the level, Astrognōseōlogosophiā. Astrosophia is understood to this. Astrognōseōlogosophia.

Let us also clarify one important concept, the Hōrōskopost. Latin Hōrōscopus. What does this word mean, literally? It means watchman. By extension, it means a time-keeper, a time-keeper. Hōrōskopeion. Later pronunciation Hōrōskopiōn, Hōrōscopium. So, a watchmaker, a watchwatcher, a watchwatcher is a I'll use the word "unnatural" to describe it, whether it's an hourglass, an hourglass, or time-view, time-view, that which follows from time-view and which makes further time-view possible. It is Hōrōskopeion, later pronounced Horoskopiōn, Latinized Horoscopium, abstracted from Ending: Horoscōp. What should be called Horoscopium, at least. It is in fact (in concrēto) a schematic diagram of the constellātiō, i.e. of the exact place and time of the corresponds to the celestial situation.

Since you can't draw the trillions of stars, the most important ones are the signs of the zodiac, the twelfth of the signums, the Sun, the Moon, the first and second planets, the most important stars, and the houses. It is a schēma. It is an accurate, yet enormously exaggerated drawing, as it contains many nuances- interiority, which may be important, cannot appear.

There is one more thing I would like to address. This is actually a techno-methodological issue in astrology. There's a word called zōdiakos (zdōdiakos). The Latin equivalent of this is zōdiacus, which could be called dzōdiakos, but let's say zōdiacus. The Hungarian translation of this is zodiac. It means the zone of constellations that lie along the ecliptic.

Ecliptica. There's a word in the Greek, Ekleipein. To omit, to skip. Ekleiphsis, from the Latin is the equivalent of Eclipsis. It actually means eclipses. The eclipses of the Sun and Moon. The linea ecliptica, or linea elliptica ecliptica, means the elliptical line and of course the plane on which the eclipses, the eclipses of the Sun and Moon, occur. In practice, we call Sun's orbit the ecliptica, and the Earth's orbit the ecliptica. That's Ecliptica, or Sun-Earth orbit for short, or Earth-Nap orbit. Along it are certain constellations, most of which are named after animals. Not all, but there are zodiacs, for example in the far east, where all are. Because the Chinese, Tibetan, Mongolian, Manchu zodiacs, for example, have only animals. In the zodiac, which is common in Assyria, Babylonia, but also known in India, there is a human or quasi-human-angelic appearance, Aquarius. So Eclipsis is actually an eclipse. It is usually understood to mean a solar eclipse, but it can actually also refer to a lunar eclipse. So the constellations along the Ecliptica are called this.

There is a zodiac, they say, where there are constellation sects. We call a constellation sectum when we divide the constellations of the zodiac, of different magnitudes, by 30 degrees. So we have the constellation- the animal of the sects, called Sidericus Zōdiacus. Sīdus, meaning star. The other is the zodiac Tropicus Zōdiacus, these are called the zodiac of the signums or signs. So there is the zodiac of the constellations (astrums), Zōdiacus Sīdericus, and there is zodiac of the signs, the zodiac of the Signums, which is called shall be called Zōdiacus Tropicus. The word tropus, Latin for tropus, means to change, to turn. It is the conversion of the two equinoxes as a conversion point. The reversal, the two solstice points, is the Solstice-Sunset. The Equinox points are called Aequinoctial points, so they are the same night point. The Solstice points are called Sōlstitium points. So the Zōdiacus, built on the Equinox points and the Solstice points, are the signs (not the actual constellations), but the animal heart of tickets. Western astrology usually the zodiac of the signs, while eastern astrology, for example Indian astrology, usually takes the zodiac of the zodiacal signs. However, the most serious trends, both in the East and in the West, take both into account. The names are the same, so there is the constellation of Aries and there is the sign of Aries. And Aquarius constellation sect and Aquarius sign. They are not the same. There is a difference of about 25 degrees between them. So the last 5 degrees of a sign is what approximates to the constellation. And the zodiac of the signs, the earth

by a certain motion (a motion that describes the mantle of two cones placed on top of each other) of the equatorial globe-globe axis, motion is called praecessiō,  
progress. Here, forward means something different from what it usually , here it is represented as clockwise. Its duration, rounded off by astronomical definition, is 26 000 years.  
According to Astrological time symbolism, this is exactly 25 920 years. It is a world year. 12 960 is half a world year. 6 480 is a world year. 2 160 years is a world month. 72 years is a world day.

The praecessiōs movement is actually the paecessiōs movement of the constellation sectors along the the tropical animal of the signs roams around. The names are the same and the characteristics are similar, in practical astrology, one must be interpreted quite differently from the other.

## Metaphysico-trāditionālis principle– Unity and Diversity

In this article, we cover the most important principles. This is related to the naming, orientation, with the categories in which we will continue our investigations, our insights. Let us deal first of all with what we call metaphysics, in the closest connection with what we think of as transcendentalism. Transcensionality is a generic term in this case, and has two degrees, which also two degrees of metaphysics: the first degree is called trānscententia or trānscentēns. This is one degree. The second, higher degree of transcensionality or metaphysics is called trānsscententāle. If is used as an adjective, as an adverb, then trānsscententālis in the masculine, and trānsscententālis in the feminine gender, and trānscententāle in the neuter gender. Trānscentēns is trānsscentēns in all three genders. So, trānsscententia and trānsscententāle are the two degrees of transcendentalism, or the two degrees of metaphysics. degree. What does it mean? The lower degree means, refers to, those things that are beyond the categorical existents. The categorical existents are Aristotle's ten categories. What is grasped by these is the categorical existent. Here it is a matter what is beyond the categorical existents.

And trānsscententāle is that which is beyond all existence. Ta meta ta physics itself is related to this. It literally means two things: 'those that are beyond the natural', the other meaning is 'those that are beyond the existent/existent'.

These two meanings of transcensionality and metaphysics are extremely important, and trāditionālītās metaphysica focuses on both degrees, with the emphasis on the second.

What do we mean by occult (hidden)? The occult is that which connects the full manifestation of existence and the lower level of metaphysics or transcendentalism. It is hidden in relation to and for empiricism the strict sense. These are hidden degrees, that is what occult-occult-occultum means. At the same time, occultum means hidden, and occultē hidden or concealed. The word occultism probably comes from Eliphas Levy, the great Christian Qabbalist. Not with absolute certainty, but it is a fairly plausible claim.

So it makes sense and is justified to examine the occult spheres, to focus temporarily on the occult levels, without being fixed on them, since the is not metaphysical. As

just as physicality has to do with metaphysics, it is obvious that occult states of being have to do with the metaphysical, nevertheless occultism is explicitly and in all respects and in all respects and in all respects reservedly directed towards that which is obviously samsārai, hidden to empiricism, and of course there are many degrees of this. There are pseudo-occultist tendencies. Our approach not against occultism, but it is definitely not occultism, and we take the fixation on occultism to be anti-metaphysical. It is possible to be born with lower degrees of occult ability, and those who are born with such ability can develop it on their own with very little effort.

So abilities such as aura-seeing and the like are certainly interesting, and may have some positive aspects (we don't rule this out completely), but they have nothing to do with metaphysical to qualify. Metaphysical vision or knowledge has nothing to do with aura vision or anything else, and in fact the possession of these abilities is mostly a higher realization of are among the factors that make it more difficult to. They are therefore not an advantage transcensional cognition, or they are unheard of, mostly neutral and very significant.

are harmful in number and in degree, atavistic, detrimental and backward, even retrogressive.

states of being are of course fully recognised, they are. If they are revealed, they are. In

emergence/emerging, they gain their existence. The metaphysical orientation, the metaphysico-traditional conception can handle the occult, so it sees through it in its own sphere, to the extent that it should, it values it, to the extent that it should not, it does not. So it is perfectly comprehensible to occultism, to the metaphysical-traditional view. For the occultist view, metaphysical traditionalism is, one might say, inaccessible. Are we occultists? If occultism were merely a recognition of the existence of occult states of being we might as say that we are occultists. But since it means much more than that, we are adherents and followers of metaphysicality and

we want to be representatives and teachers and interpreters and experiencers of the occult, not defining ourselves as moving along the line of the occult. That which is occult is largely samsārai, that is to say, it is related to the vortex of being

bound, since even the level of trānsscēdēntia is bound to it. The trānsscēdēntia (i.e. not the trānsscēdēntāle), although it is a much higher level than what we call the occult, is actually part of the samsāra.

Samsāra means a vortex of existence or being. It means the world of being-in-being, not the world of being-in-being. Existential existence is important because it is real. It is important because it is the medium of permanent experience, but it in no way to mastery, power, freedom, immortality. Let us stop for a moment at the word immortality.

Surviving death not immortality in a metaphysical sense and in a metaphysical sense. It is called supāvivēntia, and it is not immortality. We can call it a supramental survival, which is otherwise subject to cessation. The Buddha said that what has a beginning has an end. That which has a beginning in time has an end in time, that which has its beginning in the supernatural

has its beginning, it ends in timelessness. In this context, we can - and have spoken many times- - that there is creation or coming into being in tempore (i.e. in time), and there is creation and coming into being (and of course cessation) cum tempore ( time). There is a reference to the time, but from above, in the sense of the transcendence of time. Thus, what has a beginning in time has an end in time, while if it has a beginning with time, it has an end time. So in this way there is mortality, *suprāviventiā*, and there is *immortālītās relativā*, relative immortality. This relative immortality is called *aiōni* immortality, which is the same as *aiōni* mortality. this case, the two mean the same thing. *Aiōni* immortality = *aiōni* mortality. And infinitely above these we can establish the *immortālītās absoluta*. The absolute is existence in timeless eternity, which has beginning nor end, neither in time nor with time, in any sense. For it is that that which has a beginning has an end also means that what has no beginning has no end.

In Christianity, unfortunately, there is a rather generalised downgraded view of this, which is completely unacceptable in relation to Buddhism, Hinduism and other traditions. It is this (taught by the Catholic Church and the Calvinistic Reformed Church, and by Eastern Orthodox Christianity): the immortal spiritual soul is created at the moment of conception and is attached to the zygote that is being created. This is doctrine. And it then becomes eternally immortal. For Buddhism, Hinduism, and other traditions, it is unacceptable that what has a beginning is a beginning, it must not end. What has a beginning has an end. One way or the other. Not to mention that a creature cannot be eternal, the timeless absolute eternity and in the sense of immortality. Creation cannot be eternal. In fact, according to these teachings, even the creator cannot be eternal, only he who is above the contingencies of all these degrees can be eternal and immortal and unconditional. So, not only the creature, not even the creator is eternal in the sense in which we can define eternity in absolute eternity. These are very essential, the most basic considerations to understand our points. So, we want to realize *trānsscendentiā*, but more of *trānsscendentā*. Let's say, through *trānsscendentiān*, *trānscendentāl*. This, from this point of view and in terms of the principles of our teachings, is fundamental. There are other ways of looking at it, and there are forms of contemplation that are in some way connected to the relative, that the relative in some with the highest dignities. These views be religious or religious, but they have nothing to do with the pure metaphysico-traditional view, nor can they have anything to do with it.

So it's very important to distinguish between the two and strictly speaking, in relation to *ta meta ta physics*, this means the natural, and the natural is something that is actually related to categories, it's usually related to space and time and some kind of substantivity. They need not be strictly spatial or temporal, for the entities of the occult sphere are not related to space and time and substance in the sense that they are in the physical world. So it ceases there too. But any relation to space and time and sub-substantiality is enough to make it absent in the second degree, and not

mix it up as if it were still present. So the first stage of metaphysics is to look beyond the natural and the second refers to beyond the existent, that is, beyond the existent. The difference between the two is essential.

The whirlpool of existence is samsāra, and the flame of the forces generating existence is the flame of nirvāna (which means flame of existence), *dēflammatiō trānsscendentālis*, *dēflammatiō*, i.e., one last flame of disappearance, flame of existence. It is not the extinction that is the important point, but the flickering, the cessation in a flame. Therefore, the flame above the padmačakra, symbolically represented on the top of the head, the flame that flares up and bursts out in its precipitation and expulsion, represents the realisation of nirvāna. In this sense, the connection between samsāra and nirvāna

the difference is infinite, and it must be said in the strongest terms. Diversity is infinite. This is reflected in the Pāli-language Thēra-vāda Buddhism, and is the basic teaching of the Hīnayāna degree of Buddhism as a whole, and this basic teaching should be accepted in the broadest possible terms. It is a higher teaching, related to the Buddhist Mahāyāna, which fully accepts what we have just stated,

at the same time states that, in the ultimate degree, nirvāna and samsāra are one and the same.

With full acceptance of the former. It obviously follows that this unity, to put it aptly

is true, say, from the point of view of nirvāna. It is not true from the samsāra point of view. The oneness of samsāra and nirvāna, therefore, is true only "from the point of view nirvāna", otherwise it is not true. So it means degrees: the Hīnayāna degree, the Mahāyāna degree, and then there is the Vajrayāna degree. The Vajrayāna stage fully accepts both teachings, and goes one step further: to concentrate on realisation, and at the ultimate, ultimate stage of realisation, the realiser comes to a supremacy and mastery and power in which he transmutes samsāra into nirvāna, nirvāna into samsāra, samsāra into nirvāna again

in infinite eternal unity. With the simultaneous and complete acceptance and assumption of infinite diversity and total identity.

In addition to the fundamental issues, the question of diversity and unity must also be raised, because it is closely related to this. Existence is the universe of the world of differences itself. Every entity is different from every other entity, everything is different from itself, as it were in continuity. So difference and change are elementarily connected. But diversity is by no means a negative. Existing beings are different from each other. To use metaphors: among these there are so-called horizontal differences (beings on the same plane of existence) and there are vertical differences (also metaphor), a difference symbolized by a vertical, and a vertical difference is a difference of existential ranks. Therefore, there are symbolically horizontal and vertical differences between existents. According to the old conception, already rooted in scholasticism in the West– and later put forward by many, including Leibniz, for example, others, if there is no difference, then the two existents would be one existent. There is no finite identity in which difference would not appear. Even at the level of abstractions it is no different. Guénon warns that the theorem with  $A=A$  already carries with it the inherent incomplete equality. Because the complete equality cannot be described by  $A=A$ , but by  $A$ . And, if I say something about this, it is already the incomplete equality of  $A=A$ .

the sense of equality and unity is stated in the direction of. So, again, if there were no difference between two existents, the two existents would be one existent. And the differences between the existents

symbolic differences between horizontality and verticality. All differences, in different senses.

But difference and difference and distinction are also present at an even greater level. Kaczvinsky calls the highest and Absolute and Self simply Soul. This designation is not felicitous, but what he says about it below is all the more so. He says that the purpose of the yōga and the essential nature of the yōga is to distinguish from the Spirit all that is not the Spirit. This is expressed in other symbolisms as separating the world from the self. To separate the world completely as other and different. The following (not in time, but in inner being and the next) to take the world back into myself as myself. We this as detaching the world as heteron, as other, from myself, and then taking the world as a recognized car back into myself. Because one of our basic propositions is that the heteron is in fact the unrecognized auton. This unrecognition persists even if I know theoretically what it is. I know that this heteron indeed myself, but it is a theoretical knowledge. You could say that a knowledge stuck at the level of nomenclature. Worthless? If I can move on from this, then even I can't call it worthless, it's still a valuable thing. If I remain here, it is not only worthless, it is a damnable and absurd and utterly defective thing. No degree is a negative if I can move up from it. That's the most important thing, that's the to step away, the ability to move on.

So the biggest difference is the difference between the absolute and the relative, which is actually is the same as the distinction between Auton and Heteron, the distinction arising from the distinction between Absolutum/Auton and Relativum/Heteron, it precedes and supersedes all other distinctions, and belongs to the essence of realisation operations. The total equality between the individual existents, the within its universal scope-and from the point of view of beings-is a blatant nonsense. That is why, from a metaphysical-spiritual point of view, that tries to present this nonsense as reality and to validate it all its consequences is unacceptable. So we do not accept any kind of , any kind of democratism, any kind of liberalism and certainly no kind of communism. These are the most radical anti-metaphysical, anti-traditional and anti-spiritual tendencies. They also have philosophical presentations and political presentations. If one were to say to oneself, that I am an adherent of Vēdānta and a supporter of democracy, would testify to nothing other than the extreme principium disorder in itself, but to this principium disorder by far. Equality is therefore not possible, but unity is very possible. We know that the wisdom of non-difference surpasses the wisdom of distinction, but the wisdom of non-difference can only be reached through the wisdom of distinction. So there is unity. This unity is a disarticulated unity. It is through seeing the differences and transcending the differences that one comes to this supremacy. The seeing of the articulated unity, in which the whole unity prevails as well as the existence of the differences. The articulated unity. A human organism functioning normally, near normality, for example, shows this. (An animal organism too.) A human organism



shows this, a human unit is a structured unit, a unit structured by differences that can be grasped. Not everything has the same function within an organisation. The liver cannot replace the pituitary gland and the pituitary gland cannot replace the liver. It cannot be substituted, it cannot be switched from one to the other, there is a close, intimate relationship between them, because unity implies coherence. Unity implies coherence. It implies the far-reaching recognition of differences, the possibility of transcending, and the unity that transcends differences, and even the transcendence of differences.

In general, intellectual formulations that of the spirit in terms of some kind of general dissipation are unfortunate. It is as if the spirit were penetrating everywhere. This is not the case at all. Spirit is the action, the act of the auton as subject. The auton subject in the act. It is the manifestation, the spirit itself. It is the manifestation, which in philosophical language can also be self-casting, is the spirit. A self-creating action and action of the self as subject is the spirit. The spirit is such is not a , the spirit is not a very subtle substance, but a subject in the act of self-creating. It is a subject centred in the car. This is the spirit. And the more it is a subject, and the more it is an act, and the more , the more it is spirit. This is the spirit. All other approaches in this field are either the result of a deviation or the precursor of a deviation. The two are not mutually , for in someone they can be, and they can be abundantly, both, even together. So the auton and the autoniā transcend not only the body but also the soul and the spirit. It transcends the spirit in the highest sense. Not in the sense of separation, of course. The auton first posits itself as subject, and then as subject it further posits itself, holds itself in act, and this self is in fact the selfFor, apart from sōlipsisism, there is no other legitimate approach form cannot be on this plane. In this respect, we can make temporary concessions, verbal relaxations, but ultimately this is where we start from and this is what we must always return to.

Metaphysics and metaphysical traditionalism are absolutely inseparable from metaphysical realisation. There is an intimacy and interconnection between doctrines and realization that is unlike any other in any plane of existence. The doctrines are a means of tracing a descent: this is the tradition in fact. It may have other functions, but this is its main function and characteristic. This is the doctrine. Again, to use an analogy. It is a very crude, indirect and imperfect analogy, but it can be used to highlight certain realities and truths: the realisation of the descent climbing back up along. This is one possible formulation of the realisation. (There are other formulations.) So it's a backwards way of doing something. To walk backwards through the descent.

We combine this with other forms, such as the one I prefer to associate them with: reduction. In common parlance, reductiō is a reduction of something to something simple and smaller means, reduction. The original meaning of reductiō is not a reduction, but solely and strictly to

feedback. So I am myself who has to be led back. To whom? Myself. I am myself leading my self back to my self by my self and through my self to my self. Why?

Am I not there already? Of course you are. Just not enough. Am I not the same as myself? I'm identical to myself. But still not enough. From a metaphysical point of view, this is the extent of it. unacceptable. I have to go back from myself myself to myself more and more intensely and intensely. Who is the starting point here, the whole process, the goal, the point of return and it is all me being me. There is no other besides me. In this regard, unfortunately, Western adaptations of Eastern teachings demonstrate an ecstatic level of non-understanding. The non-ecstasy of understanding appears. A frenzied celebration of non-understanding, and a flood of utterances. We often encounter the doctrine of "not-me", "there is no me", when it is not really possible to say "there is no me", but only "I am not me". Such as "I am not me, I am an illusion". This is as valid a statement as "the peace camp is invincible." That's about the extent of it. These statements that "The peace camp is invincible" and "Knowledge is a weapon in the fight against the imperialists.." That's it. They are slogans. Slogans in which there is in fact some particular truth, but not there, and not in the way it is used. For example, selfhood as selfhood becomes transcended and becomes only selfhood in such a way that if everything is integrated into selfhood, then there is no distinction of self, and then it is left behind, it becomes transcended. But not so that the experienter of realization disappears.

So reality and illusion. They keep claiming that it's an illusion. Otherwise, countless times I have said that *reālītās illūsōria* is as much to be assumed as *illūsio reālis*. Reality and illusion are not two different things. Reality has illusory nature, and illusion has its real nature. They are all realities. Every reality, every experienced level is reality, but at the same time every experienced level is illusion. Every dream is reality. It does not refer to reality, it is reality. I dream that I am in a meadow I walk among the poppies and then they explain to me: no, you were sleeping there, I saw you. Anyone who says that is a dwarf in need of care. The reality I experience is the only reality. And, when I wake up from my dream of the poppy meadow, I go into a new dream where someone tells me I was lying in bed. When I was walking in the meadow with the flowers: it was a dream and it was real. When I'm informed that I was lying in bed: it was also a dream and reality.

There is an absolute awakening, which Buddhism calls *bōdhi*. Metaphysical awakening is not enlightenment, *illūminātiō* is the lower and intermediate stage. The metaphysical awakening (*redexvigilātiō metaphysica absolūta*) is the awakening from all dreams and all realities. In comparison, what is almost nothing. It is not a denial of what is. Let us examine these questions more carefully: I say that this chalk is real, everyone understands what I have said, and I say that this chalk is illusory (you understand this too) there is no difference between the two. There is no difference that can be practically grasped, interpreted or qualified. That there is, or actually appears to be, but in fact there is not. What is the difference between the two?

Virtually nothing. So, anyone who says such a thing is a hothead because they've heard or read something ,

say, in oriental texts that you don't understand, you don't understand them essentially (even if you read the texts in the original.)

There are "great Eastern masters" who don't understand any of this. Nothing. "Great Eastern masters" like Vivekananda once, or in more recent times, say Osho, that just "my favourites": Punja, Ole Nydahl, Chin Moi. Not only do they not understand enough or zero understanding, but their understanding takes on something of a negative value in this regard. They have a minus value, a negative value of understanding. Total non-understanding is a condition to be cherished in comparison.

Authority means a lot to me. but authority should be authority. Let authority be established, just because it is authority I don't care. I want to see the foundations the foundations by which authority is given to those who are perceived to be. Just because you are an Indian pretty boy, or an Indian big bearded shaggy-haired man, does not make you an authority. None of these things. At some point here a person named Poorna was prowling around. He was a prowler. was rumoured that he was seventy and eighty and two hundred years old, but he didn't look more than forty. Somebody -- sneakily rummaging around -- found your passport. He was actually 35, which is why he looked 40. And, when asked, how old he was, he said, "I won't tell you because I don't want to influence you." So he doesn't want fact that he's so old and he looks young to influence them, because he just wants to influence. And here he' saying, "when I was walking in the garden of the UN with this...", they're like recurring things, how important he is, and how much he gives his word, and how much the world is defined by yōga. As much as it defines him, indeed. Well, Poorna didn't usually drink spirits, but sometimes he did, and he would talk about how he used to cheat women in England, how he used to take a lot of money from them, and then he would lock them in a room and left them... This is from him. Because he rose above it, but he was "sincere." Master... He could be sincere. Here they were shouting around - poor, since deceased, Váradý Hédi - and others, "Swāmi Ji! Give us a teaching!" A bank robber is better in my eyes. Only those who respect them are lower than that. If they are, in a peculiar way, deserving of recognition-- not from my side-- but if they are, their fraudulent, utilitarian qualities would be worthy of mention in this regard. It is, for example, a complete misrepresentation of authority.

Authority must be realistic. So, someone does not tell the truth because he is an authority, but because he always tells the truth, therefore he is an authority. That's why it's authority. I consider him to be an authority because of his professionalism, not because of his authority. This would of course be a long way off, because authority and wisdom recognition and so on, are also very weak. I used to say how much Eastern peoples, for example the Chinese, value the respect for authority that still exists today. And how despicable it is that they have no sense whatsoever of grasping authority realistically. But Mao Tse-tung and I don't know who the authorities are. The respect for authority is a positive in itself in these people, but there is no authority cognition qualities present in them.

DOGMATA PRŌTOKANŌNIKA/DOGMATA PRŌTOCANŌNICA

CRITĒRIA METAPHYSICO-TRĀDITIŌNĀLIA-RELIGIŌNĀLIA

1.

Being and Consciousness— are essentially— one and the same.

"Tötālītās" can be conceived of Being, Consciousness, and first and foremost as a unit of the two, even as a unit of identity.

Being is Consciousness-Being, Consciousness is Consciousness-Being-Consciousness.

2.

Consciousness-Being and Being-By-Consciousness are the combined unity of the "Reālītās Obiectīva", the "Reālītās Āctiōnālis" and the "Reālītās Subiectīva" (i.e. the Subiectum).

The Centre of Consciousness is the Subiectum (Subject) of Consciousness.

3.

The triune unity of Consciousness, Conscious BeingBeing-by-Consciousness (Obiecta, Āctiōnēs, Subiectum) centred in the Subiectum, means true and complete unity.

4.

The ultimate-finite essence of the Subiectum is the Absolūtum Metaphysicum or Metaphysicum Absolūtum.

5.

The Metaphysicum Absolūtum or Absolūtum Metaphysicum and the Supra-Divine Being are one and the same.

6.

The Metaphysicum Absolūtum– Absolūtum Metaphysicum, the ultimate infinite Being of the Subiectum and the Supra-Deity are one and the same.

7.

The Subjectum of Consciousness is I-Myself (Ich-Selbst, Egōmet-Ipsum, 'Egōmper- Auton, 'Aham-Ātmā).

8.

I Myself am the Consciousness-Being, the Centre and Sub-Ectum of Consciousness-Being-Consciousness, but also the Supremacy of the Centre and the Totality of the Whole.

9.

I- Myself– am essentially– or potentiāliter or āctuāliter God, but in my most essential essence I am God-above-Deity.

10.

I am an existent among existents, I am a human among humans, I am a (human) person among (human) persons, but as a "sva-svatva" (self-sovereignty, self-personality, self-personality, self as personality), in the deepest-highest sense, as I-self (I-self), I am one, unique-one.

Existents have "astitā", My-Self as Self- Self- Self ("Sva-Svatvāham-") has "astitā" and "I-ness", or– or more precisely– My-Self as Self- Self- Self I am "ignorance" and "I amness".

11.

The realization of the "Absolūtum Metaphysicum"– is in fact the realization of the "Absolūtum Metaphysicum"–of the I-Myself.

The fulfillment of Supra-Realization-Realization, the Metaphysical Awakening, the Metaphysical Fall, the Metaphysical Liberation— is the fulfillment of the Metaphysical Realization of myself, the Metaphysical Awakening, Fall, Liberation of myself.

This is only possible if Being— is the existential Being and the existential-intrinsic Being ( including the 'two kinds'  
Non-Existence too)— and the potentiālis and actuālis Totality of Consciousness coincide,— further, only that the Subiectuma of Consciousness and Existence— is in its ultimate-finite essence— identical with God, and even with the supra-God.  
Even with Divinity, and beyond, only if I- Myself am the Subiectum, and through it All.

12.

The Realization-Realization of the "Absolūtum Metaphysicum" or " Metaphysicum Absolūtum"— whether I call it Absolūtiō, Redexvigilātiō, Exvigilātiō, Dēflammātiō or Liberātiō, all refer to the I-Myself.

I reduce My-Self to My-Self, by My-Self, through My-Self, as My-Self to My-Self, into My-Self.

This is possible despite the impossibility of "reductiō— . It is the only Absolūt Goal above all goals.

## Liberālism contrā Lībertātem

Man's relationship to freedom is defined by the relationship between the person and the subject. This means that the more the spirit dominates in a man's being, that is, the subject in the act, the "subiectum in actu", the higher and more complete the degree of freedom, and that if the subject is completely in himself, then freedom is absolute and infinite. All other states depend on the intensity of the spirit, on the intensity of the consciousness of the spirit. Accordingly, that which is in man as the subject-bearer

is not conscious, it cannot eo ipso be free, and what the unconscious determines in the sense of a counter-regulation is opposed to freedom its essence. It is distinct from it, distant from it, and opposed to it.

This is why the positions on freedom usually completely wrong, since associate the freedom of man, as a human being in general, with his freedom of movement, or of action, as a human being in a figurative sense. So is not and can never be the case that either the individual human being or a human body or a human collective is free to do or does whatever is consciously actualized in some sense and in some direction.

For that which appears in consciousness as intention is in the vast majority of cases an inferior force, an untransparent force, a heteron force, a very largely alien and inexperienced force in its own right. which can only be experienced, as it were, in its results and its end. And he who lives according to these, without limitation, without supposed limitation, is still far from being free, since the unconscious heteron, thateron, in man, is what paralyses him most, shackles most, and within the determining and regulating, counter-regulating range of these shackles, moves him who perhaps out of intellectual blindness, confuses and mistakes it for freedom.

Liberalism is a view, primarily philosophical or philosophically defined, which bases its principles on the freedom of man, but is not clear about what human freedom is, and sees freedom primarily in the freedom of principles and the free expression of principles.



First, we need to look at this as a way of looking at things in the sense of approaching a bona fide, bona fide worldview. Freedom as I said is essentially spiritual, and outside of spiritual freedom, outside of freedom of the spirit, freedom cannot be understood. The essence of freedom is an autonomy which is the autonomy of consciousness, of subject consciousness, when the subject determines itself, according to its own principles, its existence, its mode of action, according to its own principles, its own fundamental principles, and can carry it out freely and without restriction, because it has all the power. In the concrete human form of existence this freedom is not generally in this way, freedom is therefore not complete freedom, but freedom never means the absence of bondage, it always transcends it, so freedom itself has a meaning of validity and existence even if freedom is not complete. Freedom is always in principle more than the absence of limitation and restriction.

Liberalism, as a principle, is based on the affirmation of freedom and the forced affirmation of freedom, but it does not take into account the motives by which a person, or several persons, interpret, understand, feel, define their own freedom. If freedom is the liberation of instincts, then we must know that there is no freedom here, and there can be no freedom at all.

There is no way, because what is instinct today was once, archaically prehistorically, not even in the context of the dimensions of historical times, will. Autonomous will. The loss of the autonomous will and its degradation into instinct that the role of the subject is here controlled and moved by an alien, other force, removed from the subject, moved by a force separated from the autonomous, which is itself autonomous in its first and ultimate essence, but unrecognized autonomous, and the unrecognized autonomous as a heteron reality, a reality with power, and this reality with power as a pseudo-reality, as a pseudo-reality, as a pseudo-reality. subject becomes a mover, and impulses and forces towards the soul, towards the soul illuminated by the spirit. which appear in the soul, in the spiritual space of consciousness illuminated by the spirit, and in this way they can move man.

It is fundamentally mistaken to think, as a commonplace, that a human being, without any external or so-called internal limitation, when he is engaged in the instinctualis of himself, is free.

It is fundamentally wrong, because freedom non-freedom, limitation, cannot be defined only by the criteria that some limitation prevails or does not prevail, but we must know that every heteronically driven inner process, without any limitation, and even more so if it is unrestricted, limits the subject itself, the subject's being, the existence of man as a subject-bearer.

There are no handcuffs more severe and crippling than the handcuffs of unknown forces. Therefore, if freedom is not interpreted from the side of the spirit, if it is not defined from the side of the spirit, if it is not defined from the side of the spirit.

on a pedestal, then we are doing something against freedom. If one freedom, and this is forcibly assumed, and there is a forcibly forced affirmation of freedom without defining the basic criterion of freedom, then it is just as nature, such as humanism, which seeks to solve man's problems only within a human framework, or tolerantism, which goes beyond the necessary and indispensable tolerance towards all forces and tolerates everything, or pacifism, which even considers the victory of darkness and not only the peace that follows the triumph of light, that is to say, a peace that wants to achieve something at all costs, without clarifying the direction in which it is to be .

This liberalism is not acceptable as a philosophical and, by implication, social-political approach because it does not take into account the very foundations of freedom, what it means and determines it, from what direction it comes and what it liberates. The pure actual assertion of the subject, the spiritual freedom of the autonomous being, or the free invasion of the spiritual consciousness illuminated by the spirit, by some alien force. In the dark age, and this dark age is strongly and increasingly strongly prevailing, it is obvious that the lower and outer and alien and corrupting and subversive versions can always prevail much more than the higher and superior and more inward and centred versions, and that is why, at present, philosophical liberalism is specifically favouring the awakening of dark forces. So freedom at all costs, but it will actually favour the dark forces.

We can add to this that liberalism on the political plane is not even that, because it was a liberalism that was handled in good faith and supposed to be in good faith, and we can say that it dominantly almost exclusively in the service of darkness. Let us add that in concreto liberalism, when it on a political-social plane, is not bona fide, explicitly ill-intentioned and bad faith, explicitly seeking and wanting to set us free in the sense of freedom defined by certain forces and certain circles and representing darkness everything that suits these circles, these circles driven by these dark forces, but it does not want free anything that would not manifest as a favour to these circles driven by these dark impulses. So it's even in bad faith, it narrows freedom down, it conforms and corresponds to what has just been said, i.e. it calls the low-order liberation of power freedom, and subordinates it to various interests.

That is why the liberalism he opposes in the first place is freedom itself. I have given this title to the theme of today's lecture, *liberalismus contrā libertātem*, because liberalism works against freedom above all. It works against human freedom, it works against the fact that the subjectivity manifested in the person can lead itself back to its own pure subjectivity. This is the meaning of the relation of *liberalismus*– *libertās*, metaphysically defined in terms of realization above philosophy. And then in all the derivatives, be they derivatives, so to speak of the freedom of the spirit, so to speak of the freedom of worldviews— these mean, but also historically

has always meant, since it first came up, the free expression of opinions has never meant anything other than the free expression of anti-intellectual and destructive opinions.

It has never meant anything other than that. It can be shown historically that it has always meant this, and it has always been referred to this, and when it has come up, it has never meant anything else.

Free opinion, once upon a time, meant to declare, to make it clear to everyone that there is no God, and no inaudible spiritual soul, and spiritual supremacy, and no a true, valid, and dignified order. These were the great free ideas.

In an era when the eclipse is called the Enlightenment, it is called the Age of Enlightenment, because it can be said in an enlightened way that there is no inaudible spiritual soul, that you are not my being, my existence, my life, has no basis and no purpose that precedes or transcends it, and that man associates with light on basis of a consensus, is far more characteristic of this era. It not only validates darkness, but calls darkness light and light darkness. He calls freedom the bondage, the liberation of principles censored by base interests, the free, so to speak, assertion of these principles. But this liberalism, which is also tolerantist, of course, and utterly intolerant, if one wants, in the sense of the spirit, on the side of the spirit, on the side of order, a world corresponding to the divine hierarchical gradualism, and assumes world, and the affirmation of such a world takes place, then immediately all tolerance and all tolerantism ceases, and immediately all liberalism ceases, and these opinions are no longer allowed to be expressed. opinions must be opposed. The dark ages, not only manipulates darkness, but with these very inversions.

When you talk about the dark ages. The Middle Ages may have been obscure antiquity, but compared to the modern age, and especially the modern age, it was an era of unheard-of brilliance. When he calls something a renaissance, a rebirth, it is in fact the beginning of a process of decay. When he calls reformation that which is connected with the complete loss of the original forms, the true forms, and calls humanism that which, although it tries to solve man's problems, man's great questions of destiny, by human means, but does so against man. This is humanism in this age, in the parlance of age.

And the greatest-degree darkening, when man becomes alienated from his own being. It is not a question here of denying an external God, but of denying the divine basis of his own being, his own being.

denies you, denies you your possibilities. It is denying itself its but still existing possibilities, and this age is called the age of light, the age of enlightenment.

The most important task for man is to reassess everything, everything in the world that surrounds him, to reassess what he has heard from infancy to adulthood, what he hears at home and at school and at work and in his environment, what he hears and what he is surrounded by and what has shaped his views, to reassess these views. There is hardly left that should not be eliminated, in the very sense of destruction. Almost nothing.

Almost without exception, the true principles against which the whole world operates, and the principles of darkness according to which the world is generally defined, and according to which the world is currently is defined by liberalism, in an era steeped in bad faith liberalism. Where everything is given free rein, although this is not the case, and where the principles of the spirit are not explicitly forbidden (sometimes can be shown to be explicitly forbidden), but by every means, using every opportunity, they allow the principles that serve the darkness prevail, or indirectly, but rather directly, or weakly, but rather strongly and more and more strongly.

Everything must be revised, and virtually everything that has surrounded man, spiritually but essentially against the spirit, must be rejected. We are far and infinitely in favour of freedom we are on the side of yes. We accept the assumption and affirmation of infinite and absolute freedom, and regard this alone as our right, but this has nothing to do with the distorted degenerate the concept of freedom promoted by philosophical and especially political liberalism. What I am saying truly free principles, and they have nothing to do with libertarianism.

Liberalism translated into the political social plane, to further underline its bad faith, otherwise strongly pro-prohibitionist and pro-repression, wishing to operate under prohibition and repression. strongly on the side of prohibition, strongly on the side of repression, of paralysis, of silencing. It seeks to silence anything that in any sense deviates from the principles which principles are defined by the proponents of liberalism, as criteria of liberalism, in bad faith and dark intentions. So, not only from a high, very high point of view, from a stifling and anti-freedom tendency, but also in the most common, concrete and general sense.

Traditionalism is radically against liberalism because traditionalism is radically on the side of freedom. It is on the side of freedom, but not on the side of the liberation of darkness, but in the sense of the universal and spiritual liberation of being, leading back to the absolute, it wants to be free, it wishes to be free, it accepts this freedom, it considers this freedom, it declares itself on this side.

Yes, freedom, liberty, must be elevated above all else. The freedom, the consciousness, the willpower, the spiritual power, the supremacy and supremacy of the subject over all. Order, orderliness. Which is the condition for the realization of freedom.

In the vortex of the dark forces, the possibility of realising freedom is almost nil. Those forces at the human level, which generally shape the world, generally shape human existence, are not forces working in the interests of man, they are anti-human. They are anti-human, anti-consciousness, anti-spiritual, anti-freedom. All the generally raised idea of freedom, its very nature, is always and primarily opposed to true freedom.

I've spoken on several occasions about how ridiculous and pathetic it is when someone says they can do whatever they want. What is meant by this is that he considers the free exercise of his unconscious powers to be what he wants. In this, what he wants is virtually absent. To will, and to freely will, and to freely act. This can only be done from the centre, from the subiectum in actu, from the subject in the act, the subject positing itself, that is, from the spirit. This spirit, when it realizes its own freedom through the through being as much yourself as possible, and this, to truly understood, must be transformed into the first person singular, and it must be said that if I am fully , then I am infinitely and absolutely I am free in a sense. But if there some alien force at work within me, some unconscious energy, force, mover, inexperienced dominance, then there is no freedom within the terrain where it can operate. This is true for both the individual and the collective, freedom on the side of spirit, spirit is on the side of freedom, the two inseparable, and one cannot speak of a spirit that is not free, nor of a freedom that is not spiritual. the sense of.

Spirit, not an infinitely refined substance, but subiectum in actu, the subject in act, the subject in the act , and the more , and the more it is subject, and the more it is in that, the more it is spirit, and that is the meaning and essence of spirit. Spirit is light from the other side, it the consciousness that it creates, spiritual space.

The spiritual space is realized by the spirit of itself and in itself, and is illuminated by it, and either all the spirit, and then freedom is total, or not all, then freedom is also a reality, but in those areas where it cannot prevail in terms of experience, there is some alien force works, and the freedom to liberate the foreign power is not in fact freedom, and the foreign forces, always works against freedom, creating a stronger bondage than any other external or internal bondage.

Precisely because it is a libertarian approach in the philosophical and bona fide sense of liberalism, because it wants freedom at all costs, it does not look at the origins of this freedom, and because it the chances of the liberation of darkness in the age of darkness are always immeasurably greater than the free reign of light, and therefore liberalism at all levels, from the philosophical, to the its bona fide perception, but in its political, social and very bad faith versions, must be .

The rejection of liberalism is an organic part of a view of being based on metaphysical traditionalism. Without it, one cannot speak of traditionalism in the strict sense of the word, one cannot speak of metaphysical traditionalism, one cannot speak of the affirmation of light while also wanting to liberate the darkness, or even not wanting to liberate it, but making concessions to such attempts.

Spiritual order is limiting. But the spiritual order works for the realisation of absolute freedom, and it restricts for that purpose. This restriction is not a restriction of the forces of darkness, not a restriction from their side, but a restriction of these very forces.

The man who works on the transmutation of himself following an inward path, following a true sacral asceticism, is the man who does what he does for freedom. For oneself. For the reduction of the self, into the self, for freedom. And in doing so, as an ascetic mosaic, he is limiting himself, but also the alien force, the heteron force, operating within himself. In order to achieve freedom, it restricts, restrains, limits, reduces, eliminates.

This is the meaning of freedom and the realisation of freedom.

Here is one more context to talk about. In relation to freedom and the breaking of shackles, the traditional understanding also takes a symbolic stand. There are two kinds of servants ( this word I use it, because the word for the dreaded Hungarian slave, the word foreboding slave, is completely unknown outside the Hungarian language in this sharpness). So there are two kinds of slaves. One who is a sui generis slave, who by its very nature, genuinely is, and if it rebels and breaks its shackles, this breaking of shackles is illegitimate. If he who is not in his essence a slave, and in his essence free, and his essence of the mentality of the ruler has to rebel, it has to break its shackles, and this rebellion and this breaking of shackles is legitimate and spiritually recognizable.

The more spiritual someone is, the more something has to do with it, and the more legitimate it has to do with true freedom. Representing the dark forces, liberating the dark forces is like destroying a flood control dam, it is like allowing polluting tides to become unrestricted. That is why they cannot be understood from the point of view of freedom. Freedom presupposes autonomy. But freedom is not the heteronomy of instincts, which we call autonomy, autonomy is the autonomy of the spirit, the autonomy of the auton. The heteronomy of darkness may be called autonomy, but it works against freedom, as well as against formulation, but especially, as a practice, against reason, and against the autonomy of logonomy

For autonomy is logonomy, the rule of the logos, the rule of the autonomous, the rule of the spirit, the rule of the supra-intellectual intellect. The dominion of the intellect over the sub-intellect.

These are all concepts and values and value systems that can be applied to freedom.

We are always in favour of freedom, but always and only in favour of true freedom, *libertās*. And we want to protect the *libertās* from liberalism. We want to protect it from false freedom. A "sabbatical principles" that liberate darkness. An offensive that comes from the dark heteron the heteron the dark heteron. We want to protect it from an attack. Freedom, our Self, our Self, our Alany.

Northern Crown I.

Man, society, state

In the sense of the traditional view of being and existence, we have to speak in a completely different approach both of man, the state and society, than is the approach taken by contemporary conceptions and perspectives that consider these three separately or in their interrelationships at all.

The traditional view of being - a view of being based on metaphysics, which traces all its propositions, general concepts and judgments back to a Principium Principiorum beyond nature - is completely looks differently at those aspects of a person's life that link him or her in one way or another to a collective.

The collectivum in which one lives or can live can be collectivum sacrum (collectivum sacrale), where the Spirit touches the individual in a "sacramental" way and touches the collective of people. In most cases, however, this is not the case, but the opposite. collectivum profanum. This means that people are being forced to live in a sacrality-less - even anti-sacrality - internal orientation and external orientation, for goals which have no transcendental aspect and which do not go beyond the more intimate - biological - human life, in the sense of life conception to biological death.

The collectivum profanum is characterised by the fact that its goals are devoid of transcendentalism, they are essentially goals that have no meaning for the individual after the death of the individual. If one tries to link this to the thesis that, although these goals do not make sense for the individual, they do make sense for the collective, one must say that conception is invalid, since the perspectives of the collective and the perspectives of the individual must in fact coincide. We are not demanding a complete identity, but a without which neither individual life nor collective life - within a normal framework - can be conceived or imagined. It cannot be said that "although my life is coming to an end, my work, my activity, has a meaning beyond my life". This is an extremely flat, banal, rational - in fact, sub-rational - and sentimental setting of the relationship between man and his own future, and the relationship between the individual and the collective. If one tries to approach this question in a real way - not in a contemplative, not meditative way, not in the sense of a higher approach, simply with a few moments of self-observation - one immediately realises that should come to the conclusion that there is no sense in any goal which is clearly based on the assumption that the individual is extinguished in death; - or which is based on the assumption that, although the individual is not extinguished in death, but its survival is automatic and necessary.

In order for man - the individual - to survive after death, he must pass through his life in such stages, must achieve such degrees, must endure such trials, that he is able to experience the trauma and crisis of death with a truly conscious self-consciousness and self-awareness.



The collective can only be *collectivum sacrum* if it creates the conditions for for all its members, if each of the individuals who make up the collective is committed to self-realization.

and if the individual can see a sacral framework for self-realisation in the collective, if he wants a sacral framework and realises a sacral framework in it.

The modern world marked by antitraditionalism. The modern world is opposed to what is sacral, what is traditional, what is spiritual, what is divine, what is sacred, what is about self-abandonment - the individual level, at the collective level. The extinct individual in the collective of the extinct can only do something as long as he can be called a living human being, and can only do something truly worthwhile if he lifts himself out of the determinations of his own extinct nature - out of the circle of his own conditioning. Only in this way can he make a movement in the direction of a movement in which the collective that includes and receives him also moves in some sense and in some to the extent of its position, the orientation assumed in this position is in fact one of destruction.

\*

The original meaning of the state is higher than the original meaning of society. The ancient *collectivum sacrum* was related to the *status sacralis* (*status traditionalis* or *status spiritualis*) and *societas sacralis* (*societas spiritualis*).

In the dichotomy of the sanctified society and the sanctified state, the sanctified state is superior.

If you look at the Word itself, in Latin, *status state*, and also *state*, standing, grounded, established. Rome's god-king is Jupiter Stator, the stopping Jupiter, the state-making Jupiter, the state-establishing Jupiter, the one who stops things their tracks. The state is always linked to the axis, the with two poles and a centre; the axis is that around which the movement flows, around which it can direct and control the movement by maintaining itself at rest, rest, at rest, in a state beyond states - in the original sense of the state.

The Sovereign is more than the state. The state is that in which the Sovereign manifests himself. The state is axial - that is, axial -, polar - that is, defined by the poles - and central - that is, central. It is axiality, polarity and centrality that are the basis of the state and at the same time the

the symbol of the state; - and that in which the Sovereign and Ruler who holds power manifests himself. Let us add that at present there are no states in the traditional - that is, original and real - sense: there is not a single true state in the world today. There are imitations of anti-state states, those in which the apparatus statialis - the state apparatus - operating in the state seems to exist independently of the state. There is a real state apparatus, but there is no real state.

It is obvious that the state in the original sense of the word - and not in the original sense we can speak of a state in fact - certainly not "an oppressive organ in the hands of the ruling class", as the hideous and paralytic Lenin claimed. Even the state apparatus is not an oppressive organ - provided it serves a normal state. If the state apparatus without the state does not serve a normal state, it is not "an oppressive organ in the hands of the ruling class", but an oppressive and manipulative organ in the hands of circles of dark forces. This is, in fact, what is happening today: there are apparatuses, but no state.

It should be that in the present there is no ruler - much less a state. Accordingly, in the present there is no people in the original sense. Instead, we find a conglomerate, an anti-sacral set of people - a distorted collective.

This distorted state apparatus, so to speak, democratically governs the collective - based on the rule of the people. The Greek word for demonos is distant, although it has a real connection with daimon, the demon, which in the Dark Ages means a connection with kakodaimon, evil demonicity of darkness.

We stress that democracy can be dictatorial or liberal-parliamentary without further ado. It has been said that the dictatura democratica proposed in China is a wooden spoon - but that is not the case. Democracy does not in any way imply equality, equality of rights or freedom. Democracy means only it is supposedly ruled by the people - the demos.

Looking deeper, however, it becomes clear that in fact in any democracy the people do not rule. It is not the demon that rules, or indeed that does not rule at all, but rather that it is ruled by the entanglements of dark forces which form a specific relationship - a kind of correspondence - with the lowest - instinctively moving - your needs. This does not mean that the needs moving at the instinctual level are satisfied, but that the needs moving at the instinctual level are responded to in some way; satisfaction, non-fulfilment, the

denial, the different possibilities of denial are represented by the demon. So they react to the demons, and the demons react to the measures.

It goes without saying that Greek democracy does not in any sense correspond to the principles derived from traditionalism. Although the Greek - Athenian - democracy is based on the difference between heaven and earth

separates it from what is democracy as we know it today, even Greek - Athenian - democracy does not to the original traditional approach. Obviously, the darkest claims of the demons dark and terroristic dictatorships that have a correspondent relationship but do not meet these needs do not meet the requirements of traditionalism. I repeat, a democracy can be dictatorial, even terrorist in character, and it can be liberal-parliamentary - and both are products of anti-traditionalism. On a traditionalist basis, it can never either dictatorial or accept democracy in the terrorist sense, nor liberal-parliamentary democracy.

The word of the majority decides, says the view that quantity rules. The Dark Ages - as it follows from all traditionalist principles, as defined by the formulators of traditionalism, and as René Guénon, for example, has very blatantly stated - are the era of the rule of. An era of quantity, not quality. Those who rely on quantity introduce pseudo-quality. Even in a world of quantity, there must be a residue of quality, and the in the world of the quantitative approach, this is the qualitative residue (pseudo-qualitative pseudo-residue): the majority. "The majority decides!" is what children when there are five of them. It's said by a country, it's said by a continent, and it's said by a World - as a principle to be followed.

In *The Invisible Story*, Béla Hamvas writes - very aptly - that the masses do not go away, as the bonafide sociologist Le Bon believed. The crowd: the satanic idiot. A satanic idiocy in the crowd and the majority. If democracy is not ruled by cliques but by is really the demon itself, democracy is still demonic, dark and satanic. Democracy is always based on what is dark, satanic, blind, manipulable and changeable in the masses. In fact, there is no crowd and no principle that cannot be accepted if manipulated and communicated to the crowd for a sufficient period of time.

Gradually everything becomes acceptable - everything without exception. And in the short term, the opposite of everything, and the opposite of that - again in a different direction.

Let it be that both real and pseudo-democracy are clear, cardinal and combative manifestations of anti-traditionalism. Let it be said that all liberal-parliamentary and all terrorist-dictatorial forms of democracy are also - in agreement with the foregoing

— an anti-traditional, anti-spiritual, destructive, destructive social and state formation, opposed to man and life, but even more so to the supernatural and the Spirit.

It is self-evident that - and this is a fundamental traditionalist thesis - the only form of statualis that corresponds to traditionalism is: monarchy alone; kingship, empire, principedom — that is, the monarchies. No other form of state can be imagined or conceived that would be in line with traditionalism. Statual formations that do not explicitly contradict traditionalist principles are possible, but monarchy is in fact the only appropriate form of government.

The early phase of the Golden Age was called the Abasileia - meaning 'kinglessness'. From this fact, the anti-traditionalist spirit might well deduce that the most ancient state was in some way opposed to monarchy. This would be a misconception, because in the abasileia period everyone was king, everyone was king, and therefore there was not necessarily a need for an honoured king. It also meant a human collective, all members of which were above caste, and even the was at the height of caste supremacy. In such circumstances, it is not of decisive importance whether there is honoured monarch or no monarch. In the case where not everyone is at the peak of caste supremacy - and most people in the present age already near the nadir of caste supremacy - there can be no to that the monarchy makes no sense. The only reason for monarchy in the present it does not make sufficient sense that the vast majority of people are no longer worthy to live in a monarchy. The majority are unworthy and unfit to form a collective equivalent to a monarchy, to form the collective of a state equivalent to a monarchy.

The Dark Age lacks the sacral king, the sacral Ruler, whose highest level was once the God-King. Then came the more strictly sacral king - the king touched by the divine chrism, who had a mandate from the Sky. Finally, the king by grace of God, and then the king in whom this kingdom by the grace of God was in some way still manifested - even if only also faded, partial, relative. Then that too disappeared, and then - at the same time, and in a certain sense even before that - the collective and the people that had the king's and under the guidance of those worthy of it, manifested itself as a demonic hieros. The hieros demos is the people who have indirectly, through the Sovereign, sanctification; and this people is disappearing, perhaps has already disappeared, in our time.

However, even today, monarchy is the only valid form of government. In relative sense, because there is no real state. There are only fakes of the real state - with their apparatus. Nevertheless, if something at least analogous to the real state were to be created, then this would only be conceivable in a monarchical framework. If there is no king, if there is no one who has been elevated to the rank of king by a celestial chrism, then at least a regent (in its original pronunciation: regens) should step forward who approaches this dignity to some extent, and who, as long as the true and

the worthy Ruler does not come - perhaps only in a future world-era - as a substitute for the actual Ruler. The regent - or even more so the regnator - could replace the king as ruler. There is no there are many possibilities in the present, but this is the only direction in which to think.

\*

At this point we have to mention a very important point: the question of whether or not the state and the church (any church) can be separated. In response to this, 99% of self-professed spiritual people say that the two should be separated. Yet this approach is completely anti-spiritual. The state and the church can never and must never be separated. Separation means: to deprive the church of the statual and to deprive the statual of all that the church represents - the Spirit and divine. This separateness should never arise.

However, as we have said, there are no real states in the present time. (If we want to make very big concessions, we can say that there are no real states.)

the apparatus statualis gives the impression of a state, but there is only an apparatus, no state. And the Church certainly cannot be subjected to the apparatus, nor can the apparatus be subjected to the Church. In the present day, therefore, a certain separation makes sense, but when we say this - and even before we say it - we have to interpret and interpret this situation: why the two cannot be intertwined today in the way that would otherwise be normal.

Part of the issue is that the church is very little church in the present day. This fact underlines the fact that the church cannot be subordinated to the state apparatus - the state apparatus without the state. If the situation were normal, then the state and the church would be in organic symbiosis with each other - in inseparable synbiosis.

If the state is really the state and society is really society, then society is guarded by the state. If society is really society - that is, if it is an organic society - then the state is also in symbiosis - but in such a way that the primacy of the state in this symbiosis is preserved.

\*

The question arises as to whether the totalitarian state has any legitimacy. Let us say that the organic state, the status organicus, is superior to the total state - infinitely superior. The status totalis is also acceptable, provided that the status totalis is organic. So we consider the organically total state which is organically cathagological () in its leadership and orderliness, and organically anagogical (bottom-up) in its aims.

totalitarianism - there is an inorganic and anagogical leadership, and an inorganic and cathagological orientation. These are formations driven by lower forces or guided by the advocacy (or advocacy) of lower forces. In these imitation states, the most subversive aims of the lower forces are taken up and represented by cliques of 'lawyers' - regardless of whether or not this is appropriate for the broad masses. No real value could ever be expressed in these goals. For a crowd can determine (as the lowest man can determine) what is currently

what is, let's say, most pleasant for him, but what is most positive for him, he cannot say; - and the two are not at all the same. He can determine what is most pleasant. If he wants to eat, for example, he wants to eat - everybody knows that, and a collective can know that. If you don't have money, you want more money. But what is positive for him, at all

you don't know - you haven't the faintest idea. What is positive transcendental perspectives; — and when I say "also", I am making a concession, because in fact it only has transcendental perspectives. What the actual positives are cannot be determined by someone whose life is not dominated by transcendentalism.

It is obvious - and we must not fail to stress this - that liberal-parliamentary democracy contrasted with terrorist and dictatorial forms are not the solution. Even in these, the demands of the people are taken up in the sense of advocatio. These demands are not met, but they are responded to in some way.

Suppose that the people's demands were really met, and that the ideal democracy (the one that has never been) would one day be established in the world, when it is not manipulated by anything, money or otherwise. would possibly be the most terrible formation that man has ever experienced on earth. For it would be totally anarchistic. When so-called freedom is taken to the extreme, it is always anarchist, therefore always terrorist. And if freedom is suppressed to the extreme, it is always terrorist. The enhancement and suppression of liberty eventually leads to the same conclusion, because there is a Dark Age, because the world and man are in a darkened state.

In Abasileia, man, whether dominated or not, remained in a state of light. Today, there either the terror of an apparatus dictatorship, or, at the other extreme, an anarchistic terror; - and there is practically no difference between the two.

Society can be organic only if it is dominated by an organic - even organically total - state, and society can be an organic society only if it is hierarchically structured; we can say that in the sense of a hierarchical gradualism - a hierarchical gradation of existence tagged.

Of course, this approach is the exact opposite of the one that has been instilled in modern man from infancy. But this should not in the least prevent us from principles which are valid principles, principles which are completely disregarding the way in which man has been manipulated during his life.

Originally (which always means at least in a state closer to the origin, to archaicity, if not in archaicity itself) man was a physical-spiritual-mental-individual unit in which the correspondence of hereditary heredity on the physical plane, of spiritual and inter-incarnational heredity and of transcendental origins was perfectly harmonious. Originally, everyone incarnated where he was meant to incarnate according to his being. This

in a sense it still the case, but then they were clear and precise formulas. So, a Brahmin family would have an incarnation of someone who met the Brahmin

never incarnated elsewhere, and those who incarnated there could never have been elsewhere. This was equally true of the ksatriya, the vaisya, the sudra, the chandala. Each one was incarnated physically, mentally, spiritually into the place that best suited him as his physical-spiritual-spiritual vehicle. Everyone was incarnated where he or she was meant to be - and these were pure formulas.

Today, a Brahmana in his being - although there are not many of them today, but let's say a potential Brahmana - may incarnate in terrible circumstances, because in some way, because of the particular distribution of obstacles and advantages, it may be somewhat beneficial to him. But it is no longer a pure formula. In fact - according to the particular karmabandha texts - everyone is now incarnates where it belongs, but this is no longer with pure formations. So it is conceivable, that if there are five brothers and sisters in a family, one of them is a potential brahmana, one is a potential ksatriya, one is a potential vaisya, one is a quasi-sudra and one is actually panchakha. If one more there a sixth brother, it could be an Avarna. Today this is perfectly conceivable, but in the age of organic correspondences such a thing would have been impossible.

It should not be forgotten for a moment that the Brahmanic principle or the Kshatriya principle is as valid today as it ever was - they are not a shade less valid. It is the clarity about the carriers that is lost. It means that the manifestation framework of the castes is wavering. These frameworks have been profoundly shaken for a very long time, since the time of the historical Buddha - that is, some 2500 years ago, around the critical year 510 (-509) BC. This does not mean, for example, that the castes in India today

2500 years have passed and they are still valid. Although it is generally possible that Brahmins are now very little Brahmins, at the same time the fifth

However, potential Brahmins are still hard to find among those associated with the lower classes. The higher ones have slipped down, and the lower ones have also slipped further and not moved up.

\*

West - meaning west of the southeast of the pyramid of Kheops or Hufu (this is the by the way, the Tropic of Capricorn also passes through St Petersburg) - in a sense, it is indeed the part of the world associated with the setting and the setting of the sun, the part where the Dark Ages are earlier than elsewhere. The Dark Ages, of course, everywhere, in the West, the East, the North, the South, but still, in the West, they are earlier.

In the West, the pure caste formations have been faltering almost since prehistoric times. Their remains but they were still present for a long time, sometimes as quite high level remnants. The Roman patricians, for example, were the descendants of a caste members were both Brahmanas and Kshatriyas, and represented an extremely exalted and ancient, deeply archaic unity - faded and degraded, but not at all undeservedly so. The majority of the patricians who were representatives of the gens - the founding dynasties of Rome - (these were sharply distinguishable from the later, appointed patricians), represented this origin to some extent; - not all, and not always, and not necessarily, but to some extent undoubtedly.

Castes cannot be artificially created. Yet it can be argued that the European, the ancient-medieval-medieval- modern bourgeoisie was to some extent and in some sense a faded state. The warrior nobility showed some association with kshatriya, and the clergy also showed a tenuous association with brahmana.



While some priests (and in this case the monastic clergy) did represent something of a Brahminical nature, and there were some quite outstanding personalities among them - though few - this not allow for a true hereditary caste formation.

The fact that priestly celibacy was made compulsory is the result of a confusion of the two principles. It is a gifted fusion of pontifical priestly qualities and monastic qualities: the monastic priesthood (the monastic priesthood). But this cannot necessarily and necessarily be extended to the priesthood as a whole. If priests marry only from priestly families, then these families might have characteristics (albeit vague and secondary) that would have provided a more appropriate basis for people with priestly qualifications in terms of incarnations. It is true that a priesthood in this sense would have been very poorly representative (even as a faded late version) of the original Brahmana, but it might still have produced some approximation - probably very slight. And here we must note that in the fact that the non-monastic clergy could not marry, we must detect an anti-traditional intervention, the operation of an intention that there should not be a Brahmin caste even in imitation form - even a pale imitation.

However, there was an opportunity in the West to combine the ascetic way of life and the chivalric way of life tied together. In this chivalrous-ascetic line, which few represented, there was the possibility and the orientation to restore the original caste supremacy. There was no other social group that actually had this potential, except the chivalrous-ascetic guidelines. And it is this policy that they have tried to push to the background the most, even when it had some kind of real relevance, or today, when it has no real effectiveness - only at some kind of downgraded charitable level. It is worth remembering, for example, that Pope John Paul VI. Paul's immense dislike and hatred of the Knights of Malta. Especially from John XXIII onwards, the popes have had an aversion anything that truly represents any high order.

\*

At this advanced stage of Kali-Yuga, society can no longer be led back to itself - that is, to its own organicity. But it is still possible to awaken in people an illuminative opportunities that mark out the direction in which the world and man should be led. There is not much practical hope of achieving the right destination, but there are definitely still some possibilities.

As we have said on several occasions, all necessary steps must be taken in a certain direction, even if its success does not seem at all assured. For these steps can be valuable in terms of an inner and personal - but - ambition. They are more likely to be unsuccessful in the external world, but if one follows an inward path and chooses as an outward path - as if ritually - make a difference in the world, then one's efforts - in the face of external failure notwithstanding - can lead to some kind of internal progress. There is no more to it, and that - it seems - is not enough. Very little, of course, compared to the highest goals that can be set. But compared to what can be done at all in Kali-Yuga, it is not too little.

One has to do everything, whether there is hope of realisation or not, and if one follows inner spiritual path, one can - at least this inner path - make progress.

Some comments on the current possibilities and needs of restoration Era paradigms

When political restoration on a historical scale is raised as a question, as a problem, the first real question that is outlined is what restoration paradigms to choose.

Obviously, the first step is to go back to the 1944-45 time line; that time, when Hungary was not yet Soviet occupation, or not fully under Soviet occupation. If there were any possibility of this, we should do it as a first step.

We have other and more far-reaching retrospections, the consequences of which would of course require a much more substantial transformation. One of these is the period before the outbreak of the First World War, again as an opportunity that could be, should be, restored - in the event that transformations were taking place on a world scale that would make this possible.

Another valid fall-back option - within the framework of this historical retrospective - is a return to the pre-1867 situation.

To think about a restoration of the foundations, you have to go back to the period before 1846-47. In fact, the period 1847 and before

was the one in which the remnants of the traditional empire, residually traditional Hungary, the traditional empire as a whole and traditional Europe could still be raised. We know that there was a party in 1847 under various names, and that they wanted to assert their point of view before 1867 and in 1867. Hungarian political life was organised along these lines. Although, unfortunately, this type of restoration was then no longer

was feasible, but more should have been done.

If one were to come to a truly interesting, truly valuable and truly crucial choice of retrospections, and would examine what happened in 1919 after the collapse of Bolshevism in Hungary, what counter-revolutionary demands were, which were otherwise justifiable, then you would have to say that there was something in which this counter-revolution was deficient. For a counter-revolution should not restore the conditions that immediately preceded the revolution, but should rather step back, look much higher and much deeper, and penetrate much deeper. The counter-revolution in Hungary - in our eyes, indeed, in many respects downright counter-revolution - unfortunately, it did not even want to return to the situation before the revolution, but adopted and promoted ideas that would not have been possible without the revolution. It would have been immersed. In this respect, we must highlight the idea of the so-called free election of kings. The idea of the free election of kings was already in a certain sense linked to the revolutionary situation, and drew its inspiration from it, although a restoration of the pre-revolutionary situation would have been insufficient. After the collapse of Bolshevism in 1919, 1847 should have been proclaimed, at least at the level of aspiration, as a slogan, as a principle: that there should be a state of affairs that corresponded to the status quo of 1847. This, although it should have appeared, at least at the level of ideas, unfortunately did not appear in any sense, in any context.

If there were any possibility of transformation, the status quo of 1847 would have to be declared; adding that in the restorationist ideological retrogression (backward regression), 1847 could not be stopped. Increasingly, one would have to go back in time; not to restore exactly what was that period, but to make it a reality, to have an ideal that

could use these older, even medieval, conditions as a quasi-paradigm in the event of a possible transformation, in order to - *mutatis mutandis* - take account of the conditions of the time in which they conditions as renovative adaptations and - optimally - to be implemented. What could really be considered as a model to follow is a contemporary adaptation of the Middle Ages, of medievalism. We cannot, in fact, be content with a kingdom, a monarchy or even a monarchy on a European scale, but we should also restore the state-social-ownership structures that were typical of the Hungarian context in 1847 and before. Such a neo-feudal adaptive restoration of feudalism could be such example, and above all.

With the reduction and abolition of feudalism, the spirit of the modern age, with its already declining movements, showed an extremely rapid downward trend. Where feudalism, combined with absolute monarchy frameworks are restrained and diminished, the sustaining and shaping power of the generally effective spirituality is , or at least diminished to the point of becoming increasingly unvaluable.

The immediacy of the spirit is not a function of all this, but from the point of view that the spirit is a The extent to which the life of a country, an empire, a society is influenced by the existence or absence of the synthesis of absolute monarchy and monarchy of order is cardinal. Direct spirituality means direct experience of experience, which is determined by the nature of the state-society structure may not fundamentally affect it, but it is of crucial importance in life, in the life of the world, in the life of Europe, in the life of a possibly restored monarchy, in the life of a country, of a society, these principles of existence, the existence of these centralised and at the same time hierarchically structured realities, and what this existence is like, whether it exists, and if so, how artificial it is, how truly alive in a supernaturally irradiated way. This has far-reaching, if indirect, negative or positive significance for the spirit.

As Kali-Yuga progresses, these possibilities naturally approach zero. Yet we start from the assumption that some global transformation has revealed a possibility from which restoration can be achieved. Far be it from us to be naive: we know that this is hardly possible. Yet we must start from the assumption that there is some possibility may arise, and we need to think deeply about what we could and should do if it does arise. If we achieve only a hundredth of our stated objectives, we have achieved a hundredth, but our needs in this respect should be at least relatively maximised. We do not want to take only a small step, because to take a small step requires a series of steps over a huge distance. To go back to the 1944-45 frontier, it may be necessary to take a conquest pre-modern times a goal, and the ideality of times that can be defined on the border between the Middle Ages and antiquity as a goal, in order to some step towards the renovative and adaptive aiming at restoring.

Obviously, we would also be happy if the situation at the end of 1944 or 1939 were restored, especially in comparison with the situation today. But we also need to look at what is actually and what is, in some ways, something happy about. In some ways, perhaps even a temporary to the situation in 1947 might be welcome, although this is already a was a profoundly dark and utterly sinful era. The characteristics of 1944 and 1939 would be very and definitely welcome, or even the 1930s, or the quasi-return to the period between 1867 and 1914; not because they were really adequate periods, but because they would be an experience of relief, above all in comparison with the present.

However, as we have already noted, we would have to go back at least to 1847 for an approximation, a partial achievement of an adequate situation. At that time, although the traditional structures of domination, power and hierarchical principles were already crackling in their gutters, they were still in place, more or less in a functioning state. Their purity and integrity could not remain, since after the French Revolution of 1789, life in Europe was no longer really normal. could have survived and not been created. The English Revolution had already spoiled a great deal, as had the period around the Reformation, but until 1847 the situation in the Austro-Hungarian Empire as a whole, and in Hungary within it, was relatively - even from a higher point of view - was acceptable. In the spring of 1848 and afterwards, everything changed in the direction of deterioration, and even if certain respects - from the end of 1849 onwards - power returned to itself, the situation, although consolidated again, was in many respects no longer really adequate: very many things that had existed in 1847 - though not in perfect harmony and not in perfect security - were eliminated after the revolution and the internal war. In the 1860s, the - by us also very much - in the Revolution and Revolutionary War and the Revolution and the Revolutionary War were no longer in existence.

respected conservatives also saw that, in practice, it was no longer possible to restore the situation to a much earlier date than 1847, but they stubbornly and rightly stuck to 1847. Unfortunately, this insistence was no longer tenable in principle in 1870. The conservative principles had been in place for about 3 years

gradually disappeared between 1867 and 1870. Some people still wrote about it in their memoirs, some still talked about it, but this ideology was no longer a real political force.

\*

The possibilities are now immeasurably smaller they were then, but if we want to create a principled foundation for ourselves, it can only be a maximized foundation in our needs, in our paradigm choices and in the very mindset that defines the whole of our aspirations. This is what we want. What can we achieve from this? Maybe nothing, maybe very little. a little. But if we do not set this as a goal, then under no circumstances can we achieve anything valid. Along the lines of very little possibility, yet knowing all that we need to know, we trust, as it were, and we think, we define ourselves, our aspirations, in such a way as to designate the attainment and realization of these high goals. This is the paradigm.

To create something similar and not exactly what it was, because you can't change it to that extent everything as if nothing had happened since then. Therefore, we are not talking about a medieval restoration or a restoration of an older era, but an adaptive appropriation. The paradigm will mean what can be made of it as an adaptation, with a lot of changes, but the most important determining factor is the while respecting principles.

You might not use the word "refeudalization" in preparing a refeudalization, you probably wouldn't use the term serfdom, but the essence of it, not that serfs can move or not move, but its most basic characteristics should be retained and adapted to the framework of the present, to the conditions of the present.

From this point of view, the restoration paradigm choice of the spiritually oriented ultra-right- is an essential part of the ultra-conservative approach, and it is in this sense that our political demands should be defined and outlined.

Northern Crown  
II.

A disappearing state, a disappearing society, a disappearing people

According to spiritual and metaphysical traditions, in the world - the world of man and the world of nature a dark age is , and this dark age is coming to an end in an even darker era. The darkness that characterises and pervades the present is not a mere sinking. On the one hand sinking, dimming, diminishing, a fall in the intensity of mental alertness, but more than that

is actually much more. Darkness is not just the absence of light. Darkness is an active force that pervades and poisons this age, and poisons it in such a way that wherever one looks - whether one's own towards his soul or towards the world, he should always and everywhere encounter this active darkness. This active darkness primarily affects man's spiritual structure, primarily attacks him from within. At the same time, the outside world provides a support for this attack and attack, providing the necessary conditions for the dark forces. A veritable offensive is launched against man's spiritual and mental life, an offensive which is supported by both the world of the "body" and the outside world.

The Dark Ages affect both the human individual and the human collective. In fact, the conditions of traditionalism were already breaking down at the beginning of the final phase of the dark age - the Kali-Yuga. The beginning of the concluding phase of the Kali-Yuga can be dated to 4182 BC (= -4181), 3102 BC (= -3101) and 2022 BC (= -2021), and these dates must be understood - according to different aspects - as the beginning of 'historicity' in the strictest sense. In the process from these beginnings the present, a particularly great and increasingly rapid eclipse began in the eighth, seventh, sixth and fifth centuries BC. This latter the world was still a traditionally dominated world, but since then, through a long gradual process, even this traditional domination has disappeared.

The traditional regulation of the world still existed in the historical Middle Ages, although it had been greatly reduced compared to earlier periods. In fact, it was only in the modern era that dark-antitraditional forces opposed to the traditional world were able to take over.

We have to see that when the forces of darkness take over the world, they have already taken over the human soul. If the spiritual and mental conditions for this takeover were not present in man, the outside world, through its influences, would not be able to carry out the total darkening of the world and of man.

So the spiritual and mental conditions of darkness and poisoning were already present before the modern age.

The new era is clearly one of extreme anti-traditionalism. This antitraditionalism is characterised by the denial, or the , or the substitution of something for the main traditional guiding principles. This substitution is made by something which is either obviously contrary to the traditional principles , although not apparently completely contrary is nevertheless

works as the opposite of traditionalism. The forces opposed to tradition are those which have most often been challenged by traditionalist principles, which are quite generally - "inside and outside" and at all levels — had a decisive role in the earth-human world. One such principle is hierarchy. The denial of hierarchy, its disruption, subversion, confusion and all that — beyond the denial in principle, it took place in practice, it had to take place because that was the intention of the forces spreading anti-traditionalism in the world.

All inner and outer orders have an organic and organically hierarchical nature. 'Hierarkhiā' is literally a compound of hieros and 'arkhiā, and it means sacred dominion, a sacred order of dominion. This sacred order of rule is gradual, that is, gradual: hierarchy is expressed in a graduality. With regard to this graduality, we must state most emphatically that two beings can neither coincide when symbolized horizontally nor be fully equal according to a measure symbolized by a vertical.

It is primarily the hierarchical - gradual - nature of states and stages of consciousness that can be expressed symbolically along a verticality. From this gradation of consciousness follows all other hierarchical structures of the world. The hierarchical gradualness of states of consciousness is, moreover, still a feature of the present  
is also manifested in the inner life of man: just as we cannot speak of a single state of consciousness, so we speak of a single stage of consciousness, since man is in the most ordinary  
is more awake and more dull, awake and asleep; is also a hierarchical gradualism. But hierarchical gradualism is also manifest in all other areas. Even conspicuously,  
is, even if not conspicuously, omnipresent - and, in essence, it must be and still omnipresent. In the present, however, the hierarchical gradualism  
a great deal of confusion has been introduced into its concretisations, and thus the manifestations of the hierarchical structure have been chaotic and inverted. This upheaval prepares the for the collapse of man's world, and at the same time provides the external conditions for the individual longer to be able to achieve an actual state of consciousness.

The disturbance in the world always targets the individual and creates a counter-conditionality that opposes and works against ascension, purification, and lightness. To this attack the man already attacked inwardly responds adequately; - although this adequacy is already a "counter-adaptation" in fact, because man already has the appetite for darkening, and can therefore respond appropriately to external influences that appear as counter-conditions to the inner path.



Traditionalism was a feature of man's inner life, but it was also a feature of his outer life - his outer life was also fully organised according to traditionalism. The presence of traditionalism in the world meant, on the one hand, and of particular importance, that - going beyond the principle of 'living rather than  
— the more-than-life principle has been expressed in a dominant way.

To put it simply, can say that there are two basic inner orientations. The first is the principle of "living more", which "to live better", "to live more perfectly", "to live more fully", "to live happier", "to live more openly". The other fundamental inner orientation is the principle of more than life, which is directed towards *trānsscendentia* and *trānsscendentālī*; - through the grasp that man is not merely "alive", that man's life actually arises from the supra-life, and that therefore man's life can be congruent towards the supra-life.

The two principles are not necessarily in conflict with each other; what we need to clarify in their relationship is which one prevails over the other. If the principle to live rather prevails, then in fact the principle to live rather cannot be fulfilled, that is, one will not essentially "live rather", but one will certainly miss the more than life by this orientation. But one in whom the principle of more than life prevails can also fulfil the principle of living rather than living; - either he fulfils the principle of living rather than living or he does not, it is a "choice", but this will no longer be relevant in this direction.

The external world - the state, society, the collective - is normally organised if it provides the individual with the principle of more life. It cannot fully ensure it, since it is in fact maintained by inner mental actions, but the external world can provide all the conditions to promote the principle of more than life and not to hinder it in any way. The traditional state has provided to the fullest extent possible the conditions which a life of spiritual fulfilment requires and demands. The whole organic structure of the state is  
was organised to be a symbol of spiritual life, to be a symbol of the supra-life, to be an analogy of realisation in the world, to be a warning of realisation by its very nature. In this connection, the traditional state also had a superstate centre; - this superstate centre was the Ruler.

The ruler is the representative of unity. When the traditions speak of the non-earthly, the one universal man - 'Adām Qadmon, Manu, Praja-pati - this figure is always king. The primordial, the timeless, the one man, the one universal man, was described as a king, his image was created as a king, and the king was always the unconditional representative of universality. This representation is not only a was a "presentational" representation, but a "fulfilling" representation, because it was the unified and

universal spiritual supremacy, which the king represented, actually permeated the world under the king, that is, this representation was an actual force, power and dominion.

The state - in its original sense - is a state because immobility is present in it; - the centre is present in it, and the axis is present in it. In the sense of 'centre' and 'axis', the state is the state. In the state was represented the *primus mōtor immōbilis*, the "first immobile mover", the "the mover and the stopper", the "Jūpiter Stator", the "stopper", the "founder", the spiritual king who provides stability. The "mōtor" and the "stator" - the mover and the stopper - are the same: the spiritual king. So the state had to be organic, hierarchically organised and perfectly governed.

The tradition speaks of *abasileiā*, kinglessness. The *abasileiā* can be king-attitude and king-above-attitude. In this case, king-abasality means that there is no need to be a king, because everyone is the king. occupies the quality of. At the beginning of the Golden Age, when everyone was king, there was no need to be a 'separate' king. But when not everyone king, the king must be present.

There may also come a time when there is no longer a king because the spiritual-mental structure no longer has an axis - no longer has an axis - and no longer has a centre. Even if there is a centre, the consciousness of this centre is no valid, and if it is not valid internally, it cannot be valid externally. If it is not externally realised, then the counter-conditionality of the external world will do its best to prevent its internal realisation.

In the modern age, the state in danger of being lost, if we put it very strictly, we can say that states have been lost, that there are no states today. If we are less strict then we can say that states are in a state of total disappearance - and in most cases they have disappeared.

\*

Let us say a few words about the total state. In contrast to the total state, we must take a stand for the organic state. A total state is acceptable if it is regulated by an organicity. Furthermore: the state must always be catagogical its determination (top-down) and anagogical its orientation (bottom-up) (the present pseudo-states and counter-states are anagogical in their determination, but at the same time catagogical in their orientation.)

The state must be organic - organic and living - and this life must be governed by a supra-life principle. The "super-life" must govern the living - bios-like -, the organic, the ordered, the coherent state. If this is achieved, then the state can be total, and can be unconditional; - it can be unconditional in the sense that does not and will not cathagogically move - move - move - move - move - move - move. The anagogically determined and cathagogically directed - progressive total state - which is also inorganic - is not really a state in the strict sense of the word, because such "states" are always moved by dark forces. In this mobilisation, the pseudo-supremacies released from below play a very important role.

The dark forces, whether they appeal to the will of the people or to their "truths" independent of the people, always appeal to something lower, always to something inferior.

One of the most demonic manifestations of these aspirations is the so-called principle of supremacy of the people, the validity of which no one has ever really believed, no one has ever really believed that it can mean anything, that it has any real value. Strangely enough, there may be people who would sacrifice their lives for the ideal of the supremacy of the people, and even they do not believe in it - because nobody can believe in it.

It cannot be believed that a real superiority is a mass which can be manipulated almost without limit; - for the masses can be manipulated almost without limit (we say "almost" to be fair, because they can be manipulated without limit). Obviously, it takes a certain time for this manipulability to come to fruition, yet, after due preparation, everything in the world can be accepted by the masses. The supremacy of the people is a distinctly anti-traditional principle. The sacral ruler in relation to the people kept only one "rule", that of not exercising his power against the people. There is only one rule of procedure in relation to the people: not to exercise power against the people. Beyond this, however, the *dēmos* - which normally manifests itself as a mass cannot have any valid determining role. The general rejection of totality in human beings has been partly justified - a legitimate emotion - because until today they have experienced a totalitarianism that was entirely inorganic, largely anagogical determined and cathagogically oriented, working entirely against the people, and also terroristic, and working with the collaboration of forces that had no relation to the actual social strata (This was the Soviet-type Bolshevik-Communist counter-state in Hungary between 1945 and 1990, not 1948 and 1990.)

It is therefore fair to say the real state has partially disappeared and its remnants in the process of disappearing. The conditions - counter-conditions, in fact - which are common today exclude the organic

the slightest likelihood of the creation of a state. Both the republican form of government, the parliamentary, liberal and democratic system and the terrorist system rule out the possibility of the possibility of an organic state. At the same time, the formal contradictions of these arrangements cannot ensure the emergence of an organic state. A pseudo-monarchy, for example, cannot do anything really real; - a republic, on the other hand, necessarily precludes the world from being organised spiritually. A constitutional monarchy, moreover, precludes actual spiritual organization, and so does an autocratic monarchy if it is inorganic.

If the autocratically ruled monarchy is organic, it does not exclude intellectual organisation. The social, though crucial traditional values, must be completely subordinated to the state; - the *principium statale* surpasses and supersedes the *principium sociale*. At the same time, it is clear that the state does not and maintain itself in opposition to society. Hierarchicity is not only indispensable to the state, but also to society.

It has been pointed out several occasions that the validity of the caste system, in its intrinsic sense, has not changed or disappeared. Externally, the caste system has to exist because it has ceased to be connected with the spiritual order and the consequent inner spiritual orderliness. All this means that at some time a human being incarnated only in the generative circle - based on heredity - which provided the conditions, physical, social and otherwise, necessary for the spiritual development of that human being. A *brāhmana* family was indeed incarnated by those who were *brāhmana* in their inner quality. When this inward order of incarnations was shaken, the caste-like organised society began to break up. As mentioned, this had already begun to falter by the time of the historical Buddha - 2500 years ago - although it has not yet completely disappeared. What does it mean that even today it has not completely disappeared? First of all, it means, that among the *Brāhmanas* there are already many non-Brahmanas born; - but it would be a mistake to conclude that among the *castrati* there are many born who are representative of the quality of *Brāhmana*. In any case, the latter possibility cannot be entirely ruled out, but it is highly unlikely.

In the West, the caste system began to falter in prehistoric times. Attempts have been made at all times to restore this caste system in some way - to recreate it, almost artificially - or at least to conserve its residues. However, the conditions for this restoration have gradually eroded over time - and eventually disappeared. This is not to say, of course, that even the Western nobility or aristocracy did not have some real significance. Although not as significant as the *varnas* in the East, it certainly had real significance and validity - until recent times, you might say.

If we look at the social formations, we must conclude that both the socialist-communist society - not to mention outright communism - and the so-called bourgeois-led state and society - with a capitalist economy - are both firmly and a thoroughly anti-traditional state and society. In contrast, feudalism is a traditional form of state and society. What does feudalism mean - in property terms - if we take the pure forms of feudalism as a basis? Feudalism originally meant that everything in a country belonged to the king; - for example, all land and property belonged to the king. The king could donate property and the estate meant not only land and farms, but also nobility and farmers. Land thus became private property, but not capitalist private property, but feudalistic private property. private property, meaning that land could neither be bought nor sold. In Hungary, between 1838 and 1842, free acquisition of land gradually began, but before then it was not possible to buy land - land could only be obtained. Donated private property became non-capitalist private property, that could do anything. In one or more degrees this feudalism was then further down the line, down to the serf who also got land. Despite the fact that the word 'serf' has a terrible meaning in today's degenerate social consciousness, its original meaning was far from sinister: it was said that everyone, even a prince, was a serf of the king - and there was no negativism whatsoever in this.

Feudalism was charged with many negatives for a specific reason: the expansion of the money economy. Money management has been around for a very long time, yet has not had a dominant role in Europe, including Hungary. The more money management became entrenched, the more widespread the form of work became, which was called 'the robot'. By the way, there was nothing terrible about robot, because it just meant 'work'. In fact, the robot meant that the serfs worked the serf's unworked land. Later the serfs without land - the serfs - appeared, and it was mainly they who cultivated the unoccupied land. In fact, the emergence of the serf already a sign of antitraditionalism, because work based on the serf is opposed to the original feudalism.

The pure feudal form corresponds to traditional principles. that, unlike the land grab of 1945, in a normal social-state system it would have been possible to give land to many, many people without taking a single acre of land from the original large landowners. A refeudalization would have been carried out, that is, to give people their own land, but not capitalistically their own land, but land that they could not - and which, of course, the nobility could not sell either. (That the king would not the land is obvious.) In this refeudalization, therefore, the principle of property hierarchies would have had to be enforced. Let us add that if the structure that emerged after this refeudalisation had been called feudalism, or people serfs, it would have been harmful to the particular psychological state of man today. would have reactions. Therefore, some other name could have been found for it. However, we are well aware that the conditions for refeudalisation are becoming less and less present worldwide; in Hungary

do not have the conditions for this - almost none at all. However, it should be known that feudalism-feudalism is primarily a concept of state-establishment, secondly (far behind the former) of social-establishment, and only thirdly of property-ownership (economic).

\*

There are bright periods - lucid intervals - which are of course very relative are lightless, yet these are the times when something can still be done, something can still be done. At the moment, there is no such lucid interval, but it is possible that there will be in the future, and then it may still be possible to move in the right directions. There is little likelihood that this possibility will arise, and even less likelihood that anyone will actually try to take action. Still, it is a possibility that we should raise and certainly keep in mind.

We said that there are no real states today. We should add that there are no real societies today. If by society we mean a set of people, then of course there are societies, but if by society we mean the cooperative coexistence of people organically guided by the state and imbued with the spirit, then in this sense there are really no societies any more. There is a kind of social residual, but society as such is now largely a reality that has disappeared from the earth-human world.

But we need to further. Man himself disappearing. If we call humans those who can walk upright on two legs - or who, in infancy, are very likely to walk on two legs later on - then of course there are humans, and they are not disappearing, are incredibly multiplying. Who we can call human depends on the severity of the criticism. If we are very lenient, we can say that a man is one who walks upright on two legs; if we are a little more strict, we say that a man is one who can speak. From a spiritual point of view, however, it is justified to be much more strict than that: in fact, only those who reflect and transcend themselves to some extent, i.e. who transcend and transcend their natural contingencies, can be considered human. He who never asks himself any essential question who is concerned with existence, life, death, the afterlife, consciousness, the processes of consciousness, who does not think about thinking itself, is in fact - and here we must be strict - not a human being. From afar and from the outside he appears to be, but in fact he is not.

At some point, if not at a high level, everyone has actually reflected on themselves. They knew they had a higher origin, and if they couldn't - if they couldn't really think about it - at least they he felt this, he felt some kind of superiority. In the present day, almost no one can think or feel his higher origin, yet he does not reflect on himself spiritually in any way, and he knows nothing about the possibility of surpassing himself.

He who remains only in the circle of life, for whom - formulated or unformulated - only the the principle of living prevails, whoever this and nothing else cannot transcend. He in whom the principle of more than life does not flash intuitively cannot transcend, cannot transcend himself, cannot transcend the circle of his person in which he - through an identification - transcends.

Even something can be mistaken for "ghostly". One may believe that one real spiritual aims; - one is very much inclined to self-deception. If, for example, he believes that it is intelligent to have spiritual aims - he may even formulate these aims for himself

-, but they are not your real goals, because they don't work, because you are not really moving towards them. You can declare that you want to move towards them, but you are not moving towards them, because you are not doing to towards the spirit.

Good faith is no excuse for believing that it is enough to set lofty goals. Many people know that it makes them look more intelligent, more beautiful, more noble, if they have spiritual goals. for themselves, but that alone will not make them spiritually transmuted. For actual transmutation, man must reflect upon himself in a spiritual intuition; - and this intuition must relate to that which is connected with eternal origin, origin without origin, eternal beginning without beginning, and immortality.

**Dr. András László**

## **WHAT IS METAPHYSICAL TRADITIONALISM?**

**Metaphysical traditionalism precedes and transcends what we call a theory of being: it is the determinant of a universally valid and extensible theory of being. Metaphysical traditionality is of supra-temporal origin; it is expressed in ancient and ineradicably enduring orders, teachings, sets and unities of teachings, archaic cultures, ways of realization, the essential spirituality of religions, the works of sacred arts, and the spiritually grounded sciences.**

**The term metaphysics in the term can be traced back to the Greek *ta meta* for physics; two - similar - translations are possible. The first, and lower, is 'that which is beyond the natural'; the second, and higher, is 'that which is beyond the existent'. It is from this expression that metaphysics is derived, as the plural of 'metaphysician' (sometimes used as an adjective in the noun sense), and then as 'metaphysics' - already in the singular sense of infinitive and adjective, followed by the Greco-Latin 'metaphysica'. In the context of the original expression, the two different levels of interpretation must be taken together, but not confused.**

**Nature ('physics') and nature ('physis') are not limited to what physics (natural history) as a scientific discipline deals with or will ever deal with. Physis, in this interpretation, is the set of all those entities that have any relation to space, time and substance (i.e. any spatiality, any spatiality, any time-temporality and any substance). Metaphysics (metaphysika, metaphysica), even in its lower sense, is - traced back to, directed towards and concerned with that which is beyond all spatiality, temporality and substance ('permanence').**

**The existent ('physikon') and the existed ('physika'), the existed world ('physis') is what the higher level interpretive translation refers to. The scope of the existent-beings goes beyond that of the natural in the broadest sense (i.e. nature). In this sense, metaphysics is derived from and points towards that which is 'beyond' the circle of beings, of existents, and even of being itself.**



**It is clear, then, that metaphysics, in its conception of a way of being that corresponds to metaphysical traditionalism, is far from being a branch of philosophy called "hyperontological" metaphysics, much less a methodology and approach that some people appreciate and others reject.**

**Tradition (Latin *traditio*; Greek *paradosis*; Sanskrit *páramparya*), 'tradition', in contrast to the commonly understood and commonly used sense of the term, means the temporal perpetuation and transmission of a timeless metaphysical spirituality. Béla Hamvas writes of the supra-temporal presence of the spirit when he interprets tradition. In another approach, one can and should speak of the temporalization of the "hyperboreal" supra-temporal, metaphysical (beyond nature and being) power-rulership knowledge.**

**In our conception - according to our approach - tradition always means metaphysical tradition, and metaphysics always means traditional metaphysics.**

**The innermost and most universal circle of tradition is called supertradition (Latin *supertraditio*; Greek *hyperparadosis*; Sanskrit *atiparamparya*), or the primordial tradition, also in use; - its first and ultimate essence is inexpressible, which is the same as the formulation that central esotericism cannot be communicated in the most secret doctrine, because it is beyond the highest spheres of communicability. The supertradition or primordial tradition is in its immediacy - undocumented and undocumentable, in fact, transcendental to doctrine. Its essence, too, can only be spoken of in the form of allusions, but it is precisely the essence, the essence of the primordial tradition, which is manifested in different traditions; in different doctrines, in different ways. The unity - the unity of traditions and of religions organised around traditions - is not a unity that can be stated without further ado. The notion that all religions actually teach the same thing is flat dilettantism. The unity of traditions and religions is unity in the first and ultimate, in the ultimate essence. That in which all traditions and religions are united must be called *Sophia Perennis* (or *Religio Perennis* or *Philosophia Perennis*) (the adjective *perennis* in this case refers to that which is eternal, timeless-temporal, the temporal representation of 'aeternity'.)**

**We can speak of a traditional and metaphysical doctrine only if the origin and the ultimate goal are supra-existential, and this is the *Metaphysicum Absolutum* or the *Absolutum Metaphysicum*, that is, the absolute metaphysic or the metaphysical absolute. This must be manifested in doctrine either directly or with slight indirectness.**

**Alongside metaphysical absolutism, it is absolutely essential to see what is inseparable from all true tradition, and what is the very first and ultimate meaning of all true tradition - beyond the realm of utterability**

inside. This is the approach whose philosophical equivalent is called solipsism. Solipsism can be traced back to the adjective solus, sola, solum, meaning 'alone', and the adverb solo, meaning 'alone', and the compound pronoun ipse, ipsa, ipsum, meaning 'itself' - as a word, as a philosophical term. It can only be translated into English as 'alone-self'. Its meaning is that Being and Consciousness coincide, there is only one subject of Being, this only subject myself, the consciousness-accionalities are the accionalities of myself (Ich-Selbst), the objectivities, the objects and the objective world - the objective world of myself, my world.

According to philosophical and super-philosophical solipsism, there are many beings, many persons, many people - but there is only one Subject. I - as person - am one among persons, people, beings, but as Subject (as subiectum, as auton, as Selbst, - as Ich-Selbst, as anam and as aham-anam) I am alone in the whole of consciousness. I am both (and here only the first person singular can be appropriate) - person and subject. I can trace myself back to myself only from my person - as the starting point of personal identification - as Subject. The Subject reduced to the Subject can no longer be called the Alany: it is the metaphysical absolute, the absolute metaphysical.

The Subject is the supreme lord of Being. It rules magically and as a king over itself and over the Self-identical All. The traditional view is magic solipsism (solipsismus magicus).

The view of being that follows from the traditional metaphysical stance - the view of being above philosophy. In philosophical terms, metaphysical absolutism, magical solipsism, absolute transcendentalism, magical transidealism, magical idealism, absolute transcendentalism, immanent transcendentalism and transcendental immanentism could be a label that would give a sense of what would correspond philosophically to what we hold to above philosophy.

In terms of doctrinal formulations, certain concessions can be made - only verbally. In philosophical terms, expressed in philosophical language, the final limit of these concessions is the demarcation line between subjective and objective idealism.

The concept of being, based on metaphysical traditionalism and the resulting conception of God or the Deity, is - in many ways - universal. Since transcendentalism, or even the supraprinceps of transcendentalism, is part of the totality of traditions, it is  
We must speak of a vision of God that embraces all the theistic visions, and at the same time all of them, and surpasses them all. It is properly called metatheophantism. Metatheophantism transcends and includes

its own versions: theopanthism (or transcendental pantheism), pantheism in the general sense (immanent), the synthesis of pantheism and monotheism - panentheism, the various versions of monotheism (unitarian, binitarian, trinitarian, etc.), henotheism (i.e. a view based on the existence of one but not a single God-Deity), dio- and triotheism, polytheism (knowing that there never was in fact a 'true' and 'pure' polytheism: the many gods meant and mean the multiplicity of manifestations of the one God or Deity), and includes positive - i.e. not based on denial - transcendentalism, the non-theisticism.

Different traditions have taken different positions, rooted in transcendental and direct experience, on the assumption or denial of the personhood of Gods, God or the Deity. The approach corresponding to metaphysical traditionalism, taking these as a starting point, primarily represents transpersonalism, the revelation of a Deity beyond personality and personhood and of a Deity beyond Deity. This implies - before and beyond - a contemplative affirmation of the divine personality-personality - theistic personalism, but also a contemplative avoidance of the personal God-Deity.

In accordance with the view of being that follows from the universal and integral spiritual-metaphysical traditionalism, the above interpretations of Deity - originally based on direct transempiricism - are all essentially true. Originally, there were extremely complex reasons and conditions for this predominance (which can be the subject of a separate study); today, it is the illumination, the interpretation - ideally and exceptionally the realisation - that determines which form of vision is to be predominated - in some respect.

Traditionalism was once the definer of the wholeness of life - so it was far more than the basis for the most coherent and elevated view of existence. The traditional world was characterised by a transcendental, transcendental pervasiveness of life. The ancient Golden Age of Hesiod and the Greek mythological tradition (this is the Krta- or Satya-Yuga in the Indian mytho-cosmological tradition - as the earthly recapitulative equivalent of the first and 'outpouring' creation) was the totality of the reign of traditionalism. However, metaphysical traditionalism was still dominant, albeit to a diminishing extent, in the Silver Age (in the Tetra-Yuga) and Archaic Age (in the Dvapara-Yuga). In 3102 BC, essentially in the context of the unfolding of history in the strict sense, the Iron Age, the Dark Age (the Kali-Yuga), which some call the Age of the Dream, began. The dominant role of tradition is eclipsed, but its dominant weight is fully and clearly maintained until the 7th to 5th centuries BC. This clarity then begins to diminish ceases around the 4th to 5th centuries AD. Nevertheless, the tradition continued to a dominant role throughout both and the Middle Ages, and even at the beginning of the modern era, although the anti-traditional influence, which was felt from the beginning of the Kali-Yuga, increasingly strong and became predominant from the first third of the 18th century.

Until the nineteenth century, tradition was not primarily a way of being, but something that functioned as a spiritualizing force and factor in certain spheres of life and in the background of some of the ways of being. The time came in the twentieth century (perhaps with a delay of half a century or so) when metaphysical traditionalism had to be turned into a firmly delineated worldview. The first third of this century saw the foundations laid in this respect. The work of Titus Burckhardt, Ananda Kentish Coomaraswamy, Julius Evola, René Guénon, Marco Pallis, Rudolf Pannwitz, Comte Albert de Pouvoirville (Matgioi) , Leo Schaya, Frithjof Schuon and Leopold Ziegler is crucial and fundamental in this respect.

In the line of turning intellectual-metaphysical traditionalism into a supra-worldview, the person and oeuvre of Julius Evola, René Guénon and Frithjof Schuon are considered to be the most universal in scope and the most significant.

In our view, although we are reluctant to rank them, Julius Evola was the most outstanding of them all. (Although there are areas where René Guénon or Frithjof Schuon saw most clearly and deeply, we are of the opinion that where there was some disagreement between the three traditional thinkers on problems of detail, Evola's viewpoint was almost always the highest and his judgement the most insightful.)

In Hungary it was Béla Hamvas whose approach was the closest to metaphysical traditionalism, and he was the first to introduce the authors of the decisive importance of traditionalism. In his great work, *Scientia Sacra*, he outlined the main outlines of the traditional conception of existence, in a way that created an 'atmosphere' and with the power of an 'atmosphere', at the highest level of literary representation and essay. (After 1945, Béla Hamvas increasingly moved towards a non-denominational view of Christianity, developing a distinctively Christian approach. This was linked to his move away from traditionalism, although he never completely broke with his recognition of the importance of tradition, and in fact, in the latter part of his life, he began to move closer to tradition again. Clarifying the relationship between tradition and Christianity was one of the most important tasks he assigned himself. Finally, he took the position that Christianity was the culmination of tradition. While maintaining this, he declared to the writer of these lines that he had not reached a definitive conclusion on the relationship between tradition and Christianity.)

Having outlined all this, we must determine which philosophical-hyperphilosophical propositions whose acceptance or elucidation is definitive and decisive for the existence of the traditional position. There is no definable dogmatics-dogmatology attached to the position of being corresponding to a universal and integral intellectual-metaphysical traditionalism, at least for the time being. It is also clear that the doctrinal principles of traditionalism, although definite and intransigent, reaching to radical levels, cannot be rigid, and that they are dogmatically valid. In view of this, it must be said that the traditional approach has some doctrinal theses with which

**the already strong intrasensitivity becomes almost finite. Of these, the most important are:**

**– The radical power of the Absolutum Metaphysicum and the Metaphysicum Absolutum.**

**– A definite statement of the coincidence of Being and Consciousness (in the broadest sense).**

**– Distinction between Person and Subject. The statement that the Subject, as the - Atma, is the centre of Consciousness and Being.**

**– The ultimate power theorem of absolute magical solipsism.**

**– To state the feasibility of the Absolutum Metaphysicum. The Exvigilatio Metaphysica Absoluta - i.e. the Absolute Metaphysical Awakening (Sanskrit: Samyak-Sam-Bodhi) - is the ultimate and supreme goal of metaphysical traditionalism.**

**– "The absolute realization of "self" - the complete regression of "self" from personal "self" to absolute subject "self" - corresponds to the absolute and "perfectly perfect" Awakening that is beyond Salvation.**

**– The rejection of religiously acceptable heterotheism - in terms of metaphysical realisation (God or Deity is ultimately the subjective potentiality of myself: my "power potentiality" to realise myself as God.)**

**– The affirmation of "transactivity" (wei-wu-wei in Chinese Taoism) - hence both activity (actionality) and inactivity (inactionality) are "entitled"; and especially their unity - reducible to transactivity-trans-activity. Passivity is, from a traditionalist point of view, at least in relation to the high and high purposeful man, a rejected intellectual attitude.**

**– The statement of the essential equivalence of the contemplative, the gnostic, the actional-heroic and, as a synthesis of these, the theurgico-magical spiritual paths.**

– Rejection of "Mystica Passiva". The classification of 'mystical absorption' as a false goal.

– In Being there is Oneness, but there is no equality and equivalence. The reality of hierarchical graduality (*gradualitas hierarchica*) and hierarchy is stated and applied to all realms; to states of consciousness as well as to human collectives and individual human beings; or to spiritual worlds as well as to spiritual beings.

– It is a flat denial of both historical, biological and cultural - and indeed any - development. A radical rejection of all forms of evolutionism. (In biology, for example, the synthesis of involutive organicism and gradual-proportional creationism is the most consistent with the traditionalist view of being, rejecting all 'phylogenies' and 'phylogenies' - even inverted 'phylogenies' - but also rejecting the oversimplifying - essentially anti-hierarchical - notion of 'vulgar creationism'. The rejection is obviously the most extreme against Darwinian-neo-Darwinian and any related tendencies, such as anti-Darwinian Darwinism, without excluding the pseudo-religious, pseudo-spiritual - in fact crypto-materialist - approach of P. Teilhard de Chardin.

– In historical, social and political terms, the metaphysical  
The existentialism of traditionality is in favour of Monarchies and Empires. These were once their primary *raison d'être*, and even today, if there were the slightest possibility of this, they would be the most appropriate formations of state, the most representative and the most secure of spiritual reality.

Nivellative, indifferentiative and sub-integrative vulgar nationalism and the equally infinitely nivellative internationalism - as anti-traditional formations - cannot be accepted from a traditional point of view. The traditionalist view, however, regards as possible and valid an antinivellative, differentiative and integrative nationalism, a nationalism which, while avoiding internationalism, is able to open up, or even to conclude on the principle of connationality, in contrast to the principle of internationalism, in the direction of transnationality (transnationality beyond the nation) or supranationality (nation-supranationality). Only a connational-transnational Imperium Monarchicum is acceptable to a tradition-based approach, both in retrospect and in prospect.

The traditionalist orientation sees conservative political and social trends in the conventional sense as inconsistent and weak, uncompromising, cowardly trends. Only a radical, 'revolutionary'-'counter-revolutionary' conservatism that wants to conserve and conserves can be considered from the point of view of traditionalism; and what it wants to conserve cannot be other than a material, structural, functional or - above all - spiritual reality, which is defined by metaphysical traditionalism as a value to be preserved.

– This approach, which derives from the spiritual and metaphysical tradition, interprets 'modernity' and the 'modern world' in a particular way. Modernity can be associated with an advanced phase of antitraditionalism, with an increased unfolding of the forces of the Dark Ages. Its roots go back to the 7th, VI, VII, V, V, IV centuries B.C. - the beginning of the manifestations of modernity which became increasingly destructive from the beginning of the 18th century onwards and which, in the 20th century, turned into a destructive offensive against the last vestiges of values.

Traditionalism, as opposed to antitraditionalism, is a rejection of modernity and modernism in its entirety, if necessary with a radical combatant. Of course, anti-modernism can also take vulgar, even blatant forms, but these have nothing to do with those who are oriented in the traditionalist direction. Anti-modernism, for example, is not primarily anti-technology, but is opposed to the forces that have turned the culture of the spirit towards technical civilisation, corrupting and degrading it. (Traditional anti-modernism, for example, refuses to enter into any kind of communion with any kind of "back to nature" orientation with a Rousseauist tinge.

After this very sketchy and tangential presentation of the accept-accept and reject-deny premises, we should also say a few words about the areas in which the orientation based on metaphysical traditionalism wants to manifest itself and the areas which it still considers to be up for grabs.

Universal and integral intellectual-metaphysical traditionalism seeks above all to change the interpretation of tradition, in the very spirit of traditional doctrines. The approach of traditionalism seeks to start from the totality and unity of tradition in all respects - an unshakable principle. It is inseparable from the demand for an interpretation of tradition that rejects historical, sociologizing and psychologistic interpretations of tradition and doctrine that have become fashionable in the last sixty years, and in particular, Freudian, Jungian and Frommian interpretations of mythological doctrines - and those based exclusively on them - must be firmly and inexorably relegated to the level of marginal significance. Not only because the validity of these interpretations can be regarded as almost nil, but above all because an optimum top synthesis of all the world's psychological tendencies is also completely inappropriate for qualifying and interpreting any spiritual-metaphysical doctrine not of psychic origin, but manifested from an almost infinitely spiritual height above the psychic, and completely untainted by any psychic contamination: from a psycho-psychological, or even psychopathological and psychiatric point of view. Doctrines are of spiritual and superhuman origin, originating in their first and ultimate essence from beyond nature and beings, and directed beyond nature and beings. They cannot be understood from a physiological, psychophysiological and psychological point of view - even from a maximally

"spiritualized" psychology - let alone touch, let alone  
"decipher", "judge" and "interpret".

Metaphysical traditionalism is orientationally capable of extending its scope to all existing and possible sciences and to all disciplines - first of all in terms of interpretation and re-interpretation, but also in terms of intellectual fertilization, although - and this must be constantly and consciously taken into account - metaphysics is not directed towards nature and does not deal with nature, and even a traditional science such as cosmology is not metaphysical. Metaphysics, however, can deal with what is physical - and it is unthinkable the other way round.

The most decisive task of metaphysical traditionalism is to provide a point of reference for bodily-spiritual-mental preparation and self-correction, for prodding, then for eventual initiation, and finally for metaphysical realisation.

Modern man, it must be said firmly and in the spirit of traditionalism, is in fact "uninitiated" and metaphysically incapable of realisation, almost completely. There is a certain possibility - for a very few and only a very small possibility - to cease to be modern man, as it were by archaïcising themselves, and thus to enter the path of initiation. The representation of the metaphysical tradition in favour of initiation and realisation is clear - but not without reservations. The path towards unconditionedness is bound up with a multiplicity of strict conditionings, and even with the inclusion of new conditionings. Very few people are capable of making any adequate self-correction of preparative significance with themselves - consciously - in a positive sense and in the direction of the higher self, in terms of their consciousness functions and certain mental-voluntary attitudes. Only a very small number of the few can attain to the pre-indoctrination (prodding) which is archaïfication, let alone initiation and realization. The representatives of metaphysical traditionalism do not want to block the paths from anyone, but neither do they want people who have positive and genuine aspirations to their deepest destruction to be left without the appropriate abilities and consciousness protection.

Although the study of anti-traditionalism and the ways of dealing with it will be the subject of a future study, we must already mention here, at least tangentially, that there are anti-moral trends (there are thousands of them nowadays), whose aim, which can rightly and without exaggeration be called satanic, is to lead human consciousness towards mental disintegration by offering pseudo-spiritual and counter-spiritual paths to people with some kind of spiritual affinity, and thus to create other occult cosmic 'contagions' affecting the spheres of existence. This aspiration is deeply sub-intellectual in origin, but when it appears it is capable of affecting instinct, emotionality and even reason to an extent that cannot be underestimated. It includes not only sects or 'congregations' with dark tendencies, called Christian, but also trends which 'open up' an initiative path or yogic path for those who may be deserving of a better fate.



**spiritual aspirants, who may have real higher potentialities, though their spiritual alertness may or may not yet be capable of recognition and rejection.**

**Today, without exception, all the open yoga movements in the world, all the "secret societies" that are open to all, all the orders and organizations that operate under usurped names and that initiate, "transfiguration", "transcendental meditation" (correctly understood: counter-transcendental counter-meditation), "hermetic practices", "yogic sleep" "as a help" to "fellow human beings stumbling in even less light"; a satanic dark tendency or organization of counter-realization and downward-transcendence, in demonic offensive against all superhuman, even all human values, especially against the already barely intact terrain of human consciousness.**

**We must know that not only the inherently dark practices of the inherently dark tendencies are extremely dangerous to the spirit, to the soul, but also to the body, but also the originally perfect and fully-fledged practices, if they are carried out by modern man - man who no longer has the very faculties and powers whose high-intensity existence was an indispensable condition for the adequate performance of the practices.**

**The various Eastern traditions and traditional religions, especially export-import versions of Buddhism, are increasingly flooding the Western world - mostly by devaluing Buddhism itself to the extreme. They are imbuing Buddhism and other traditional religions with such utterly anti-traditional pseudo-ideas as leftism, democratism, liberalism, and even left-wing socialism, Marxism; communism, or at least humanism, pacifism and tolerantism. True traditionalism - and therefore true Buddhism - is humanist, but not humanistic, and does not subscribe to humanitarianism, because it does not see man's bonds as being dissolvable by human means and in human ways. True traditionalism, true Buddhism, is, as Frithjof Schuon says, pacifist but not pacifist; in other words, the man of tradition strives for peace, but not at all costs. It only wants peace after the triumph of the spiritual Light (the "pax post victoriam lucis spiritualis"), and rejects peace following the victory of antispiritual darkness (the "pax post victoriam tenebrarum antispiritualium"). The tradition - and Buddhism within it - is tolerant, but it is not tolerant because it refuses to be tolerant to the extreme in the face of overt and covert but increasingly destructive attacks by dark anti-spiritual and anti-spiritual forces.**

**Those who smuggle or openly import into the Western world the yogic paths of Buddhism, which are nowadays - especially for modern Western man - increasingly impassable in an adequate way, the intellectual and attitudinal aberrations and deviations, deliberately and purposefully fuse-confuse with the downward-transcending practices of counter-yoga (i.e. leftism, liberal-democratism, "spiritual**

**materialism", egalitarianism, pacifism and tolerantism, occult degradation, and the practical activations of the forces that prepare death). Universal and integral spiritual-metaphysical traditionalism has not and will never make any concession to any manifestation of antitraditionality, and especially not if the cause is presented in spiritual, even traditional, disguise.**

**The integral and universal spiritual tradition, the corresponding traditionalism and the view of being based on it, is the timeless-original view of Light - the supra-worldview of power and certainty that perceives and rejects darkness and false light.**

**EXISTENCE AND CONSCIOUSNESS IN THE LIGHT OF THE  
METAPHYSICAL TRADITION**

**ANDRÁS ANDÁSZLÓ**

The coincidence of being and consciousness has been discussed in various aspects throughout the history of Western philosophy. From Greek times to the present day, there have always been philosophical trends which, in different approaches, have emphasised this unity of consciousness and being - but have generally not dared to reach final conclusions. We know that even those philosophical currents which went furthest in subjective idealism always, according to the truisms of philosophical lexicons, stopped where epistemological or existential solipsism emerged. Solipsism means 'only myself', 'based only on myself'; in the first person singular and explicated: I am only myself, there is no one and nothing but me. This "there is no one and nothing but me" does not, of course, refer to the human person: there are obviously many people, many human persons, but only one subject. What must therefore be immediately made aware of is the multiplicity of human persons and the universality of the subject, for the most vulgar theoretical fallacy could be produced if one were to regard personal existence, human personhood, as universal. The subject precedes the man and precedes the world. The subject is the centre of consciousness. The "centre of consciousness" means the master of consciousness. And "Lord of consciousness" means Lord of Being.

The subject dominates being, but not as some kind of abstraction, not as an abstraction in the theory of being. The subject is always me, which means that I can only take it in the first person singular. When I speak, I speak as a human personhood, and through this human personhood I speak as a subject. The subject cannot be sought in any other direction but in the direction of the singular first person, otherwise it cannot be found. Eastern spirituality has formulated this more sharply than Western spirituality: either quite directly revealed, or only in a metaphorical way (as in cosmology), but in the East this is the constant basis, centre and aim of the approach. For all those spiritualities that sought to self-transform (for example, law or other paths of realization equivalent to law) would be meaningless without solipsism. The more recent and widespread view that these paths of realisation actually transform various aspects, attitudes or orientations of the human soul is wrong. They touch the personal man only in so far as they dismantle the personal man from the subjectivity which manifests itself through personhood, by personhood, but at the same time paralysed, degraded and delimited by personhood.

If the subjective forces are diminished in the personality, it is always these losses of strength, these deficiencies, these weaknesses, that cause man to assume an objective reality that exists independently of himself. He who conceives, feels and experiences the world as existing independently of himself expresses nothing but his subjective weakness: nothing but his own weakness, his own mental weakness. Why? Because subjectivity, the Greek *auton* and the Sanskrit *ātmā*, is existential. The being-creation lies so deeply behind the personhood, in the circle of the subject's forces directly around the centre, that the human being who has almost completely lost himself in his personhood is unable to discover it in himself. Thus the process of creation in which the whole of being is created is reduced to mere constellation in perception. What remains of creation is merely what it perceives. He no longer experiences himself as a creator. In itself, this would be acceptable, but he does not intuitively realize that in his present state, reduced to being a creature, he is also a potential creator. What remains of creation is merely perception, experience, conjecture, statement.

If one were to study one's own consciousness functions, one would find that what has some creativity left is thinking, but thinking is also the weakest, most subtle and most subtle consciousness function. Voluntary imagination is stronger in comparison, but the creative force that works in it is weaker. The spontaneous imagination is even stronger, but the subjective being is even weaker. This shows that the further one moves away from thinking towards empirical experience and perception, the more the existent is projected and the less the subject participates in it, the less it experiences itself as creative. The fact that volitional imagery is considerably more difficult and more fragmented and uncertain than, for example, semi-dreamlike, spontaneous imagery, is very much a characteristic of the human condition. That is to say, the forces of the heteron against the alien, the other, the auton, are commonly and generally much greater than the forces of the auton. And this is inseparable from an inverted view of the intensity of reality. This inverted view is expressed in Sanskrit by a special word, the

"The goal is precisely vipari- viparyaya, the reversal of the reversal. In the older form of the Greek language, this was denoted by "metagnoíá" and later by "metanoíá", which, as a conversion, always meant a conscious awakening, a return to the self. One possible formulation is that of turning from the illuminated to the source of light.

So one of the fundamental and serious characteristics of this inverted view is precisely that man takes as real what he is powerless to face, and if he is more powerless to face something, he takes it as even more real; that is, he takes as incomparably more real than his own thoughts and thinking functions the 200-kilo bag that falls on his head. Whatever he squeezes, whatever he is powerless against, whatever he cannot penetrate, he is, and the less he can penetrate, the more he is. It is a degeneration of vision that must be reversed in the intellectual paths. If, however, one changes it only in the consciousness, one has taken a step, but not a very big one: one has reformulated something in oneself. This reformulation does not mean, of course, that he will henceforth experience the world in the same way in general. It does not mean that he experiences the world in the same way. But in any case, in a sense he has opened himself up. But realisation is still a long way off: realisation means that I realise myself. Not in the psychological sense of the word; in the psychological sense of the word, one realizes oneself when one achieves one's goals, plans, or whatever. This is not the case with metaphysical realisation. To realize is to create. From this point of view, it is completely unimportant that I am already created; it is completely unimportant that I find myself already here in the world, as it were as a given, thrown into the world (this is the meaning of Heidegger's *Geworfenheit*), if I find myself in the world once not having created and established myself, if I once experience myself as if I had not created myself. And if I did not create it, then someone else did: the heteron. And the heteron is the unrecognized auton: the other, my unrecognized self. The recognition of the auton in the heteron leads to the dissolution of the heteron. For this, however, it is essential to develop a world view, a view of being that not only exists as a view of being, but also functions as a view of being. Here it is not enough simply to assert the static perspective that the "perspective"; it is also essential to have a dynamic perspective, that is, to always , to look, to look this way.

So not just a view, but a view, not just a worldview, but a worldview; not just a structure and a framework, but a living process.

In order to look at myself and the world differently, to intuitively seek out the points where creative activity can be detected, I can of course be greatly helped by interpretations of certain doctrines, and in particular by Eastern teachings. In fact, the Western teachings, the dogmas of the Christian denominations, can also be of considerable help at this point, since it is precisely the dogmas within Catholicism, for example, which are much deeper than the Church is accustomed to extract from them. There are esoteric depths to be unravelled in these doctrines, even if it is not usually done. The patristic literature or Greek philosophy also touched on much deeper points than are usually taught or assumed in connection with them. That the Eastern doctrines are here given greater prominence than the Western is not for reasons of principle, but for didactic reasons, namely, that they are more illustrative. For in the East, realisation as a way and as an end has persisted longer than in the West. Hinduism, Buddhism, Bon in Tibet, Taoism in China, and various forms of shamanism have regarded realisation as crucial for direct activity. Behind these, as religions, was a spiritual-metaphysical tradition focused on realisation.

Of course, implementation has always been alive in the West. It lived in the Christian gnosis, it lived in the Templar order, it lived in the Grail order, in true Rosicrucianism. With regard to the latter, it must be said emphatically that it no longer has any representatives, since there are more than thirty Rosicrucian organisations worldwide, each of which claims to be the original, authentic and competent organisation. But there is not a single authentic Rosicrucian among them. You could never "enter" the original Rosicrucianism; you could grow into it spiritually, but you could never enter it. Every authentic spiritual movement has a status, and a spiritual status which cannot propagate and plurify itself in a vulgar and profane context.

The power of consciousness is absolute power. The power of consciousness is the power of the centre of consciousness: the power of the subject. The very expression "subject", or "subjectum", is actually rather unfortunate, since means "subjection", "subjection", while "objectum" is a "confrontation", "projection". Sanskrit, on the other hand, derives the word for the subject from the subject's actionality, and this is kartr, which means "subject", i.e. the doer, the doer. The process is kartum. And the objectified action is karma. So the approaches that first expressed themselves in Sanskrit, namely Hinduism and Buddhism, approach subjectivity from the perspective of actionality.

Some intellectual trends, such as theosophy (although the term originally meant something else), or anthroposophy, cannot be considered metaphysical in the strict sense of the word, i.e. they are not directed towards or charged by anything beyond the existential. That which aims only at the occult, only at the hidden, embraces only a very small segment of metaphysics. The metaphysical always means two things: on the one hand, that which is beyond the natural (meta ta physics), and on the other, that which is beyond the existent, beyond the existent. Of course, the term metaphysics is already used to describe "beyond nature" is more than what physics as a science deals with. Physicality also includes other kinds of space and time structures,

although not within the scope of the physicality that physics as a natural science deals with. However, it is not only a matter of transcending what is outside time and space, but also of transcending what exists at all. And the occultist tendencies do not even reach the first meaning of metaphysics, i.e. they are stuck in a differently structured temporality and spatiality. And the entrapment in temporality and spatiality creates delusions in these tendencies.

If we try to look for the most important statements of the true spiritual-metaphysical orientation, we find among them expressions that are rather antipathetic to a kind of sentimental sentiment. These are "power", "might", "domination", "freedom". Thus, the way in which a subjectivity that transcends a man, a subjectivity that transcends a person, leaves the earthly form of existence, and the fatefulness associated with leaving the earthly form of existence, are far more closely related to the forces of consciousness, to the presence of consciousness, to the domination of personhood, of the bearers, than to what is usually implied by life according to moral categories. Accordingly, traditional spirituality has always conceived of morality in a particular way. Moral precepts are for the high man warnings, reminders that in the areas where the precepts prescribe something, increased caution, presence, heightened awareness is required, because there the potential for failure is also increased. For the not really spiritual person, the commandment is always clearly just a commandment; for him it must be commanded and he must obey it. The high man also observes it, but from a different angle. From the side that it is a condition of his elevation. He is warned that there he must be particularly present.

Religious trends that have taken the form of sects (of course, "sect" in itself means nothing, only "cut off") always focus on the incidental; on the accidents, the contributions, rather than the essence, the essence. Certain contributions are hypertrophied and represented with immense aggressiveness. A much gentler over-emphasis of these contributions would be dangerous; but if they are aggressively over-emphasised, it can in any case produce spiritual deformations. This is also a characteristic, albeit in a quite different sense, of pseudo-spiritual and counter-inspirational paths.

We will deal with many of the difficulties that arise here in later presentations. It is only worth mentioning here that the process of leading myself more and more back to myself through myself can lead in a different direction. For example, consciousness can be led into a world, or a state of consciousness (for the world and worlds are states of consciousness!), in such a way that it then poisons and makes impossible both the state of consciousness in question and, through it, its own perspectives. The poisoning of being and consciousness is the method of certain dark counter-spiritual and counter-intuitive tendencies. These tendencies actually perform a rite, an operation, an operation, an operation of being: for example, they introduce death forces into states in which death forces are not originally present. Death forces can also be introduced into corresponding states of being in a positive sense - but these tendencies do not perform this operation in a positive sense. Each fallacy is immediately recognizable as a fallacy in itself by the extent to which it is based on subjectivity. Here there is room for error, but it can be avoided with due care. The person-based tendencies can easily be confused with the subject-based

based on. The potential for confusion is certainly quite high at a basic level, but if one really gets to know certain doctrines, if one can immerse oneself in them in a consensual way, the potential for confusion is reduced to almost zero.

To illustrate this, one could actually take an example from the New Testament. When Christ says, "I am the way, the truth and the life", it should be understood, at first sight, as if He were saying of Himself, "I am the way, the truth and the life". So He is the way, truth and the life. The real deepening of this, however, is when I say it as 'I am the way, the truth and the life'. How is this to be understood? As if I am already me? No. Not in my personal being, that is, in what is actually manifested to me. So in my personal being I am not - but I can be. I want to be, in the sense of the potentiality of the goal. This is why I have stressed before that God cannot be spoken of in a vulgar way as being or not being. The question of God's being is in fact a question of weakened and about to be discarded judgments. Accordingly, any pro and con answer falls squarely within the realm of these. God is the apex of existential ends. Its ontological nature can be seen in the fact that it is the summit of existential ends.

Usually, if one is sufficiently broken by life, or if one encounters impressions of great magnitude, even of a natural nature, one easily concludes that one is small. For example, I heard recently that someone had to see Niagara Falls to realize his own dust.

Some people even attach a special significance to the recognition of their own dust motes. Various phenomena may be more powerful than I am, but I perceive that phenomenon, and it exists only insofar as I perceive it, insofar as I see it, insofar as I experience it. It does not exist in any other sense. I am always more than what I see. I am always more than what I assume. And the goal is not somewhere out there. This is the profound difference between latentia and potentia. The goal is not lurking somewhere that I will then reach. No. The goal is achieved by my achieving it. There is no goal that waits. I have to create the goal. I have to create my own goal. Goals do not wait, least of all in the most serious orders of magnitude. The afterlife is not latent, it is potential. It exists by my realizing it. The ordinary world is no different: it too is only by my continually constituting it, though I do not recognize my self-constituting power in this constituting.

The study of religions and doctrines in themselves, separated from finding in them an orientative tool for myself, is in fact uninteresting. That is why it is not a technical matter. Religions and teachings cannot really be studied from the point of view of expertise. If you don't understand existence and you don't understand consciousness, you don't understand Buddhism - you don't understand Buddhism either. In vain does he understand something, he is in a permanent state of non-understanding. He who does not understand himself, who does not understand his own processes, what can he understand at all? That is why almost all the translations of holy books are by far wrong. Yet they are translated by competent people who know the language and the dictionary meaning of the word in question. In the case of translations from Western languages, where there is constant contact and control, this is not so obvious. In the case of Eastern and especially archaic languages, however, all translations are stances; all translations have an attitude, or perhaps the attitude is present as a lack of attitude, as an adequate reflection on itself



Absence. For example, Helmut von Glasenapp's *The Five World Religions* is on sale in Hungary. This man has spent his whole life studying only religious history. His expertise is indisputable. Yet his insight is so limited that one can only wonder. He barely understands anything. Of course, such a book may have some segmental value in terms of drawing attention to something from which an actual conclusion can then be drawn. Of course, there are other trends that lead to continued obfuscation. There are disciplines whose current character is such that they seem to have been created specifically to achieve this obsolescence. For example, almost all branches of contemporary psychology are like this.

So it is that if you start to deal with it, you will know less and less about the soul as the years go by. It is constructed that way. Of course, every discipline could be different. In every discipline there could be life, there could be spirit, there could be cognition, there could be elements, forces that could help to awaken further forces. But this is not usually the case.

What I am advocating here is - in a very long-term sense - practical. This practicality would be the actual goal; not the direct goal, but a multiply indirect goal. At the very least, it is a matter of disseminating knowledge. There are lectures, books, courses, etc. specifically for this purpose. To look at things differently - in the sense of autoreflective looking at things differently, and looking at the world. For this, help, points of view, various certain inspirational touches can be given. On the other hand, it is not possible to give much more than this in the present day, especially directly. Those who claim to be able to do so, on the other hand, should not be allowed to accept anything from them. Indeed, the production of poison in this area is on an astonishing scale. The only real intellectual movements in the world are one or two small pockets. In contrast, there are thousands of pseudo-spiritual movements. Europe is infested with a dangerous type: the Indian pseudo-Yogi. In India, since Sanskrit is taught in secondary schools, and the original language bears some resemblance to Sanskrit, and since asanas and other things are taught in physical education classes, almost every intelligent Indian can pose as an expert, a yogi, even a guru. If this were purely for the purpose of getting rich, it could be seen simply and vulgarly as a series of sleazy deals. But the danger is much greater than that. While not forgetting the former, the aim is far more pernicious. The Indians currently rampaging around the world - and more recently the Tibetans - are closing off the already very limited opportunities for realisation. In fact, even if there were no darkness in these trends, they would still be immensely dangerous, because they are not tailored to the modern man. For example, there is a Buddhist monastery near Zurich, where Europeans are sometimes admitted with great difficulty. An important part of the learning is the memorisation and recitation of Tibetan sacred texts. The more diligent you are, the more you are likely to get into trouble. Those who are less diligent drop out and realise that the whole thing is basically pointless. And at the moment it is. Reading something used to mean as much as understanding it. The man who knew how to write not only knew how to read and write, but also knew the essence of writing, for it was not necessary to write or read things that were irrelevant. So at one time, to say the text to understand the text, and to understand the text was almost to do the teaching. Today, even for Tibetans, there is nothing of this left. And even less for Europeans. So, in this Buddhist monastery, they are doing something that was not done in the high

was made for the oriental man; it is now being done to somebody as a first step, and whoever does it thinks he is doing Zen or Tibetan Buddhism or yoga or something else - and he is not. It looks like he's doing that, but it has nothing to do with it. It is not consciousness light that awakens in him, but he mobilises specific vital forces, and all the vital forces mobilised without the mind, all the vital forces, are transformed into death forces: first damaging the consciousness, then damaging the carrier of consciousness. Every vital force that is awakened in an inadequate way, that is, not imbued with spirit, functions as a death force. This is a counter-alchemical process carried out by the heteron; the heteron, that is, the unrecognized self. There is no greater enemy than the unrecognized self. It is the prototype of all enemies. The satanic principle is entirely related to this. "Satan" means accuser, enemy, adversary. But there is no Satan on God's side. Satan is only on the side of the human condition. That is, there is no Satan on the side of my own purpose, but there is Satan on the side of my starting position.

In Sanskrit, the name of being is the same as the name of essence: sat. Sat condenses both at the same time. Non-being and non-essence are asat. The Greek name for truth is alêtheia. Alêtheia is related to non-forgetting. What is it about not forgetting that has metaphysical weight? Obviously, it is the forgetting or not forgetting of the metaphysical origin of myself from myself that is decisive. To live in the non-forgetting, the forgetting of forgetting, that is to say, in the metaphysical forgetting-overcoming, is to live in truth. In Sanskrit, the name for truth is satya. Satya is cognition, teaching and living according to being and essence. So what is insubstantial, what is not substantial, what is not essential, is not true from this point of view. In fact, the question of substantive-true-not-true was in traditional cultures a minor one. Not that it was not to a very great extent - but that was not the emphasis; there was always something much more to be understood by what in Latin appeared in connection with spiritual truths as veritās and in connection with legal truths as iustitia. The Greek equivalent of iustitia is dikē, while that of veritās is alêtheia.

Those proverbial, clichéd remnants, such as "the light of truth", even in their very discredited form, represent the relationship between truth and light. That is to say, truth, alêtheia, satya, veritas, are all related to light; light is related to the essential nature of consciousness. Light is the nature of consciousness. The "light of mind" is almost a pleonasm, that is, the application of a single term in a series. The light of spirit is the light of consciousness. Darkness is also the darkness of consciousness. For consciousness is more comprehensive than spirit and light. Spirit always means that the centre of consciousness, that is, the subject, is in the act. It is in act, that is, it is in the culmination of actions. Subiectum in actū - that is spirit in my definition. The subject in the act. And the conscious act of the subject is spirit, that is, light. It is not primarily physical light. It was not physical light, natural light, for which spiritual light would then be similarly named. What we experienced as light in the physical sense was light that was lost, dislocated and displaced. Because of spiritual light, there is also external light. The sun was not associated with God because they saw the sun; they did not associate God with the sun. No. There is a sun because there is a sun god. The self-creating light-being is the auton. Consequently, it must have an imprint in the physical world, and that is the celestial body. But it is neither the name nor, above all, its existence that derives from this. How pathetic it is when people try to deduce religions and spirit from natural phenomena, forgetting why something exists at all. This question can neither be answered nor answered in the sense of refusing to answer it.

they ask. No spirit has ever been derived from any natural phenomenon in any sense. It is always the spiritual and always the higher that is primary: both in essence and, if it has a temporal dimension, as in the case of what has just been said, also in time.

The assumption of nonconsciousness, especially in the overemphasized sense in which it is made in deep psychology, is in fact both an offensive against man's powers of cognition and an explicit fallacy. Some, for example, recognise in the Jungian tendency an actual spirituality, whereas Jung's tendency is peculiarly anti-spiritual. It is anti-spiritual because it derives consciousness from non-consciousness. As if the unconscious were primordial as opposed to the conscious. Obviously this is not as pervasive or as vulgar in Jung's approach as it is in Freudianism, but it is certainly there. But there is no such thing as "unconscious", no such thing as "unconscious". Consciousness has actuality and potentiality, and it has a potentiality that is open to infinity. It is obvious that this potentiality has closely individual, collective, familial, cosmic and other dimensions. In this sense, to speak of layers of consciousness is simply a metaphor, a metaphor by far; there is potentiality, there are lower and upper potentialities. There are potentialities which, when actualized, destroy consciousness; and there are potentialities which, when actualized, are related to the rise of consciousness. This whole question should be raised only in terms of actuality and potentiality. Otherwise, we would get a picture of consciousness which would suggest that there is some kind of original hidden naturalness in the background. If what psychology calls the unconscious has any effect, it is not because the unconscious performs some occult function, but because it is unconscious, because it is heteron, because it is other. The unconscious is in fact not me, and everything that is not me is in some sense working against me. This must be understood with due subtlety and insight, because if it is not, it is immediately misunderstood. It does not mean that every person and the whole world is my enemy, but that if everything remains in the state it is in, then everything is indeed preparing for death, not only as a biological event, but also in a broader sense.

The world is there to take me back to myself. Or which means the same thing in a different sense: it exists to separate me from myself. To detach the world as world, as heteron, from myself - and to take the world as potential auton back into myself.

Unity is the goal. Unity is the unity of the car. What seems to fall out of the unity is the heteron. What seems to fall out of the unity, I want to take back into myself not as heteron, but as auton. That is, I must recognize the auton before I can take it back.

According to the Tantric doctrine, everything in the world can be perceived and experienced as yoga. This is especially true for the individual human being. So, if the necessary powers of cognition have been developed, each individual human being can be seen as manifesting something: his life symbolizes something. The more intimately I know someone, the more intensely this manifests itself. Some people seem to be specifically associated with symbols that clearly represent forces of destruction. All this must, of course, be understood with a very wide differentiation, for there is not only white or black, but in a single human being there is an unheard-of wealth of qualities; and this can be said not only in relation to man, but also in relation to animal species, and even

in a sense, animal individuals express something. Since most human-human relations are carried out at an insignificant level, we should at least look at the more important individuals in this way: what does it represent, what is it that is expressed? And here we really have to go deep, because the role of the impressions we make is very small in this respect.

So there is no other existence, there is only conscious existence: there is conscious existence in the sense that there is conscious objectivity. So what I have no relation to, I cannot say I have, and what I have a relation to, I cannot say I do not have. There is objectivity without a doubt. But in what sense is there? Objective reality existing independently of consciousness - there is no such thing, it is meaningless. I don't say it's the greatest nonsense in the history of philosophy because it doesn't actually fit in the history of philosophy. There is a serious internal contradiction here, namely that if I know something exists because I know it exists, i.e. because it is in my consciousness, then I declare that it exists even if it is not in my consciousness. In fact, it exists even if it has never been in my consciousness. By the way, this does not only apply to the whole of objective reality, and not only to the spheres of the afterlife, but also to something much more concrete. If one is sufficiently vigilant, one can see that an entity that is not present has a very specific ontological position. Anyone who thinks he is going home because he finds his apartment there is a naive realist. What does it mean to "be there"? It means that various imaginary states of being of the apartment in question may arise at some point. Otherwise it has no state. Why is it always possible to find something so regularly? It is because man's constitutive power is so deeply rooted, so profoundly remote from the sphere of power that man can control in ordinary consciousness, so great is his inertia - that is why things can be found. That is why one knows that when one goes there, one will find it. Not basically anything else, because basically you won't find anything else even if your house collapses. What would be fundamentally different is if you had permanent magical power over everything that exists. This magical power, though not within the immediate reach, exists as a possibility, of course, since power itself is a possibility of power. If this power potential is actualized, it is no longer a matter of demon magic, when the magician has not yet taken power over himself and therefore the powers appear in the form of beings. The appearance of magical power in the form of beings, which has not been fully taken over, is only a partial realisation of domination, and can be dangerous and fatal, since these powers in the form of beings are very real. The demon magician does exercise dominion over these forces, but not as over himself. In contrast to goetic or demonic magic, theurgic magic, on the other hand, is of such a nature that in it the power of the autonomist begins to increase into limitlessness and is above all a power over himself, so that the magician exercises his power over beings and forces, that is, over the heteron, as a power over himself.

The magician at the culmination becomes the creator, sustainer and transmuter of the whole world. He realises that the world exists because it is created and sustained - in the Hindu Īśvara-Trimūrti sense: as Brahma, Viṣṇu and Śiva. And it was always he who created, sustained and transmuted the world. But this is not only a question of mere recognition, but also a question of realisation: a question of realisation beyond the person. The accomplished magician not only realizes his own person, his own personhood, but it is he who realizes the whole of existence. Even if there were only one aspect of existence which

would be left out of the realization, it would make what we call metaphysical awakening impossible. Omnipotence is not a consequence but a precondition of metaphysical realisation. By omnipotence, of course, is meant omnipotence without any limitation. And this is not only omnipotentia, but also omniagentia. Not only omnipotent, but also omnipotent omnipotent. There is nothing in the world that is not operated by the purposeful magician. Who's the wizard with a purpose? Myself, when I reach my goal. Is there any other world than the world of consciousness? No. Is there any other center of consciousness outside myself as the subject? It cannot be said that there is. So the whole world arises from me. However, if I do not experience it as arising from me, then that means that I am not fully at the centre of myself. Or I could say that I am not fully myself. If I were fully myself, I would be realizing myself as creator, sustainer and transformer. The significance of this is limitless. The significance of this is infinitely great for the one who does not settle into his own state, for the one who settles into his own state will move out of his own state, but downwards. He who does not strive upwards will decline downwards. For the mere slowing down of descent requires extraordinary forces of ascent, not to speak of stopping and reversing.

When one looks at an ordinary human life, one sees in one half the teleological magnificence of providence, and in the other half its utter denial and destruction. These are questions of power. As long as man occupies the earth-human form of existence, he is in fact in an unfolding. In unfoldment, not in development. Anyone who sees this process as an analogy of development is fundamentally mistaken. It is a matter of occupation of a form of existence. Of course, the forces of death come into play immediately at the beginning of the life-form conquest, but they only predominate if man does not resist. But the spiritual man resists the death forces. What does this mean? It means, and it must mean, that man, not even in the sense of high realizations, but simply in terms of his very personhood, however long he lives, should always be at the highest stage of his life, at the last moment of his life. For if he lives to be a hundred and twenty years old, he will naturally be on a higher level at the age of a hundred and twenty than at the age of a hundred and nineteen; and on a far higher level than at the age of fifty. Of course, this is not usually the case. It is not found that those who live to a ripe old age are 'in floribus' in their last months. This means that an alien force begins to operate, an alien force which is not essentially alien, but which is for the moment alien in the experience. An effect is created. We know that disease is never caused by what appears to cause it. So, the obscuration of consciousness is never actually caused by cerebral arteriosclerosis, and in fact death from cholera is never caused by the causative agent of cholera, nor is anything caused by what one thinks it causes. They are always companions, associations, and they play a part in the periphery of the causation. Obviously you can't say of a pathogen, a pathogenic bacterium, that it has nothing to do with the disease, but it never has anything to do with the disease, it never has anything to do with the disease.

Every disease is a destiny. Since we generously say that heteron and auton, in fact, an unimaginable multiplicity and differentiated multiplicity of heteron-self-like forces, and differentiated acts of taking and losing power of the self as auton are present and taking place - this is the actual fate. It is these that create situations of destiny, so that from these situations of destiny attacks are launched against the present form of being. A

the attack takes in the deep physicality, and this is compounded, associated with the peripheral triggers. The actual causes are elsewhere, and from this point of view the causes of disease are more in the realm of causation. They do have a causality, but it is not a first-order, second-order or third-order causality, but a very much multiorder causality. That is why fighting them cannot produce fundamental cures. On the periphery there may be complete healing, but not at the bottom. The possibility of a healing process taking place in a multiplicity of planes and aspects was barely possible even in much older and purer times.

All spiritual approaches - and the Eastern approach emphasizes this in particular - do not treat the return to the self as an end, but actually include it in the sphere of operations of beginning, but are aware that such an operation of beginning can of course also appear as an end in the sphere of beginning. Nevertheless, realisation operations cannot be made obligatory for anyone, nor can it even be said that they are explicitly recommended for everyone. And one of the characteristic features of the present misguided paths is precisely that they place great emphasis on everyone following some definite path - which is not surprising, since they deliberately provide misguided paths, and it is therefore in their interest to impose them.

There are more serious and well-intentioned approaches, but they also propagate the same. There is no question of metaphysical realisation being suitable for everyone, even though it is ultimately open to all people - but only ultimately. Because, strictly speaking, it is open to most people only to a very limited extent. In fact, it is open to those who represent the ascending and aspiring image of the one Man, the spiritual, universal Man, as a possibility in themselves stronger than mere potentiality. So that metaphysical realisation is ultimately open to all, and that I myself, experiencing myself in all things, can awaken - this is in fact a doctrine, and it simply means that everyone can do it. To infer from this that I have a chance - especially when one does not aspire to it - is, in my opinion, usually suggested by those who do not aspire to metaphysical awakening but who have been informed from somewhere that it is nominally intelligent to set such goals. These people believe that I should actually strive because it is good and meaningful, and that I have a chance, even though I am not doing anything about it, and that I will do something about it when I have the time.

If one recognises the law that one represents, one recognises what Hinduism and Buddhism in Sanskrit call svadharma. The svadharma is its own rule, its own law of being. It is not just what its mission is and what it has to do, but rather how it can find the path that it has to take to find its way back to itself. In the complete return, then, both dharma and svadharma are eliminated, for the one who has reached the goal becomes the master of dharma. Therefore, there is no dharma applicable to him: he has no svadharma. However, the path is determined by the svadharma.

Finally, there is karma, which is so much misused. Karma means "action". And karma-vāda, karma-tan, means that every action in the world is related to every action. Of course, the action of the self, that is, what I experience as the action of the self, is even more closely related to my personal self. Embedded in the doctrine of karma is of course the principle of action-reaction, as well as the

of karma as a shackle, although the two are not the same. However, karma in the general sense is confused with karma-bandha, the karmic bond. The karma-bandha is the bondage. Why does this bondage work? Would it work because the unfortunate person does something? Is it because it is a shackle? No way. It is a shackle because the action is not completely self-realised. The heteron is a handcuff because the heteron is always playing into every action. It is only because of the heteron that karma becomes karmic bondage, vinculum karmicum, shackle, burden, net. It is because he is not the executor. It is because he is merely a co-executor. Even in his thinking he is only a co-executor, although in thinking the heteron has the smallest role. And it is for the latter reason that all paths of realization can and should begin with thinking, not because it is the most powerful, the most elementary. It is not. The reason why all paths must begin with thinking is because one is most oneself there and then. Even if he starts out on completely different and false trails in thinking, the thinking function itself has such peculiarities that it can serve as a starting point for a metamorphosis. Otherwise, even the smallest feeling is much more powerful than thinking, but feelings are so heteron-functional that they cannot be used as a starting point. Realisation cannot be built solely on feeling as a basis. At a certain stage of realisation, of course, feelings must also be into account, since they are among the most important elements of life.

So I can only reach - and this is a basic tenet of Eastern metaphysics - what I have never actually left. "In fact" I have not left it; because I have "actually" left, and have moved far away from what I never actually left. I can only get to what I never left.

\* \* \*

András László

## THE REGULARITY AND ESSENCE OF METAPHYSICAL REALISATION

In relation to prodination, initiation and metaphysical realisation, the question of regularity and irregularity, their relationship to each other, the indispensability of regularity or the permissibility of irregularity, arises again and again.

In this context, we must say that essentially, prodination, initiation and metaphysical realisation are also based on regularity. What is to be realised, what the aspirant is striving for, what is the aim, the essence of this whole process, can only be realised on the basis of regularity. But regularity can be interpreted in several ways. One can speak of conventional regularity, with respect to which the authors and thinkers of metaphysical traditionalism have held different views.

The introduction of the notion of conventional regularity is important, because there is no such thing as an irregular metaphysical realization; but we must also say that the realization need not be closely connected to a conventional school, a closely defined path, a center, or a chain represented by a center. This issue needs to be examined in more detail and analysed in more depth.

What is called irregularity from the point of view of conventional regularity is not necessarily irregularity in the strict sense of the word, but merely means that conventional regular lines can be switched off, suppressed or omitted in certain cases.

It should be borne in mind that in the present age, the trends and centres representing conventional regularity are either exhausted or have been exhausted. This means that, even if they are maintained, they are not necessarily able to provide real opportunities for initiative. It should also be borne in mind that, in the European context and in relation to the civilisations that emerge in Europe, there is only one religion or one set of religions that could in principle provide a backdrop for regular and conventional initiation and implementation. This religion is Christianity - not Islam, not Hinduism, not Buddhism, but Christianity.

Christianity, as a religion, cannot be the framework and condition for trends that are by their very nature very different from Christianity, and in some respects even opposed to it. If a person really wants to be religious, say a Roman Catholic, he cannot join a movement which differs from Catholicism in its internal doctrines, but in fact in its aims and in the whole course of its endeavour, to such an extent that this difference is in many respects

can be perceived as contrary to Catholicism. It is not possible to follow a religion as a framework which does not recognize either metatheism or autotheism, and is explicitly opposed to them, and which explicitly postulates God in terms of an objective reality, namely an objective reality independent of the consciousness, does not recognize the supernaturalness of God, and consequently cannot give support on essential questions and thus constitutes an obstacle for the aspirant to metaphysical realization. It is very important that only a religion which does not contradict the above-mentioned theses can be a suitable framework. If one follows a religion, one must follow it seriously, with full commitment, from the depths of one's being.



follow. From the depths of its being, it must follow the doctrines, along with the implementation paths and methodologies that are directly related to implementation. This statement on the question of religious frameworks is, we believe, correct. The situation is different in the case of Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism or Taoism, where their religious forms, in a certain respect, with a sufficient approach and sufficient experience, do provide a support and a framework.

The other question is the regularity of the implementation path itself, in this case the conventional regularity. We have just mentioned that conventional ways of realisation, although their methodology may be known, are no longer able to mediate properly in the West, nor in many respects in the East. The importance and fundamental significance of the centres of initiation and realisation, and of the chains that appear in connection with them, are not for a moment in doubt, but they are only valid if the realisation is a real realisation, if the initiation is really an initiation, if the human conditions are really present, both on the part of the masters and of the disciples, in which they can be perfectly practised and carried out. Although we do not deny it, we strongly doubt the likelihood that they exist today, and probably even less that they will exist in the future.

Again, this is not only the case in the West, but also in the East. The probability of success of experiments that arrogate a religious framework on the one hand, and a literally conventional regularity on the other (i.e. a methodology linked to a conventional regularity, a centre and a chain closely linked to a conventional regularity and representing it), is approximately zero.

Looking deeper into the question, we also need to look at what it means to be a chain. A chain does not only mean that the initiation comes to me in the sense that I have a master and my master had a master and my master had a master - and so on up to a certain point. This is actually a very exoteric, and therefore samsaric, aspect of initiation, realisation, transmission and chain. The chain is in fact within me, which, in Buddhist terminology, arrives at my level of consciousness and experience of being, originating from the Adi Buddha. This chain within me, if it is not connected to the chain that manifests externally, or vice versa, this chain that manifests externally is not connected to this chain within, then the reality of the chain as it is conventionally understood does not exist. If it exists, it exists within me.

It becomes recognized in me by deep-high intuition - then I belong to a chain, the real chain, which goes through different levels of guru to the Adi-Buddha, my own Adi-Buddha reality; it comes down from there, it is transmitted to me. The 'master', the guru, is always a projection of an inner guru. The guru I meet, whether in the external world or in an inner, internal experience, is me-myself in the strictest sense of the word. The guru represents my degree of self-guru, in relation to and towards my degree of cela ['disciple'], which I am experiencing at the moment.

There are possible paths of realization, and prior to that iniciatic, and prior to that prodiniciatic paths, possibilities that are not connected to any conventional regularity, in this way, from this point of view, they are "irregular", but in a deeper, more profound sense they also represent a regularity, a centrality and a chain-likeity.

Where the external conditions for the latter are there, there is an exoterically understood chain and centre, where authentic masters teach; authentic disciples are attached to it, and I am attached to the authentic master as an authentic disciple. This way is more secure, more solid, more reliable than if it were not done this way. But this possibility has not existed for at least a millennium; the inner aspiration can exist.

The inner aspiration and the aspirant representing the inner aspiration do not in this case have to wander the world until they find some kind of centre, but can be linked to an apparent irregularity which is, however, internally and essentially regular, and which is decisively based on inner cognitions, which proceeds from inner cognitions, and which finds a regular methodology through inner cognitions, which can and is able to function without an external regular framework, but which can and does function in the sense of the strictest regularity and methodology.

Without regularity and methodology, there is no implementation. We state, postulate and advocate this in the strongest possible terms at all times, to all people. However, it is not necessarily what it usually is or what is usually thought to be.

Also, external regularity is only valid if it is socialized by an internal regularity, otherwise the external chain does not chain me. Being associated with a credible master who had an even more credible master, and so on, does not in itself guarantee anything, even if it is correctly maintained. But in the present day, it does not. The aspirant is forced to resort to a much more unstable, insecure and indefensible solution, because he has no choice, because there is no other.

Modern man is incapable of initiation. Only archaic consciousness can be initiated. In the case where there is an affinity and orientation towards archaicity, consciousness must be pre-archaized by prodinication so that realization can really begin, for the time being at the level of initiation. Initiation must be preceded by prodinication, and much must precede it. There must be some recourse to doctrinal memories of regular pathways. Very cautiously though, because these involved presentation by the guru and the guru's instructions in this regard. One can also find the methodology, especially bearing in mind that the whole process, even in its most accelerated version, is done in small steps. One must first correct oneself, thus making oneself suitable for prodinication. There are also preparatory stages of rectification. In the case of an evolving case, these

but with small steps, it can achieve an inner luminosity that, in small steps, will definitely increase its insight into the whole process. Actions taken in small steps become operations of revealing validity. He who starts on this line at the most elementary level of self-correction can take the next step in the sense of a greater inner luminosity, and then proceed with still greater luminosity. The possibility of derailment is constant, even when under the guidance of a guru. One cannot progress completely without a guru. "He who is not led by a master is led by Satan." A guru, if an external guru, is also an internal guru, projecting into the so-called external guru, which is hidden within, and which can be realized from its hiddenness through processes. The danger is great, but the danger is also great if there is an external guru, if I am linked to a chain, if I am linked to an organised centre in the sense of conventional regularity. Without this, there is an even greater risk, but today it is the only path that still opens up possibilities for me.

We come to a very important question. What is the essence of implementation? The essence of implementation is not the methodology. Without methodology there is no realisation, but realisation does not depend on methodology. If I have a real, strong and insurmountable aspiration to seek Truth, which in this case means Truth rooted in myself, and which in this case means ultimately to attain to myself - if this aspiration is present in me in a real and increasing degree, in the sense of life above life, then this aspiration will be my only possibility of realisation. This is the essence of realization and not the methodology. One can practice the methodology for millions of years and get nowhere in the best case. In a less good case, it will lead to disintegration, disintegration and fall. If I do yoga practice - even under the supervision of a master - and this aspiration is not alive in me, I will get nowhere. Let us add that the master who takes on such a disciple cannot be a fully authentic master. It is precisely the "generosity" towards the disciples that is one of the most concise signs that the masters are not authentic masters or are very inauthentic masters.

It is about a real, strong and insurmountable quest for Truth. This is what leads to realization. But this effort must be coordinated, regularised, coordinated, ordered, structured, otherwise the whole process will become a disjointed process, a ductus. But if this effort is there, then the methodology - although, I repeat, it is indispensable and inescapable - is secondary. It is never for lack of methodology that they have never achieved what they have not achieved, and it is never for lack of methodology that they have achieved what they have achieved. It is certainly true to say - as it was understood in the East - that those who mature sufficiently will find the right methodology. He will find it in the form of an external guru or an inner guru. He will find the helpful moments and actions to be performed. Without methodology there is no realisation, but only on the basis of methodology is realisation unthinkable - and immeasurably little attention is paid to this. Most of today's trends say: do it! You have to do it! But if you don't live what is at the heart of it all, you do it in vain. And if a master takes a disciple who is immature and incapable of the essence, then the master is not a true master and the disciple is not a true disciple. That is clear, for sure.

If somehow - almost miraculously - someone has the opportunity to join an authentic centre and has this aspiration, then do so. It is right to do so, and wrong not to do so. But again, it is no longer an open possibility. There are not many authentic centres, and they are not really centres any more, but there are a lot of obviously pseudo-centres. It should be noted that we can rightly harbour very well-founded doubts about the seriousness of genuinely serious trends. One can be a privately serious person, credible and intelligent, but something is missing.

Apparently, maintaining centres, even if possible, is actually criminal. Yet it is sinful to initiate uninitiated people, to force people who are incapable of realisation into paths of realisation. It is also on the part of the disciple, and that is because he has not seen through his svadharma. It is not a duty, not a task, nor is it to be approved if a person who is incapable of initiation nevertheless seeks initiation. A man who is as yet uninitiated may be able to perform inner operations which will make him initiate, but there are men whose svadharma is far from being set in that direction; such a man's aspiration is inherently defective. If a master takes such a person as a disciple, the master's mastery - and that is the finest way of putting it - is questionable. To put it more strictly, it is questionable and deniable.

We are pro-regularity, we are pro-methodicity, and we cannot be any different if we take this issue seriously. But this regularity does not necessarily have to be conventional regularity. The methodology, the set of methodologies, does not yet guarantee implementation.

It will be the praexistential-transcendental base and traditionalism as qualities, as well as the orientation and ambition, which, while keeping the principles in mind, will ensure internal regularity despite external irregularity.

**András László**

**SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE TEMPORAL FRAGMENTATION OF HUMAN LIFE**

The time as flowing duration (duratio fluens) three adequate ways of looking at it are possible: a) linear time and time perspective, b) cyclical time and time perspective, c) radial time and time perspective. These three ways of conceiving time, temporality and temporality are not only each of them is valid, but only a combination of them can be accepted.

The time as a flowing tank is both linear and at the same time cyclic. Radial time appears in the interrelation of the flowing duration (duratio fluens) and the stationary duration (duratio stans). This time is called as stationary duration the time of entry into time as a flowing container, and at the same time the time of exit from the flowing container, directly to the plane of the created stationary container (duratio stans creata), and indirectly to the absolute timelessness of the uncreated stationary container.

On the plane of the earthly human world, the corporal man is individual personal his life of existence begins in time (in tempore) and ends in time (in tempore), but in his ever-present higher planes of being there are always present other beginnings and ends, other contents, the totality of the bidirectionality of linearity, cyclicity and radiality. The interplay of these forms the quasi-rhythmic content articulation of all human life.

Normative minimum human lifespan is 72 years in the traditional sense; in the Far East, people like to talk about 81 or even 120 years, en from an astrological point of view 96 years, 100 years and 108 years, and according to some trends 60, 64 and 84 years are also considered to be of great significance.

Accepting the tripartite structure is inevitable, but nevertheless exaggerated. Youth, maturity and old age: a valid distinction, but no room to satisfy the need for nuance.

The four-way split seems to be is definitely more valid, especially if like the Yugas the ratio 1:2:3:4 as a growth progression within the at the forefront of our thinking.

Here are the 70-year-old and the 90-year-old second-rate should be taken as a basis, because these are base years, while 7 years and 9 years are of primary importance. In other words:

1 x 7 years = 7 years 0 up to 7 years of age Childhood

**2 x 7 years = 14 years 7 up to 21 years adolescence/young adulthood**

**3 x 7 years= 21 years 21 to 42 years of age before maturity**

**4 x 7 years= 28 years 42 up to 70 years of age at maturity and beyond**

**In this segmentation, old age begins at age 70 and older, and outward activity roughly this is the final period. This is when the real inward turn should begin.**

**In other words:**

**1 x 9 years = 9 years 0 up to 9 years of age Childhood**

**2 x 9 years = 18 years 9 up to age 27 youth**

**3 x 9 years = 27 years 27 54 years to maturity**

**4 x 9 years= 36 years 54 up to 90 years old old age**

**Age of old age in this division starts after the age of 90.**

**A clearer and more nuanced picture is obtained by combining the above lifespan divisions with the planetary divisions of astrology.**

**According to the 9 years of basic membership:**

**0-9 years Luna**

**9-18 years Mercurius**

**18-27 years Venus**

**27-36 years old Sol**

**36-45 years old Sol**

**45-54 years old Sol**

**54-63 years old Mars**

**63-72 years old Jupiter**

**72- ? until the age of 72 Saturnus**

**According to the 7 years of basic membership:**

**0-7 years Luna**

**7-14 years Mercurius**

**14-21 years Venus**

**21-28 years old Sol**

**28-35 years old Sol**

**35-42 years of age Sol**

**42-49 years of age Sol**

**49-56 years of age Sol**

**56-63 years old Mars**

**63-70 years old Jupiter**

**70- ? up to the age of 70 Saturnus**

**According to the 12-year basic membership:**

**0-12 years Luna**

**12-24 years Mercurius**

**24-36 years Venus**

**36-48 years old Sol**

**48-60 years old Sol**

**60-72 years old Mars**

**72- 84 years old Jupiter**

**84- ? up to the age of 18 Saturnus**

**These three different subdivisions are valid and should be considered together, with the two types of tetractys tagging being taken into account to a large extent.**

**Details of the 7 years of basic contributions the first 7 years of life:**

**0   1 year old Luna      Luna**

**1   Up to 2 years Luna   Mercurius**

**2   Up to 3 years Luna   Venus**



3 Up to 4 years Luna Sol

4 Up to 5 years Luna Mars

5 Up to 6 years Luna Jupiter

6 Up to 7 years old Luna Saturnus

This fragmentation also occurs later in life, but not in such a clear and explicit way.

According to tradition, in Satya Krta-Yuga in the Golden Age the human lifespan was 4000 or 4320 years, but it could be longer; in the Treta-Yuga, the duration of human life on earth was 3000 or 3240 years; in the Dvapara-Yuga, was 2000 or 2160 years; in the Kali-Yuga, in the Dark Age less than 1000 or 1080 years, the duration of the period, the general maximum is either 100 or 108 years; people usually live shorter than that and only very exceptionally live longer.

Astrology takes into 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, (132,) 144-year life cycles, but there are also many adherents of the 100-year A. Frank Glahn life cycle. And post mortem, a life cycle based on the actual life =  $360^\circ$  key can be constructed, and it retrospectively outperforms all other life cycles in terms of validity.

Lifetime quantitative in the sense and in relation to projectiveness is not usually known, so the most appropriate way to define a broad outline of a spiritual life plan is to think in terms of 72 years, although life can be much shorter and much longer. If one has already reached the age of 72, one can move on to a life expectancy of 108 years, which is possibly to 144 years (the divisibility by 36 is a particular priority).

For the ages life stages are associated with specific life management modalities, tasks and responsibilities, the non-adherence to which can be a major and potentially fatal which may lead to the accumulation of disadvantages along the line of autotransmutatio spiritualis et metaphysica.

There have been, are and will be very exceptional cases, exceptional lives, exceptional individuum personae/persona individualis, who have transcended and who will transcend the otherwise necessarily valid framework of life management, including in relation to age-related tasks. These are, for example, those who follow one of the regular - exceptionally: irregular - paths of Yoga. Yoga, as an asceticism of metaphysical realisation, gives or can give an exemption from the absolute obligation of caste laws - the varna-dharmas - and age laws - the asrama-dharmas.

In the world of brahmana-varna varna-dharma as defined by the Indo-Hindu tradition, the following cycle of asrama-dharma was included, according to the stage-levels of the stages:

#### 1. brahmacari(n) phase

This is the youth period, which corresponds to the period of immersion in studies, the later increasingly spiritual in the sense of laying the foundations for a more spiritualised life.

#### 2. grhastha phase

The era of the master of the house, husband and father. It is an age of founding a family, of worldly growth, of begetting and rearing children, but with all its aspects subordinated to the principles of a spiritual metaphysical orientation.

#### 3. vānaprastha phase

If the youngest child of the Brahmana father has started to lead an independent life, and other unconditional no longer has any other duties, the father, as a husband, must leave home and retire to a forest hermitage to concentrate exclusively on the supernatural.

#### 4. sanitation phase(s)

Old age in the forest hermitage presents the Brahmana a new task: he must also leave the forest hermitage to live out his final period of life as a wandering, totally homeless hermit ascetic, fully immersed in the metaphysical liberation of the the moksha realization of the moksa.

These life phases were loosely connected to the life phases that followed from the temporal fragmentation, but the relatively close connection meant an approach to optimality, and if this was not precluded or prevented by something,

preferably with a view to matching them as a quasi-task.

With some irony, one could say that the average person is infantile until about the age of 36, after which he or she becomes senile, or at least senile, almost without transition .

The nine-yearly rounds plus or minus one to two or three years are extremely significant. Most people stop around the age of 27 , about is stuck; its approach is fixed by then, and even if it can change, it will not be a real change, he remains within the existing, established and rigid framework-schemata, if he changes his position, he accepts the new one in the same way as he accepted the discarded one before and kept it for a while. The very low class of people already start to falter around the age of 18, and the rest of their lives mainly in a visual sense. by what they have built into themselves up to that point. Today, even the closure around the age of 36 begins to to become an accomplishment , and around the age of 45 or 54 will become increasingly exceptional.

The spiritual man should never be closed, and if he is a truly spiritual man, we know that he will never be closed, he will never be closed beyond the age of a hundred, if he is worth it, and never at all.

In fact, immediately before death (and of course at the moment of death), you have to be at the highest spiritual level, whenever it occurs. There may be a biophysiological slowdown that occurs, it is still is permissible , but there is no actual mental decline.

The perpetual youth of the body in Kali-Yuga is only possible for very exceptional viators of very exceptional paths, and even this is less and less. The soul of the soul in the case of the spiritual man, however requirement, and the purity of mind is a *condicio sine qua non*, and this we believe to be self-evident.

The spirit, in its present state of progress in Kali-Yuga, has little influence on the body, but it can prevent the body from dominating the spirit and the integrity of the spirit. The body can have a strong influence on the spirit in general, and through it it can influence the spirit. It is imperative that the dominating power of the body's direct indirect influence on the soul over the spirit be restrained by anyone who wishes to define himself as a spiritual metaphysical aspirant. The difficulty of accomplishing this task is extreme, and depending on the time increasingly difficult as the age progresses.

When a person grows up, they have to become a full adult, it is essential to maintain and increase vigilance maturely; but this must be done by to reach to achieve without any infantilism

keep the child inside you. The loss of the child within oneself precludes spiritual metaphysical realisation, as does the failure to perfect adulthood. The infantile adult is the one who, despite growing up, remains a child in such a way that true, mature adulthood is never actually attained. Adulthood if the preservation and maintenance of the child is lost it passes briefly into the onset of senility. To put it more strictly: the in us is the main metasomatic cause of the onset of senility.

To summarise: infantility and senility, in different ways, both exclude spiritual metaphysical realisation.

The child (especially the infant) is closer to the origin, through it to the beginning, and behind it to the beginningless. The adult, on the other hand, has come or is coming closer to the possession of mature alertness, of alert maturity. The state of the infant, though progressively decreasing, is given, but the adult's the life path from the middle to the end subject to natural contingencies declines, and this is only otherwise if there is a definite inner one might say: superhuman and superhuman willful counteraction to this decline.

An upward counter-movement is needed: not only for the actual rise, but also to stop the downward descent, and even to slow it down. Whoever relies on naturalism must die young in order not to grow old approaching humanity, thus ending his life on earth.

Praeexistence and postexistence belong to the timeless existence in relation to human temporality on earth. But this is far from being an absolute timeless eternity (aeternitas), only a timeless eternity so different from the temporality is temporality, which, in relation to the generally experienced temporality of content, means, even if relatively, but in fact: a kind of quasi-temporality.

The absolute certainty of the reality of human praeexistence and postexistence is emphatically affirmed, while the theological positions on this issue are which may be very different from one another usually put in place we accept. As to redincarnationismus vulgaris, our position is negative; nor can we accept the claims of the restrained postulatio redincarnationis in the affirmative. The metaphysico-traditional view of regeneratio tendentialis is generally and unambiguously accepted. It is indeed not open to discussion. The question is whether the tendencies

karmically self-determined whether something beyond the karmically karmic reflux of tendencies is acceptable that can be related to the basic claims of the nuanced and restrained doctrine of regeneration. The answer must also be nuanced, restrained, multifaceted and must be ambiguous. To discuss this would require volumes of guides. As this is not the subject of this paper, we cannot even tangentially address the issue. All we can say is that a firm rejection of redincarnationismus vulgaris, a rejection of redincarnationismus subtilis, is one of our basic premises, but that this does not necessarily imply a complete denial of factualitas redincarnationis.

Life, embedded in the framework of the supra-life, does not begin with birth, biological conception, or even occult conception, nor does it end with clinical, biological or perfected death (or any subsequent temporal event). The ways in which pre-mortal and post-mortal life-life are immeasurably complex, multifaceted and ambiguous, and the relevant questions and answers are also multi-aspectual and multi-dimensional.

The totality of life goes far beyond the rhythmicity, cyclicity, articulability and indivisibility of the ages. But this in no way contradicts the division of the duration of life into different phases as a far-reaching and justified procedure, neither in terms of validity nor in terms of justification.

Life is not very predictable. From a metaphysico-traditional point of view, the potential success of life planning multivalent, or at least bivalent. If it is considered possible and positively valued, the most sophisticated and in-depth consideration of the life stages is essential. our self in relation to the life of the self. The former promotes the latter, and in relation to the recognition of the principle the latter needs the support of the former.

Temporal existence is related to the multiplicity of cycles. The smallest are of the order of tens of thousands of time-seconds or even shorter, the largest are measured in quadrillion years . The study of these does not fall within the scope of metaphysics in the strict sense, but metaphysically defined cosmology and anthropology are important preliminary and subsidiary studies precisely for the foundation of metaphysical reflection.

Modern man is insensitive to everything that extends and goes beyond his earth-human existence - in the sense of verticality and upwards. Modern man, however, is not necessarily modern man (though he usually is). Modern man does not take into account the content and phase of life, even if he is informed of their existence, even if he has read about the phases of life and their consequential references.

The interest of the modern man and the man who is able to break away from modernity necessarily extends to the which can rightly be called occult background contexts. This is not yet a metaphysical orientation, but optimally can prepare it, introduce it, lay the foundations for it. in general We should generally be positive about all such things, as long as they do not represent a fixation on the occult only, as this fixation can become one of the primary obstacles to a turn towards the metaphysical. In the present in many respects modern occult trends reveals the existence of this danger and

complexity. (We do not consider a comprehensive and detailed knowledge of occult trends to be inevitable, but interesting, at least important.)

Human life on earth is not at all of earthly origin. The Kali-Yuga which is primarily a state of consciousness (To state this explicitly does not in the least contradict our solipsistic position.) Human life exists and takes place within the framework of Kali-Yuga, but Kali-Yuga itself is not independent of higher consciousness-existence realities. Awareness of this must be embedded in the understanding of the phases of human life.

László András

TANTRIKUS YOGA

Tantric Yoga as a subject does not need to be given a special topicality. The topicality of this subject is precisely that which gives topicality to all substantial and fundamental questions, questions which are directed to the subjectivity of man, which deal with his subjectivity, and all questions on which misunderstanding, misunderstanding, misinterpretation, good or bad faith, have become almost universal.

To understand this compound "Tantric Yoga" from some angles, we need to clarify what Yoga means and what Tantra means in the interpretation in which I would like to put it. And what are the principles of being and what are the foundations of principle that are necessary to understand and interpret it correctly, either theoretically or in preparation for a practice.

Tantra is a Sanskrit word meaning "extension". This is the shortest, simplest term that can be used to describe it, and extension means that Tantra as a principle and as a practice should be extended to all spheres of human existence.

However, Tantra can be associated with religions based on certain metaphysical traditions. These religions are primarily Hinduism, Buddhism and Jainism (or Jainism), and are also related in a metaphorical but essentially close sense to religions such as Taoism or so-called universalism, i.e. the various Chinese traditions, and

to the Tibetan tradition. In quite different contexts, the expanded sense of Tantra can even include tendencies that are more prevalent in the Western world or in the Middle East, so for example Hermeticism, narrowly defined but expanded from the ordinary sense, is indeed part of Tantrism.

If we are looking for a proper translation of Yoga, we cannot be satisfied with the usual dictionary analysis, which is based on the root "yuj" and has a wide variety of meanings of subjugation, subduing, restraining, binding, etc. It is most appropriate to associate it with the Greek word asceticism, as it really and originally occurred, which means an exercise in spiritual realization. The purpose of Yoga is in all cases a Purpose which must be called metaphysical in the strictest sense of the word.

Metaphysics has two possible and primary meanings. The designation itself is "ta meta ta physika", that which is beyond the existent. That is why one sense of metaphysics simply refers to that which is beyond nature, the lower sense, and the higher sense: it refers to that which is beyond all that is, all that exists, all entities. We know, by the way, that many other meanings have occurred in the history of philosophy. It was a branch of philosophy, roughly coinciding with the theory of being, and a method which was sharply rejected by the Hegelians, for example, or criticised by existential philosophy like Heidegger's. By metaphysics we will understand neither a method nor a philosophical discipline, but the two senses indicated above: on the one hand, that which is beyond nature, and on the other, that which is beyond all that is.

The purpose of Yoga: metaphysical realisation. Metaphysical realization in the sense that Consciousness is rooted in the Metaphysical itself, and the regression in Consciousness leads one's subjectivity back to the Universal Subjectivity which is beyond the created world, which is beyond all created spheres. Yoga, therefore, realization is absolute self-realization, a realization that lifts man out of the human world, lifts him out of the world of the existent and leads him through a path opened in himself to the Beyond Being Center of existence.

The philosophical and theoretical background to Yoga is quite strict. The popular and propagandistic literature, which may be disseminated even by orientalists, is usually completely detached from any philosophy of existence. This, however, if we are to deal with it rigorously and seriously, that is, if we are to set ourselves on a line from which we can be properly informed, we must recognize that it is not at all indifferent to the theory of being with which this subject can be approached in any meaningful and reasoned way at all.

The first duality that we have to account for in terms of understanding is the primacy of Consciousness and Being in relation to each other, or the primacy of one over the other.

subordination. In the Yoga view, the extended sense of Consciousness, which usually includes what is called "unconsciousness" or "superconsciousness", in this extended sense Consciousness and Being are the same, coincident. There is Conscious Being, not one determining the other. Being is Conscious Being, there is no other kind of Being, so to speak of a Being separate from Consciousness is utter nonsense. Objectivity itself, which must necessarily be recognized, is not independent of Consciousness, but is objectivity of Consciousness. All processes are traceable to a process of consciousness and to conscious subjectivity, subjectivity. These relations of consciousness have different degrees and are realised more and more strongly and intensively as they are realised.

If we go further along this line, then subjectivism, properly understood, also becomes an indispensable theoretical basis. This must be understood so profoundly and so completely that it must be said: if I identify the Subject with my Self (in the first person singular), in this case there is only one Subject in all Being. This is not the identification with my personal Self. There are many persons, many human persons, many individual persons, but one Subject. A single Subject, whose fullness and universality of potentiality is not unfolded, because the central state of the Subject in the experience is not realized to the extent and with the force that it should in fact normally manifest. It is well known that this approach, which assumes the universality of the Subject, is what philosophy calls solipsism. To understand Yoga it is essential to take up the principle of solipsism. Otherwise, the realization of the Absolute Metaphysical Center in the Self would be impossible to talk about.

If we want to define solipsism even more strictly, it should be called magical solipsism. Magic means power and dominion over Being. So it also means that the state beyond the ultimate and absolute state is realizable, this realization is up to me alone, no other external spiritual power can interfere with it. From this point of view, for example, the question of whether there is or is not a God is meaningless. God is a potentiality, the ultimate, powerful fullness of the Subject, which is according to its being realized in a realization. So this question of whether there is or not is meaningless.

Going further along this line, we have to come back to Tantra, which has its religious offshoots, but is primarily associated with the metaphysical realization, i.e., Yoga. (We don't have time to talk about the not at all uninteresting historical background of this. Anyone who reads in world languages will find a large body of valuable literature on this subject. There are many books on this subject, although a considerable number of them are misguided.) Tantric Yoga should be called the "Yoga of Power". The principle of power plays a role in all Yoga, but in Tantric Yoga it is of exceptional importance and can therefore be called "the Yoga of Power Expansion". It is a path with a distinctly magical character, a path that is the most difficult of all possible paths to follow, and



but it is increasingly becoming the only way left open (the only way left open for man).

Another thing to note about Yogá is that the term is generally used in a very irresponsible way. One who does some physical exercises imagines that he is on the path of Yoga, whereas the term Prayoga, or pre-yoga, has long been known, which was the preparatory path to Yoga for the very advanced man, but in modern times man has become so far removed from the original principles that even Prayoga cannot be done directly: it requires a long preparatory action. But on the theoretical plane, too, everything must be preceded, for without theoretical confusion it is inconceivable to begin or continue any praxis.

What does this "extension of power" mean? And how is it different from those Yoga movements where it has not come to the fore? The Tantric view, and indeed all spiritual views, accept the reality of involution as opposed to necessary or possible evolution and evolutionary theories, that is, that man and Consciousness do not rise in time generally sink. That is, there is no upward regularity or upward contingency. Ascension can only be conscious, only voluntary and only free. Here, necessity or contingency cannot even be assumed. All that is connected with necessity or contingency, or some amalgamation of these, is always in long run conducive to descent, descent, descent.

In Eastern doctrines, the Dark Age, Kali-Yuga, is a general teaching. This age is associated with the beginning of history, so that the Kali-Yuga, the Dark Age, begins at the time when history proper begins; it is associated with a date: 3102 B.C. (but this is only a date to give a direction). The Kali-Yuga therefore begins with history and becomes more and more intense, more and more of a darkening, according to the principles, not in the World and not in Consciousness, but in both, since there is only conscious Being and conscious World. Descent in Yoga and Yoga preparation is transformed into ascent. It is now a volitional and free self-action. In the pre-Kali-Yuga ages, the structure of being and consciousness made it possible to a great extent for all that a person came into contact with in his spiritual realisation to be and to be easily made into something that aided and enabled ascension itself. As the Kali-Yuga becomes more and more intensified, the means of realization must be more and more extended. Areas of life must be brought into the process of transformation (for Yoga is the transformation of life processes and areas and terrains of consciousness) that do not in their ordinary form facilitate realization, and in their ordinary form are even contrary to the aspirations of realization. The so-called "non-tantric Yogas" are thus directed only to areas which are already conducive to ascension, while the tantric paths are in fact progressively extended to all areas.

"The Lord of all Yoga" is seen in the Indian view of Shiva. Siva is a potentiality of power which means a mastery over regeneration. The Tantric paths of Yoga are particularly associated with the Siva principle, and of these in particular those that bear the name of Vamacara, or the "Path of the Left Hand". The left hand has always been a symbol of avoidance (for example, in India one could never take food or medicine into one's mouth with the left hand). The Path of the Left Hand means to extend realisation, i.e. to include what would otherwise be avoided into the scope of practice and to practice ascetically.

Some branches of Buddhism, such as Vajra-yana (the way of the Diamond-Villam carrier), which is prevalent in Tibet, or also the Chinese Chan Buddhism, or Japanese Zen Buddhism, are not religious Buddhism, but trans-religious and aspiring to realisation, all of which are considered tantric paths. It is therefore important to note that Chan and Zen are tantric paths. We can state that they include not only the spiritual-mental paths of meditation in the strict sense, but also those that include, for example, areas of life such as asceticism: fighting and the martial arts. Think of Taoist Yoga, or Chan, or even Zen Yoga. Fighting and martial arts, fighting as a way of life, can be a path of realization. Commonly, fighting is an inner activity that is the opposite of realization. That which is connected with the greatest passions (in general) can therefore be pursued with such inward neutrality without diminishing the power in it that it can ultimately be put at the service of spiritual elevation.

What is commonly known about tantrism is the link between realisation and sexuality. There are certain things to be said about this, how true it is and what it means.

A wide variety of mythologies, including the so-called Androgynous myth, speak of man in a primordial and as yet unmaterialised state an Androgynous, that is, as one who fully absorbed both sexes into himself. He was therefore not half male and half female, but both fully male and fully female. According to the myth, the Androgynous men besieging Olympos were cut in two by the Apollo gods and since then the two halved beings have been searching for each other and thus cannot take possession of Olympos.

The word sexus itself is probably derived from the word secare meaning "to cut"; it is therefore related to "to cut" and its original purpose would be for the two beings to re-establish Androgynos and legitimately take possession of Olympos. Commonly, sexuality does not promote spiritual and metaphysical realisation, but diverts the inner orientation away from it and thus hinders realisation. By developing a particular inner attitude, the tantric paths have made it possible for sexuality itself to become a path. Sexuality itself was used as a magical path, in the sense of its original purpose (Androgynous restoration), eliminating all its features associated with deviation from the path.

Of course, fighting, and sexuality in the realm of realisation, are extreme examples. But tantrism is more distantly a particular way or

options, such as the way of tea ceremonies or flower arranging, the so-called ikebana. So everything that does not usually promote implementation, or even works against it (in the absence of proper control), has now been made a means to an end. The tantric formulation speaks of this as "turning poisons into elixirs". So what is commonly a deadly poison must be transformed into a medicine, even a life-giving force.

The actuality of tantric trends increases with time, because more and more processes become negativistic, become something that works against human realization. Slowly, progressing in the Kali-Yuga, in the present age or so, even abilities such as the pure gnostic, or transcendental abilities, are increasingly undergoing such a degeneration that they are becoming negative in the public domain. So thinking itself, which is the most obvious way, whatever the path, is also in danger. Not the way of thinking, but the way of thinking, the functional transformation of thinking is the first task in every tendency. There is no exception to this. It could not once be called tantric in nature. Today, after thinking has undergone such a transformation, that is, it has become so embodied, so reliant on bodily-nervous-systemic vehicles, especially its rational, discursive form, not to mention automatic, associative, "thinking while thinking", that it is now considered rather negative in its ordinary form, rather than positive, that is to say, a force which is in fact (in the first person singular) the force of the I myself, but since I do not experience myself as the master of this force, the master of this force becomes something else (heteron) which is in fact also myself, but not my self-recognized self, moved by another, alien force.

It is essential to clarify certain basic concepts about tantrism. One such concept is Sakti. The Indo-European etymology of the word is very poorly understood. The meaning of Sakti is quite narrowly 'power'. Power and strength. In tantric symbolism, Sakti was understood to be feminine and the one who possesses Sakti (called Sakta) was understood to be masculine. Sakta is actually Siva.

Many of you have probably heard of the strange symbolism of the snake, which represents Sakti, coiled up and sleeping in its dormant state. The purpose is to awaken and unite this coiled snake-like Kundali, or Kundalini in its female form, with Sakti or Shiva. The Sakti, without the possession of power, that is, if the possessor of power is not the experiencer of the subject, appears as an unbridled force. So it is a restrained force that disintegrates and destroys. It is also related to Kali-Yuga itself, since one of these representative goddesses of Shakti is called Kali (black, dark). She represents the principle of destruction and destruction and Shakti is related to this here. Here the goal is domination over Sakti, that is, the realization of a position, which position is the position of Sakta, the possessor of Power.

This is an opportunity, after having associated Sakti with the feminine, to see on the basis of a partly symbolic and partly a deeper reality, that this is not just a biologically based duality,

but of a duality that exists ontically, existentially, that is rooted in the depths of Being, and that manifests itself in some way in all spheres, on all planes of the world. In the existential totality, it manifests as the duality of the Spirit (Purusa) and the world-in-being (Prakrti). Biologically, very few and very pathetic arguments can be made for why biological, bipolar sexuality exists, and why it must exist. In fact, it cannot be supported. The argumentation on this gives a very after-the-fact and tacked-on impression. The bipolarity of sex in the world corresponds to the totality of Being, of conscious Being, which is also bipolar and represents duality within Oneness.

The restoration of Oneness is also the restoration of the wholeness of Realisation. So the more primordial a life form is, the more it reflects this sexual bipolarity, and this also confirms that very simple living beings where this is no longer found were never primitive, but were always the final product of an involution. So where the qualitative differences become increasingly blurred and disappear, the more one can expect a degradation. But sexual bipolarity is normally perfectly present in man, and in the tantric tendencies this has been very much taken into account and, as I have said, brought within the realm of realization. It would be superfluous to go into the details of this, but it should be stated that the methodology should be, above all, the full realisation of one's own gender, that is, the man should be fully male and the woman as much as possible female. Do not therefore seek to create unity by approaching the other sex in this way. It is only total separation that can create bipolar unity.

Among the tantric tendencies, two should be distinguished, one is the Divya tendency, which assumes a specific type of man, also called Divya. The other path is the Viriya principle. In the Greek language this word "theos" has three meanings, (1.) The god; (2.) One of the gods; (3.) A man of divine quality. In the Greek, Hemitheos.

the demigod, another name is Heros. This word corresponds etymologically and meaningfully to the Sanskrit Vira, since in ancient Greek Heros was: Veros. In Latin we also find "vir" meaning man, which always refers to a quality higher than man. Vira is the heroic man. Divya is the divine man, the god-man. The path of Divya in Tantric Yoga was the path of the man who was all alone. That of the Yogi who found the other sex within himself, separated it from himself in a process of inner spiritual separation, separated it completely and finally united with it as World-Sakti.

The way of Vira was different, because there Sakti was represented by a living, concrete woman. The separation in this case also took place from both sides. The woman was usually a representative of a spiritual being called Dakini, sometimes called Yogini, and the one who walked the same path as the Yogi. (Just as an aside, I should state that it is a common misconception among those who read or have encountered such books that the Yogini is considered a "female Yogi". There is no such thing as a single Yogini. It always belongs to a Yogi. They always form a group.)

So, while in one of the paths, the path of Divya, there was a singular realisation, although the unification of the hidden world polarity took place here too, in the path of Vira there was a concrete, visible representative of it, that is, two persons were the bearers of the polarity. The path of Divya became increasingly impassable. It should be noted that the path of Vira is not easy to walk either, so it requires extraordinary, preliminary inner transformations, inner spiritual and mental transformations, to even reach it, or even to reach the preparation for Pra-yoga. This should be understood as a fixed point, which is unchanging, but in relation to which one is moving further and further back.

Ultimately, all human beings are capable of metaphysical realisation in the final analysis. No concrete conclusions can be drawn from this. It means that the human condition carries with it potentialities, so that certain conditions are simply inherent in the human condition. Moreover, certain conditions are even given in the subhuman form of existence, but in order for all the preconditions to be present, it is necessary to possess or acquire special exceptional qualities within the human form of existence.

It's very unfortunate that in the present times, certain East Indians and more recently Tibetans are going around the world propagating different ways. In general, the fact that they are oriental and know something has a strange suggestive effect, a completely pointless effect. So, on the basis that one can show what one knows, how one knows it, it only seems to justify something, and in fact it justifies nothing... It makes absolutely no difference if one knows something, whether one heard it on the tram or learned it from an oriental master. It means nothing intellectually. The so called "yogis" are all, without exception, common crooks. They find out what they can swing apart to their advantage and swing it apart to their advantage. They have the worst opinion of them in the closed, exclusive circles of India. One can tell with unerring accuracy that one is on a wrong track in this area by the fact that one claims that the path one is on is open to all without further ado: in this case, clearly wrong. There can be no exception to this! It is precisely a denial of the human quality, that is to say, a denial of precisely that quality which comes to the fore here, not to the extent that it does in profane life in general, but as a multiple of that quality. It is precisely the less spectacular differences whose significance is unheard of.

Every spiritual approach, in all aspects of the world, is hierarchical. Spiritual realization also has an inner hierarchy, which gives a hierarchical picture of ordinary human states up to the realization of the Absolute. Every meditative path has an inner hierarchy. In this way, people differ from each other according to hierarchical principles. The Yoga approach therefore does not recognise any "human equality". Unity, which is, however, restored by the realisation of a state beyond the central, central, absolute state. Unity is equality is not.

I would like to say a few words illustratively about the conditions that are also important at the stage of preparation, and essential at the level of Pra-yoga. These, in the context of tantric symbolism

should be called "breaking the shackles". One of these shackles is directed towards a duality, called in Sanskrit Adaya and Daya. Daya literally means "compassion", in fact it expresses compassion, mercy. Adaya means the opposite. In tantric movements, all emotionality must be transcended. Emotion, in today's psychological parlance, is a degenerate state of feeling called commotion, which is an inner dissipation. And to transcend emotionality means to overcome negative emotions first, then positive emotions. In this way, therefore, all emotionality is transcended in the initial stage of an elimination. Transcendence is the key term, because the task is not simply to eliminate, but to radically eliminate the level of negative and positive emotions in the sense of transcendence. Within this, the annihilation of fear is the most outstanding. Fear is one of the most serious obstacles from a tantric point of view. The elimination of fear must be extended to all planes of Being. Fear of principles, fear of thoughts, fear of feelings, fear of animals, fear of people, fear of natural forces, fear of higher powers...

Any form of fear is extremely disabling. All forms of fear must be eliminated during the preparatory journeys. And this is a path that must be followed not only by those who have spiritual goals, but also by those who just want to coordinate their lives on some level.

In a strange way, even transcending the rules that define life becomes necessary. A truly spiritual approach to spirituality, even more so in Yoga and Tantric Yoga, values morality from a very different perspective than, for example, the usual one in religions. In morality, there must be an inner intuition at work and intuitive decisions, which can be informed by certain principles that are quite reductive. For example, from the point of view of tantric morality, all that is right, all that can and should be done that promotes metaphysical self-realisation, and all that is wrong, all that should be avoided that hinders it. Apart from this, there is no other moral rule. All the rules serve only the role of drawing attention. It should be noted that this thesis does not apply to the non-self-realized man in this form. On the contrary: for such a man, rules are commandments which he must observe, which he must follow, and, ultimately, even be forced to observe.

For the man in whom there is an inner light, in whom responsibility is based on principles which are in harmony with the whole of Being, there is no need of any other directive than what has been said. Either something serves Absolution and then it must be done, or it hinders it and then it must be avoided. That which seems indifferent in this respect must be made the subject of still deeper consensualism, so that the decision may be intuitive, free and voluntary. The tantric view is a view of immortality and freedom, because it is the principle basis of a path towards immortality and freedom.

In relation to mortality and immortality, the options interpreted by different world views are:

certain views explicitly deny immortality (materialism);

certain views of immortality as absolute (such as the general religious views), with different variations;

certain schools of thought (occultism) put faith in the law of reincarnation (rebirth).

(It should be noted here that Eastern views are associated with reincarnation. However, this is a quite fundamental error. High Eastern religions and teachings have never taught a necessary reincarnation, only a regenerative return to the human condition of certain tendencies of human aspirations that are cut off by death. So regeneration of tendencies. A regeneration of intentions, of desires, of motive forces, forces which may return, and in which connection we may speak of certain heredity which precedes material heredity.)

In fact, death in the Yoga, Tantrism view is completely alternative. And death can be survived through conscious survival just as death can extinguish consciousness that is sunk into personhood and bound to bodily conditions. So for the majority of people who do not undergo an internal transformation in their own conscious terrain, death is like a complete abandonment to the fate of fear with its self-induced craving for fear. This is why, for example, Tantra calls the common man pasu, and pasu means "sacrificial animal". In relation to man, it means man analogous to the sacrificial animal. It is similar in that it does not individually possess the powers that can be used to consciously survive death. It is not a question of morality, not a question of reward, but a question of spiritual powers, whether one can survive death. Thus, there are three possibilities for surviving death

The conscious survival of death, followed by the extinction of consciousness at a later "time" (here temporality is to be understood differently).

Relative immortality: there is no beginning and no end of a state in time (in tempore). This kind of eternity is called aionic immortality.

Absolute immortality: the Eternal, the timeless Eternal. This means absolute immortality, because I am not in the realm of the created, but I become the Centre of Being, the Lord of Being. This central and absolute state is the state of absolute immortality and absolute freedom.

The possibilities after death depend on one's mental-spiritual (and in a certain sense, indirectly, physical) condition, and depend primarily on one's spiritual powers. In other words, it is determined by the general conduct of life, the spiritual alertness of the period immediately preceding death and, above all, the 'quality' of the moment of death.

**It is interesting that even in Catholicism, the old prayers (which are disappearing) still include the question of the waking death. This suggests, at some point, that it was of importance, or at least given attention.**

**By his very nature, man does not have the capacity to survive death, unless he can manage to maintain the forces of Consciousness without bodily functions, without bodily conditions. We know very well that the body, the central nervous system - the brain, the cerebral cortex - does not perform conscious functions. Everyone can see this, if he really turns his attention to the question, but there is no doubt that the brain functions are the carriers of the conscious processes in a transference way. It is in fact a natural process. What is much less natural - and this is related to the extra-subordinate nature of the subordinate branch - is that the consciousness functions have become so much like a fusion of the brain functions that they have become fused. It is as if the horse is not simply the carrier of a rider, but is fused with the horse. One of the exercises of the preparatory paths is to remove this compelling interconnectedness of the conscious functions. The brain functions would play the role of the carrier, but not in the sense of an interconnectedness. The survival of death, relative or absolute immortality, must be achieved by the inner principle of the Substantiality of man, that is, beyond his personality, and this is one of the fundamental tasks of life. For no one can seriously claim that it is not important, that is, that immortality is not important. Anyone who claims this does not understand the problem, does not see the alternative. For those who understand what it is about, it is not irrelevant. For him who understands what it is about, to approach a path of realisation is important. More important than anything.**

**Here, the two principles that can be formulated as what is at the heart of life can be decisive: the principle of "more to live" or the principle of "more than life". If one recognises in oneself something that leads one out of the duality of life and death, this corresponds to the principle of "more than life". The decisive factor is what a man judges himself to be. A mere physical being? Then the fate of the body not only influences but completely determines him, i.e. the degradation of the body also eliminates him as a person. Or else he intuitively recognises in himself 'someone' who is not subject to either life or death - this does not mean that he has stabilised this state in himself and thus acquired immortality, but that he may be able to embark on a path which will eventually make this possible.**

**Yogá, Tantric Yogá, can be talked about for years, because the theoretical part of it alone requires a huge amount of prior study. It requires constantly maintained planes, which is also connected with various linguistic and other skills. However, I believe that certain aspects can be brought to the attention of people who have heard very little about it in a short period of time. Today, the question of self-transformation in psychological and existential dimensions is commonly raised. However, its direction and the clarification of the necessary principles that are adequately validated here do not usually arise. Tantrism and Yoga cannot be understood from any point of view that does not arise in this sphere of the principle and practice of realisation itself;**



so neither a psychological interpretation (which may indeed be a guide) nor social or historical principles can be derived that would provide a sure guide. In the intellectual sphere, psychology becomes inauthentic. It tries to interpret the Spirit by reducing it to the level of the psyché, that is, to the level where it ignores the Substantiality of the Spirit. The psychological approach sees in the subject only that the psychic modifies the world, which it considers given, according to its own projections. The spiritual view, which is related to the Yogá, does not relate the personal subjective modification of the world to the power of the Subject, but to the existence of the whole world. Again, it must be said that there is no Being, except the Being of the comprehending Consciousness. Objectivity is also a conscious Being. There is an objective world, but not apart from Consciousness. Nothing follows from objectivity as a fact.

If one sees in Yoga what Yoga is about, one will also see that this approach is a corollary to the concept of Yoga. If one calls it Yoga to feel better by doing some physical exercises, it is not necessary for that, but it has nothing to do with Yoga, it is only nominally related to it. The fact that this connection is usually "public opinion" is more of a hindrance to the perception and understanding of the whole issue than a guide.

The world is not included in the sphere of the personal (personal) man. He does not rule the world, the world appears to him to exist independently of him. But this comes from a personal degradation, from those upside-down views which are the peculiarity of a degraded state. This upturned state is called Viparyaya in Sanskrit Yogic terminology. One of the most striking examples of this is that one considers real what one is powerless to do, and if one is more powerless to do something, one considers it even more real. Let us imagine that for the common man, touch is the main justifier. If I see it I believe it, if I touch it I believe it... The more genuine would be to consider as real that which is most in his power. The mass of these inward, functional and substantive perversions leads him to believe that the perceptual world, being powerless against it, is very real, so real that it is independent of him. The existence of perceptual reality does not depend on ordinary or personal consciousness in the sense that personal consciousness does not consider itself either creator or sustainer of it. This is indeed the case in its ordinary state of consciousness, in that it does not experience the perceptual world as its own creation. This means, however, that it has as it were lost the creative activity of itself. If he experiences something to be or to exist through another power, it means that he does not possess his own powers. Regardless of this, the ordinary perceptual world is also through perception, only the consciousness of creative activity is obscured. This is not a refutation of solipsism, but an indication that the truly fully exhaustive solipsistic position must be realized. That is, I must reduce myself completely to the position of the Creator. Completely in the position of sustaining, completely in the position of regenerating and transforming power. Into that which corresponds to the Real position. Not into the position of losing power.

The fact that on a personal level man does not experience himself as Creator and considers the world as "independent" in this way is almost natural. But this is related to the fact that he has not acquired the necessary intuitions about his own consciousness. These intuitions can be attained without any special prior study. If one is keenly observant of one's own mode of experience. The emergence of experience and the world of experience. If he observes this with all impartiality, without any particular world-view constraint, and with keen observation, he can awaken the intuition that reveals the right relation between the world and his own existence. This right relation is closely related to Yoga and Tantric Yoga, and this perspective is a prerequisite for making transformations in oneself, transformations of consciousness, of being.

András László

#### THE WAY OF LOVE

(Lecture given by the author on 1 August 1998 at the Monastery of the Virgin Mary in Sabolcs)

The point of every spiritual journey is to find the Centre of Being, the Centre of Consciousness, the Centre of Myself; to get to where I started from, where I can get through Myself. The most varied forms of these paths of realisation are known: there are those that try to walk this path in pure forms of solitude, solitude, silence, contemplation, or try to get there - which cannot really be called getting there, since there is no substantial movement in this process of realisation.

At the same time, there are paths of forms of action which are linked to the highest degree of action, the deed; the deed in which cognition has as much a role as action, activity - as in any of the autonomous, self-actualising forms of realisation.

In fact, the spiritual paths can be of the most diverse kinds: they can be conceived in ways that are quite different from the common conception of them; the common conception of them is only associated with tranquillity, with contemplative, contemplative, contemplative ways of realisation, which are associated with the self-passage of man. There are, however, other possibilities; there are also those which, at the level of action, go to the most extreme forms: they go to the struggle, to the

to the final borderline situations, both external and internal, and among these paths, the chivalric paths have a prominent role.

The chivalric way is a spiritual way. The chivalric way is a path of realisation - a path of self-realisation. The chivalric way can be formulated as transmuting a basic human quality, militancy, into heroism. In the language of alchemical symbolism, it can be said to transform militancy as a *materia prima secundum quid* into a *materia ultima secundum quid*, that is, militancy into heroism, heroism, heroism. This is the short, soupçon-like essence of the chivalric journey.

But we have not exhausted the inner nature of the chivalric journey. The chivalric journey is about fighting. Fighting is not, in fact, commonly - and as such, commonly known - to be considered, could not be considered, a spiritual path; fighting is not, in fact, a path of spiritual realisation. Struggle in the ordinary sense is a further agitation, disturbance, disintegration of the existential being in the existential realm. What makes the struggle a possibility that is in the mark of the self-progress of man, the Self-man of the Subject-bearer? First, let us look at the basic nature, the basic forms of struggle as such. The struggle is always between "darkness" and "light"; between the forces of darkness and the forces of light. The noble adversary is the one in whom the spiritual light has a dominant presence; the ignoble adversary is the one in whom the forces of darkness dominate. But the struggle can only be directed against the darkness from the position of light, so in the opponent I am not attacking the forces of light that are also present, but the forces of darkness that are present; the forces of light are always the allies of one who can move along the spiritual path with truly orientative forces; the offensive of the forces of light is never directed against the forces of light; thus the knight may, in a given case, also encounter the noble opponent, but he seeks the darkness in the noble opponent, assuming that the noble opponent will also seek the darkness in him. We know well that the Knights Templar met with Muslim Ismaili-Sufi knightly orders and had the most extreme friendship between them, knowing that they would clash the next day, that the possibilities of death would be opened, that their opponents would be ruthless adversaries, but also knowing what it was against; the encounter between light and light is friendship, and the clash is to find in each other the darkness behind the dominant light and to fight against it. That is the essence of the struggle; as, in fact, the essence of peace is related to it. There are two kinds of peace: 'peace after the victory of light' (*pax post victoriam lucis*) and the other possibility is 'peace after the victory of darkness' (*pax post victoriam tenebrarum*), the latter of which is spiritually unacceptable and therefore all pacifism is fundamentally flawed, sinful, wrong and misguided and works to corrupt the world. Peace can only mean peace after the victory of the forces of light and only this is acceptable. The idea of 'peace at all costs', 'no more war', 'no more bloodshed', in such sentimental terms, is, in a given case, entirely bound up with the deification of the states of being, of the states of the existential order; these are samsaric aspects. The celestial, the divine, the Nirvana aspects are quite different: in them the restoration of the higher order is the only fundamental aspect, the higher and higher and higher, not the circumstances, the incidental aspects, which arise in the course of changes in the states of existence; these are insignificant compared with the former. If we determine that the chivalric way is a method of transformation, a method of transformation of militancy

into heroism, if we establish what kind of fighting is possible and what kind of fighting is to be approached in what way, then we must come to the point again and again that if the enemy is a non-enemy (i.e., a representative of darkness, a representative of the dominance of darkness), then I am attacking only the darkness within, not the minimal but existing light forces. Only that which is the downward orientation, the degradation, the corruption, the subversion of states of being - that is what is in the sign of darkness and with which no solidarity can be assumed. The chivalric ways have also taken this into account to the furthest possible extent and have brought it to the fore at every possible opportunity.

A history of chivalry would require volumes. However, it should be said that chivalry has always existed since prehistoricity or from times within prehistoric states. The 'horse' in this case is not simply the animal called 'horse', but the bearer, the dominated bearer - that was the name given to it, and later applied to that (the animal) which was most often the bearer. But in the Sanskrit language, in the Indo-Hindu tradition, the bearer of 'knight' - asvin - is, for example, hamsa, 'swan' - and think of the Lohengrin saga in this context from another angle. The 'carrier' - that's what the horse itself meant. I'm thinking of the Indo-European languages in particular, but in a sense it was everywhere, because the Aztecs, for example, had an order of knights: the Order of the Jaguar; and if we go back as far as we can, with enough care and enough information material, we could show this almost everywhere, or at least where there were ethnos that were capable of representing the spiritual-metaphysical tradition at all. This was the case in the culture maintained by the Chinese tradition, just as it was - and in a certain sense still is - the case with the Japanese, where the 'way of war', the bû- do, or the 'knight-warrior way', the busi-do, originally represented a high spiritual rank, a way of spiritual realisation. For it is by passing through the struggle, by passing through the confrontation with death, that the possibility of contact with states that transcend death in magnitude and in order of existence opens up on the way of the knight-warrior. The Japanese have always known this, and they knew it in Europe when the chivalric ideal was still alive, living, functioning, capable of having an impact and of playing a generally decisive role. It can be said straightforwardly that the highest spiritual paths of realisation have always been linked in some way to the chivalric paths, even if this link was not explicit and not emphasised. A relatively late example is that within the Catholic Church, within the monastic orders, the Cistercian Order was a contemplative counterpart of the Knights Templar.

More than once contemplative orders appeared in parallel with chivalric routes; they were interpenetrative and cooperative. If not directly, then by some kind of parallelism, there was always a fundamental and profoundly organic relationship between the paths that marked out the immediate forms of interior contemplation and the other forms.

There is usually a sharp distinction between cognition and action; this distinction has a certain justification. René Guénon, one of the fundamental figures of metaphysical traditionalism, said that action involves modifications on a horizontal plane of existence, always on the same plane of existence, as opposed to cognition, which can be understood along a symbolic vertical plane and in which there are changes of scale. This

in many respects, but what is not taken into account by this person, whom we respect so much, is the deed. And action must be distinguished from mere doing; doing is doing in which deep, powerful, transcendent forces of cognition - gnostic - are at work; doing is gnostically imbued when it is doing. In action, the cognitive element is unconditional. Just as in true cognition the action element is extremely strong. Contact between them is possible, so that not all forms of action are bound to horizontality, but forms of action that are also bound to the vertical are possible. These are manifestations of a gnostic force - they are manifestations of actual action.

The spiritual journey of action. A series of actions corresponds to the gradual unfolding of spiritual paths. The spiritual path and the path of action are not only not in conflict, but are most closely related. We know that the interest of the knightly orders in transforming combat and militancy into heroism was very strongly gnostic in orientation. The knightly orders have always marked the furthest-reaching interest, attention and contact with the gnostically definable principles, and this has always been one of their aims.

In the Western world, the ancient knighthood corresponded to such a high level, since for the Romans themselves it was the second degree of patrician dignity: from top to bottom, the senator was followed by eques, 'knight'. The senator was a member of a ruling class, while the eques was the class that was able to actively maintain, preserve, defend, extend and make the empire more complete. But later on there were also quite profound spiritual orders: think of the Order of the Grail Knights; the Order of the Grail, which maintained and carried the deepest Grail spirituality, with its pre-Christian roots, headed by the Grail King, who was also the supreme ruler of the country over which it ruled, was a wholly spiritual order. Although it also held secular dominion, it represented in essence the spirituality kept alive in the world by the metaphysical forces within, as a path of realisation and as a religion and culture radiating out into the world in all the areas with which it came into contact.

There have always been so-called secret orders of knights. "Secret" meant that all that was known about them was that they existed; almost nothing more. A later version of the Grail was precisely Rosicrucianism, which carried very strongly a tradition that was Egyptian in origin but synthesised with Greek, Arabic, Germanic, Celtic, Kabbalistic and other forms - it was hermeticism. Hermeticism was later revived as the so-called Late Hermeticism or Alchemical Hermeticism. One of its main representatives, upholders, bearers, exponents was true Rosicrucianism. (There are still "Rosicrucian" movements today, but they are all fakes that usurp the name.) Rosicrucianism was the most strongly chivalric, but at the same time a Gnostic and magical way - at the same time. Heroic chivalry, gnosticism and magic could and did form a perfect union in certain cases - for example, in the case of true rose christening.

The heyday of the most closely knightly orders of warrior knights was the XI-XII-XIII- It was the 14th century. These were connected with the Crusades, the essence of which was that Christianity should recapture the Holy Land, Jerusalem, the surrounding lands and above all the Holy Sepulchre. The main aim of the Crusades was therefore to recapture the Holy Sepulchre, but they were of course joined by pilgrimages, and although not all of them were chivalrous in character, the greatest of them was Berthold Feilitzsch, the - semi-secret - spiritus rector of the Hungarian right, who played a decisive role in the powerful consolidation and revival of Hungarian right-wingism. By the way, the Prussian Order of St. John had an honorary commendator between the two world wars: Miklós Horthy of Nagybánya, who was also dressed as a commendator by Baron Berthold Feilitzsch. In the background of Hungarian public life, the Prussian Order of St John played a role, but so did the Order of Malta, mainly through the so-called Secular Association of the Order, of which Archduke Joseph, Prince Royal, Field Marshal, was the president. Today in Hungary, the former Order of the Knights of the Order of the Knights of the Order of the Knights of the Order of Malta operates as the Order of the Knights of the Order of the Knights of the Order of the Knights of the Order of the Knights of the Order of the Knights of the Order of Malta - on a limited scale, but it operates.

In addition to the Knights of Malta and Prussia, there is another Order of St John, which is ecumenical in nature, i.e. based on Christianity, but whether Catholic, Protestant or Eastern Orthodox, and is not generally recognised by other orders.

The Knights Templar were destroyed in 1314 by Berthold IV (the Fair) Feilitzsch: beheaded and their leaders killed. (The Knights Templar were also revived, but these attempts at revival were not entirely serious. Just as the revival of the Order of St George, based on its former existence in Hungary, is not entirely serious; however sympathetic the idea of St George might be, its seriousness is debatable; in King Sigismund's time, around his reign and even afterwards, there were two orders of knights very closely related and similar to each other, one the Order of St George, the other the Order of the Dragon, both with similar orientations.) A few words should be said about the destruction of the Knights Templar. it is usually said that they were after the Templar fortune: Philip IV (the Fair), the Pope and Chancellor Nogaret, but, although they were after that too, that was by no means the main and dominant aim. In the Knights Templar there was a presence of spiritual power that transcended the general strains of Christianity. They were striving for something more, an initiatory, realisation surplus; in this sense they put at the centre a spiritual figure called Baphometous, and this is probably the name of an initiatory deity: I say this on the basis of the root 'bap' (baptismos, baptisma and baphometous); this figure was at the centre.

There was also a strong move towards Gnostic and magical orientations in the Order, and probably a goal of uniting the Pope, the Emperor and the Grand Master of the Order of Knights, or the head of a Grand Master, in one person: the Emperor should be both Pope and the supreme personality of the Order of Knights, and this person should come from the Ghibelline dynasty. The Ghibelline dynasty was in fact the Hohenstaufen dynasty, named Ghibelline after their central castle of Waiblingen, a corruption of the Arabic name. The opposing party to them was the Welf, also called Guelf. The Guelfs thus acknowledged the unlimited supremacy of the Pope over the Emperor; they said that at any time

the pope himself could be the emperor, but if not, he is still above him, and they fully recognised him as emperor. And the Ghibelline view was that the emperor was superior to the pope, he could even take over the function of the pope, but if he didn't take over, he was still superior. This was not at all absurd, since the emperor bore the title of Vicarius Christi (Vicar of Christ) and the pope only Vicarius Petri (Vicar of Peter); this was the case at one time, but was changed over time. The chivalric tendencies, but above all the Knights Templar, were most closely linked to the Hohenstaufen-Ghibelline aspirations, so so that the chivalric imperialism of the Middle Ages was decisively determined by this Ghibelline spirit, inextricably linked to the Teutonic Order and even more so to the Knights Templar, as long as the latter lasted - after which the whole Ghibelline world collapsed, the last Ghibelline pretender to the throne was beheaded, a painful fact because the Hohenstaufen dynasty was the highest dynasty in Europe.

In studying the inner nature of the chivalric journey, we cannot ignore an important factor that is not only important, but is directly linked to the essence: the relationship of chivalry, of struggle, of heroism, to death. The knight in the battle strove to win, but constantly confronted with death, constantly accepting the challenge of death, he faced death in such a way as not only to defeat the enemy, the adversary, but in fact to defeat death itself. The knight, if he fell in battle, if he truly died like a knight, transforming himself in a sense into a hero, this death was called *mors triumphalis* ('triumphant death'); it meant to experience death as a transcendental act, to rise higher; ideally to experience in death resurrection (*resurrectio*), even metaphysical awakening, that is, the Nirvana end goal; this was the highest possibility, but in any case to die in such a way that death would occur in a way that would transcend the maxims of the states of general existence; so that in death there should not be a diminution, a diminution towards extinction, but an ascension, an ascension, preferably a resurrection and ascension and fulfilment, for which the experience of death, the experience of the limit situation of death, intensified to infinity, made infinitely conscious, would have given or gave the basis. The knight sought a confrontation with death in order to the force of extinction in the tension of the borderline situation - the tension of a situation that is directed towards the extinction of consciousness - and to experience a much higher state than he would have had the possibility of experiencing in general.

The relationship with death is crucial. Consider, for example, that the Indians, for whom chivalrous combat was of central importance, generally went into battle with the idea that they could win and fall, but there were always those who, after voluntary enlistment and special initiative involvements, had to die anyway: these were the "never to return"; they wore different feathers and insignia, and in any case died in battle. This dying anyway was for them a spiritual act of initiatory magnitude, even of a magnitude beyond the general levels of initiation. An act which was also an act of cognition (*gnosis*) and a magic on their Auto-beings; to provoke death to such an extent that it would win on the surface, but would not be able to overcome the transcendental

interiority, in the sense of interiority, in the sense of an inner being that transcends the human being, the personality, it must be a victory (*mors triumphalis*) in any case. These have always had a special significance in the various chivalric journeys.

Interestingly enough, in Germany in World War II there were Tibetans, high ranking Tibetan lamas, some of whom went back to Tibet and some of whom stayed there until the end; they formed a task force to defend Berlin called the Volunteers of Death, who fought in SS uniforms without rank and all of them died; so all of them died there and that was the goal.

"Death's Volunteers" are always popping up here and there on the Knight's Journeys, and if these issues were more thoroughly investigated, obviously much more would be revealed about the rites and selection involved, which are otherwise largely hidden, so it is very difficult to uncover them. The nature of the post-mortem state, according to the traditional view, depends enormously on the whole of life, the final (terminal) period and the moments around death (*circum mortalis*), in terms of and in the sense of the intensity of consciousness and wakefulness.

It is not at all indifferent what the spiritual-mind forces are that exist throughout life, since they determine the terminal period, the terminal period determines the moments around death, and the quality of the moments around death determines the quality of the possibilities after death. In the context of post-existence, the possibilities of existence after death, the retention of forces of wakefulness, depend to a very large extent on the forces that determine the whole of life or, even more so, the end of life, the nature of the moments around death. Any man who has any kind of spiritual openness is alert to this; if his attention is called to it, he is even more alert. In the Knight's Journeys, everyone was aware of the crucial importance of this fact and circumstance; that it depends here on the whole of life, on the terminal period and the moments around death. A knight not only wanted to live, not only wanted the exaltation of life, but wanted above all the transcendence of life and death, life in the sense of the transcendence of life after life and death. The fall is not a sacrifice. In the ordinary order of words, if someone dies for this or that, we say, "he has sacrificed his life" - he has not really sacrificed anything. Sacrificing life is only possible in the sense of the transcendence of life, since sacrifice is the creation of a bridge, a bridge of transcendence, from the general states of being in the world to the transcendent - that is, rooted in the Self and connected to the innermost Groundedness of the Self. The "sacrifice" of life, if not in the sense of the supra-life, is not a sacrifice of life, it is only the extinction of life; sacrifice can and must be made only for a higher order, and it is not otherwise. Operations created in the direction of diminution are not sacrifices, but among the most violent forms of denial of spirituality.

The basic aim of every man should be, should be, to be at his highest when he dies; if at the age of 30, then at the age of 30, if at the age of 120, then at the age of 120; then to be zenith. To achieve this in public is immensely difficult, in fact it is really difficult, but it was not easy in the case of the Knight's Roads. However, the knight



he lived his life directly focused on this, so that he would die in battle if possible, in the moment of victory, but certainly in the moment of inner victory, so that he would be at the peak when it happened. a mental collapse, life and death cannot be truly surpassed; a mental zenith position is required for life and death to be surpassed at the moment of death. Chivalry, in terms of the transmutation of struggle and militancy into heroism, in the adequate struggle - which is the struggle against 'darkness', not only the darkness in the enemy, but, in the first person singular, the darkness in me, of which the darkness manifested in the external existent is but an outgrowth - has as its goal the fulfilment in the struggle against the darkness within. In Islam, a distinction was made between al-jihad al-asghar and al-jihad al-akbar. The former is the war in the outer world, the 'small holy war', and Muhammad, the Prophet, pointed out that after the 'small holy war' comes the 'great holy war', al-jihad al-akbar, and this is the war against the forces of darkness in the inner world, and the 'small' one, which takes place in the world outside, in the so-called great distances, is still small because it takes place in the world of the phenomena of consciousness, whereas the 'great holy war' takes place in the world of the formative forces of consciousness and is therefore greater.

The knight fought on all planes: not only in the world against the enemy, the noble adversary and the ignoble enemy, not only against the darkness that they represented, but on all occult planes and on all higher, super-objective planes he actually fought. He fought against the forces which, detached from him, but not yet completely detached from him, are opposing him, the forces of darkness and the realization of the redintegrative Unity.

In the approach I am taking here, the primary premise is that everything is I-me, everything is Auton. That which is not I-am-me, i.e. heteron (other something) is also Auton, only unrecognized Auton; the unrecognized Auton operates in the form of, among other things, dark forces in consciousness. There is no fundamental distinction between the outer and inner worlds in consciousness; I have to perform operations with them; operations are, in one order of approach, combat operations; the ways of combat, chivalry, heroism, capture in this symbolism the relation to heteron-force. It can, of course, be conceived in other ways: it can be conceived as a purely cognitive way, a process-whole; it can be conceived in many ways. One such conception is that of a struggle between dimensions. It is not a question of a higher or lower order of methodology, because verification is only revealed in the result. There can be operations of recognition that result in the same thing as the insightful ways of grasping in the symbolism of struggle; it is the outcome that decides. It is also entitled, absolutely entitled, and even distinguished, and combined, since different combinations are possible by combining cognitive and overcoming operations.

The path of metaphysical struggle in the Auton-heteron context is the chivalric path. Confrontation with death, confrontation with the other, the relation of the self to the self, the relation of the self to the Absolute - these are the issues that arise, not only as a starting point for cognition, but as a way of

I have to bring them into a tense relationship. The transcendence of these tensions are certain stages of the chivalric journey; they may appear in the external struggle, in the generality of the external struggle, in the concrete combat acts of the external struggle, since the real combat operations have always been operations of initiatory character; they may appear on the plane of the forces of the spirit and of the spirit against the spirit in the internal space of the soul, and they may appear in many other forms.

The chivalric way is a spiritual way; a way of self-passage. If we do not think of it as a "journey", we can say instead an act: an act of self-realisation, a spiritual act, a metaphysical act. Every approach is a metaphor, so instead of saying 'a way to travel', I can say all sorts of other things, and so approaches that struggle with the question of whether it is really a way or not a way are ridiculous; what is a way can be formulated as a way, it can be formulated as 'not a way', without using that term.

There are many approaches: they can all be valid in parallel, and I am trying to say this by the intellectual force to which the appropriate correspondence in this respect can be applied. I can say it inadequately and powerlessly, but that is not the point here.

On the one hand, I would like to stress that the chivalric way is one of the highest ways, an actual way, and that chivalry has had a validity that lasts almost up to the present day. This is not to say that chivalry in the present age has no potential. Unfortunately, however, the existing, well-known orders of chivalry have, in many different senses, forms and ways, been eroded, especially after 1945. In 1945, the forces of darkness dominated the world, and these forces invaded the whole of the Earth, and within this, they subverted the reality formats associated with the values of chivalry, so that a general and very great decline can be observed, and this can be seen in each order of chivalry separately. The current knightly orders are limited mainly to charitable activities, which is worthwhile in itself, but this is not the strict domain of chivalry; anyone can distribute humanitarian aid packages if they can get them and pass them on, this is not a special knightly skill.

However, in the current age, the special knightly skill is no longer that of going into battle on horseback in knightly armour, but that of seeking out the 'dragon' in its more subtle form.

In chivalry, the "dragon", the "dragon of the waters" plays a major role (in Far Eastern symbolism there was a "dragon of the sky" and a "dragon of the waters", in the West only the "dragon of the waters", and therefore it was negative and represented darkness, while the "dragon of the sky" is a positive reality); to seek out the "dragon of darkness", to confront it and defeat it. In the present age, this means fighting against forces that are subtle, if not abstract, mostly internal, but sometimes external. This struggle is the equivalent of the struggle against the dragon of old, but the latter also took place on a spiritual level, not on a spiritual level, and did not consist in the defeat of a dragon-like animal. It was a fight against dragon forces - the forces of darkness, we call them - that appeared on different planes of existence; today the fight must be different

The knightly mentality and attitude has not ceased to be valid. The frequency of the probability of appearance has ceased, it has diminished to such an extent that one can speak of it less, but it cannot be excluded at all. The knightly orders, even the residual ones, still represent and maintain something, though very little; to appear at a gathering and then go home and live on in their obtuseness, that is not a spiritual rank, not a spiritual, chivalric life. There is nothing more important than a spiritual existence.

No one can say that their life does not allow them to live that way; they have to change their life. He must subordinate everything to it - spiritually, of course. Something like "I would do it, but I don't because I don't have the opportunity" is unacceptable, in which case you have to change your life. If you live with someone who hinders your spirituality, you have to turn away from him; if your way of life, your work, your activity does not allow, you have to change and look for other areas of activity. It is not to life, not to samsara, that the higher must be subordinated, for the present deterioration of the whole world is the result of this very thing: to subordinate the lower to the higher - this is the main cause of the deterioration of the whole world. To the higher must be subordinated the lower, be it in any sphere of life, in any of its total dependencies. The chivalric way was in the spirit of this, as all true paths of realization are: to subordinate the lower to the higher and to avoid that for a moment, in any segment of life, the higher should be subordinated to the lower, which should never be allowed for a moment, even under the most extreme compulsive circumstances, and, to repeat, if one finds that life is like this, one should change it urgently. To him in whom there is no realization, I have not said a word; but it is debatable whether such a one can be called a man at all; not a man of high order, a man at all. No one can seriously say that he does not care what happens after his death; he who says that he does not care has done nothing but to give a certificate that he understands nothing of anything. He who swears that he does not care, has put three stamps and a documentary stamp on it. This cannot be said seriously; it is not indifferent to a serious reflection. And if it is not indifferent, then it requires an inner confrontation.

The chivalric way has made no concessions in this respect, as no real path to realisation ever has. So much so that it was not actually linked to an advanced degree: it was a *condicio sine qua non* at the outset. It is not possible to imagine, to conceive of a life that might define itself in some way as having higher ends, might have a religious orientation, might mean something to the supra-life, if the whole way of life - internally and externally - is contrary to it. Are there exigent circumstances? There are. They have to be changed.

The chivalric way as a transcending way has never made concessions. The paths of realization, the real Yoga, the real Zen in the Japanese context, or the real Taoism in China and so on, have never made any concessions. Some people carry out these processes in their own lives: the descent, to the point of later finding their juvenal aspirations, say, towards something higher, frivolous.

and - according to him - it is "serious to create - say - a business; it is "frivolous" to strive to go beyond the vortex of existence - such attitudes and attitudinal changes are created, develop in his life; it is subhuman, that is exactly how a subhuman being does it, with the difference that he has certain human qualifications (speech, conceptual thinking, walking on two legs, etc.), but it does the same thing; it is not a human being, it is subhuman.

The true spiritual and realisation path - including the chivalric path - is a powerful and radical challenge to all the mediocre conditionality of life. These mediocre conditionings are more dangerous than even the darkest conditionings, because the possibility of a certain opposition to them is still awakened, whereas the possibility of a certain opposition to mediocre conditionings is not generally awakened; the latter are therefore the most fundamental opposites of all spiritual paths. If we think about chivalry in itself - what it once meant - on the basis of the points of reference I have mentioned today about fighting, the qualities of fighting, the search for limit situations, the confrontation with the forces of darkness, the conquest of death, if we think about all these points of reference and along these lines even awaken in ourselves emotionally what is connected with chivalry, we are confronted with the possibility of a certain progress in this respect.

András László

## TRADITION AND PRESENT

Tradition and Tradicionality as a term are used here and always in a specific sense, a sense that conveys an ancient, primordial spiritual knowledge, a spiritual knowledge that speaks of the Origin, the Beginning and the Unbegotten from the coming into being of the created world; this timeless knowledge is maintained in time in the sense of an abiding, indestructible spirituality. This is called Tradition, not what is commonly and generally called by that name. The other concept we are talking about is actually the wider present; the wider present and its relation to traditionalism. Here I would like to refer to certain cycles, certain doctrines about cycles. As you know, Hésiodos also speaks of a Golden Age, a Silver Age, a third age, sometimes called the Golden Age, sometimes the Bronze Age, sometimes the Bronze Age. , sometimes called the Copper Age and finally the Iron Age, which some authors, such as Scaligero, call the Lead Age. This corresponds to a decline, an involution. In the context of the doctrines we have been discussing, it is often

we have dealt with the fact that within the world we have created, we do not mostly find progress, but in many respects a relegation, a decline, since superior does not mean that something corresponds to a more technicised world. Higher expresses that I am, or have been, closer to my Origin, my Beginning, my Beginness, Spirit and God and Myself. In this sense - and we use this word again - we are talking about primordialities, and primordialities refer to an essentially higher state of being, and these higher states of being are very often related to antiquity or at least to older times, sometimes even to archaicity, projected into time. To understand these ideas, therefore, it is essential to take up the possibility of involution and regression, as is not usually the case; something that in many ways the world, in its unfolding, is divorced from its divine and spiritual origins. It is not completely separated, but it is distanced, and tendencies appear in the world which move it away from the very essence, from the very state that can be called the Overself, from the very Divine. These factors, influences, forces are manifesting themselves in the world. These manifesting forces appear ever more strongly, more intensely in the existence of the world. The more they are connected with space, time, substance, matter, the stronger and more intense this distancing takes place.

The world of tradition maintains a *sophia perennis*, an eternal wisdom knowledge, at some level of existence. It sometimes fades, it is eclipsed, but in essence it remains. We call the world of traditionality the world when the traditional-spiritual principles were still very much in force. We call the world of modernity the world in which these principles are no longer in force, if not no longer in force, but in a way that is insignificant, in which life seems not to be determined by them, in which destructive, disruptive, destructive tendencies, influences, forces enter into existence, which are of the spirit, the attention of man, who is turned away from the Self, from these foundations and from the supreme, from absolute supremacy, from the hierarchical structuring of existence, from the eternal validity of values, and turn the human mind, spirituality, spirituality into a game of contingencies, completely time-bound and time-determined.

There are many possibilities for linking modernity to dates. The move away from the spirit can be dated to the 7th to the 6th centuries BC, and it is likely that a materialistic and atheistic approach would have been impossible to have been established in the period before that. All the dimensions of life were permeated by spiritual forces which were then impossible ignore and which always drew attention back to the origin of the world as it was created, that is to say, to the existence which, as pure Being, was an absolute, the Absolute. Obviously, this time 2500 years ago cannot yet be called the modern world. But something was already happening then, and if we go forward in time and look at the millennium that is now coming to an end, we can see that in the 1200s and 1300s there was already a definite shift in spirituality. There were definite influences which diverted attention, attention, attention forces away from the Principle and the Principle of Principles. This divergence of approach appeared to a very great extent, for example, in the Reformation, in which one cannot fail to notice an anti-spiritual tendency; it appeared in the 'Renaissance' itself, where the forces of the passing away were much more

were present as the forces of a rebirth; they appeared in the eclipse which the anti-traditionalist spirit calls "enlightenment", since this is the "enlightenment" was a darkening in spiritual terms; a very definite darkening. It was called enlightenment when the view turned from God to Earth. That was the Enlightenment in this usage of the word, and what is a darkening in our usage of the word. In what we call modernity - and modernity is a synonym for antitraditionalism, antispirituality - we have to recognise these as preparatory tendencies. In fact, in very many respects they were not only preparatory tendencies, but also carried to a large extent what is associated with darkness itself.

Modernity in our language does not mean the technicity of the contemporary world, and although it is related to it, it does not mean that we are not focusing our attention on it. In fact, modernity means a lack of tradition and a lack of tradition, a lack of spirituality and a turning away from spirituality; a forgetting of the Self - to put it in the first person singular - of the relationship of the Self to Spirit, to Reality, to the Unconditioned, to the Absolute.

The modern world is a distancing. Whatever aspects of the modern world are considered more advanced than an older one, they are never superior in terms of substance. On the contrary, we must always look at what human consciousness has moved away from, what we have moved away from, or what I have moved away from. And then it turns out that it is precisely from Essentialism that I have moved away. Whatever I have gained in this age, the gain is negligible compared to the loss the world has experienced. The world has entered an anti-spiritual - not entirely without spirit, but tending to prepare the way for anti-spirituality - era. When did it enter it? In many ways centuries ago, in many ways in the 20th century, and in very many ways even in the 19th century.

Think of the French Revolution, which was the bearer of a very dark tendency, think of the various revolutions of the 19th century, and this century. We could say that we entered this state at the time of the First World War, we could say that it was at the end of the First World War, we could say that it was at the time of the Bolshevik Revolution, we could say that it was at the beginning of the Second World War, we could say that it was at the end of the Second World War. These are all adequate insights, all of these theorems are true in this respect.

The fact is that a process has begun, a very long time ago, which has gradually, but in the last century with rapidly accelerating gradualness, reached the state of being that characterises our times in the strictest sense of the word. But the present must be understood in any case as a broader period, the last 100-150 years, because the characteristics that manifested themselves after the Second World War, for example, were already present at some germinal level. Anyone who observes the processes, the intellectual processes, and is alert enough to really pay attention to them, can now identify stages of intellectual eclipse every five years, for example. For example, the 1950s were in many ways much more terrible than the later years, but there was still a mentality in people that hoped for change, that hoped for a reset and a rebuilding, and that hoped for the restoration of a set of values. It is precisely this mentality that is fading and

ceases to exist in this world. As generations pass away from the earthly, human sphere of existence, a darkening can be discerned more and more clearly, even within the world of darkness. And although it appears, of course, hope does not disappear in the present, nor even in the future, but hope in this world can be said to have eschatological perspectives, and only in these can it prevail. It is only in eschatological perspectives that hope can prevail.

Thus, the well-known principle *Omnia vincit veritas* ['Truth conquers all' - ed.] seems to be true only in eschatological perspectives. But in the context of strictly earthly developments, it seems as if this absolute truth cannot prevail. Truth remains truth, but truth can have, and retains, an eschatological validity that transcends temporality. It remains indestructible. But the hope of a strictly temporal and historical reality is fading. And that it is fading makes sense, for it is fading because the truth does not appear.

The spiritually oriented man cannot fix his goals in the earthly world; any goal projected into the earthly world can only be an intermediate goal. If the goal is to climb a mountain peak - and in this case we can use the mountain peak as a metaphor for the ultimate, superhuman transcendent goal - then the earthly goal can only be to reach an intermediate frontier and continue on my way from there. But in the age of eclipse, there is no longer any hope for earthly goals that, while never the ultimate goal, at least in earthly terms pointed in some sense towards it; when at least certain value systems prevailed on earth, there was an adequate hierarchical structure, people were in their places, everyone did the task that was really his task, quite independently of whether it was convenient or pleasant or not. When dark, one might say satanic influences prevail in the world, it is primarily a matter of upsetting the orderliness of the world, of upsetting the order of hierarchical articulation, of not knowing what and who is first, what the task of this and that is, what the task of the other is, what should be done to achieve a life on earth that reflects spirituality. The earth can never replace the world of heaven, at most it can represent it in some sense - and it is this representation that is actually being eliminated in the world of modernity, in the world of the present in a broader sense. It has long been in the process of disappearing, and is gradually disappearing, and will probably continue to do so for some time to come.

Whatever may be the end of things, true hope, hope for transcendence beyond the earth-human world, may be rooted in the fact that I have something to do with transcendence, that my spiritual soul belongs to transcendence in its very nature.

But what can be done must also be done to put the world right. It must be done, clearly, but knowing that this is not the real goal, and knowing also that in the Iron Age or Dark Ages, in the Hesiodic sense, these hopes are necessarily pale and narrow hopes, whose specific hope of realisation is more or less lost. Faith in the better world is adequate, but the validity of faith in the better world is not absolute; and the absolute validity of that which cannot be disappointed is not realized within the framework of earthly existence. The modern world fundamentally forgets this. The modern world can pay no attention either to the Alpha or to the Omega; it can pay no attention either to the Origin, the Beginning, the Beginness, the Beginlessness, or to the Infinite as the goal above existence.

is not directed towards; it is by its very nature not directed towards. Exceptionally, quite exceptionally, people may be directed towards it, but among the general tendencies, the general tendency-affections and tendency-violations, these exceptions cannot be discussed, because they are extremely rare. They were probably never common, but they are quite rare in the present day. They exist, but they are quite rare. I repeat: the drive and aspiration for a better world is legitimate. However, only that which is related to the transcendence of earth-human existence has an inalienable claim.

The orientation towards the death of earth-human existence within the framework of earth-human existence was not only legitimated in the traditional world, but everything was organised in this sense. The world was structured in such a way, as if by its natural impulse, as if providentially and organised, that this spirituality was maintained, supported, promoted, strengthened, surrounded by protective bulwarks, so to speak, and which was able to eliminate destructive tendencies, if not completely, then not insignificantly. The world of antitraditionalism, which is in fact a world of modernity in the broad sense, stands in opposition to all this. It hinders, restrains and restricts genuine spiritual aspirations, promotes and supports the penetration and assertion of demonic and satanic forces, places itself at the mercy of these forces and the mercy of others, and places the world at the mercy of the general order of life. At the same time, we must be aware that we live in this world. Whatever other structured world we look at, even paradigmatically, that it should be, we must note that it is not, but precisely that it is precisely the tendencies that are observable by all, that are manifest to all ('manifest': this is not evidence; it is manifestation), that are accelerating decline and so on, that are coming to the fore. They are coming to the fore, and with them we have to find our place in the earthly world, and with them we have to find the means to go higher, to go upwards.

In this age, the present age of antitraditional modernity, there is no doubt that a challenge can be experienced among the undermining and disruptive tendencies, the darkening. It can be. We may not experience it, but it can be experienced. This challenge is stronger than at any time in history. For the greater the darkness, the greater the challenge, and this is true to an extreme,

and in the most extreme situations, this is no longer the case. The greater the darkness, the greater the need for spirit in some people. "Blessed are the poor in spirit", which is the correct translation of the original text, "blessed are the poor in spirit", means that they have a longing for spirit. It is the insight of spirituality in a world of spirituality, and the longing for the spiritual. They are poor in something, and they are directed to get rid of it. And this is actually the opening of the dimensions of possibility in the Dark Ages. Facing the challenge of deprivation on one side, the world of being filled with dark forces on the other. These must be faced, these must be seen. See it and take it as a challenge. As strong as the forces of deprivation are, as strong as the forces of deception and turning away are, I am



**I oppose. And if they're even stronger, I'll confront them even more. I know that I am setting myself up for destruction if I do not.**

**It is not just a matter of finding that we have come out of a brighter age into a darker age. It is also that we are indeed in it, that we find paradigms in the lightness of the past, but that this is in itself insufficient; it is essential for determining the future, but it is insufficient, and in fact we must find the possibilities in the present, even if everything seems to contradict this, that there is a way out of the greatest darkness, or almost the greatest darkness. Precisely if what we perceive is perceived as a challenge. In this sense, then, in this spiritual perspective, we have to evaluate the relationship between traditionalism and modernity in a particular way, we have to understand the relationship between them as atypical, but the statement of this must not be a lament for the past, and especially not be exhausted in it, not exhausted in nostalgia, which might otherwise be justified, but must awaken inner mental, spiritual activity. The past, which can be paradigmatic for the future, and among these, the present situation, which presents itself as the sharpest test and the sharpest, most ultimate challenge - if we can be alert to it.**

**András László**

**FROM "THE SATAN"**

**SOME COMMENTS ON THE NATURE OF SATANICITAS (DIABOLICITAS)**

**The doctrines of the divine ascents to incarnation - the Avatars - are illuminated from the highest to the deepest by the autodistancing of Deity - that is, by Deity, manifesting Himself as God, separating Himself from Himself, and in that separation, removing Himself from Himself. If it retains its continuity of consciousness in the state of abasement of detachment: the appearance of the Avatars; if it breaks its own continuity of consciousness: the appearance of forms of existence like the earth-human being in Kali-Yuga.**

We can also talk about the actualization of other possibilities, - precisely on the basis of a correct reading and understanding of traditional teachings, linking this understanding to a cognitive examination of one's own consciousness processes. It can and does take place that the Deity manifesting itself as God, in a partial manifestation, separates, separates and removes itself from itself, and then turns its removed self into itself.

God - and through God, the Godhead - is unassailable. Confrontation can and does turn into attack. The attack, however, is not on God, because that would not be possible, but on the realization actions of *redintegratio unionalis* in God - and through God in the Godhead. In essence, *satanicitas-diabolicitas* always seeks to prevent or derail - by all possible ways and by all possible detours - the action of the transscendental realization of *reductio et redintegratio unionalis* transscendentalisque, directly but also indirectly, even by multiple indirectness. The *esencialiter-principaliter* is always directed against the transcendence of life and the realization of the transcendence of life, but also - along the lines of indirect connections - against life; in the biological sense and in the general sense.

Satan, the Diabolos, usually attacks the personality and the supra-personality from the subpersonal spheres. The Diabolos himself, however, is - first and foremost - supra-personal, in his manifestations he can be impersonal, a force manifesting itself in modal effects, but he can also be substantial-personal. It may be something, it may be someone, but in its primordiality it is neither.

Some spiritual schools know bipolar *Diabolicitas* in addition to unipolar Diabolos. Eugen Heinrich Schmitt/Schmitt Jenő Henrik distinguish (a) Mammon and (b) Belial. Partly under the influence of E.H. Schmitt, Rudolf Steiner also developed a bipolar Diabolos theory: the duality of Ahriman and Lucifer. He later developed his Diabolos concept into a tripolar one, introducing the Asuras, well known in Indo-Hindu thought, but in a diabolical setting.

Although in our eyes neither E. H. Schmitt nor R. Steiner are not authoritative authorities, - while maintaining the unipolar Diabolos conception, we do not in the least exclude the acceptance of the validity of the bipolar, tripolar or even pluripolar Diabolos conceptions, primarily in the sense of the assumption of trans-personality and super-personality, while also acknowledging the parallel validity of impersonality and the concomitant validity of being-personality of essence - second-order and third-order.

Diabolic attacks are extremely diverse and varied, and can even be contradictory.

There can be no doubt that certain forms of diabolicitas are closely related to what has been conventionally called - at virtually all times and everywhere in the world - sin-sins. This is an indisputable fact, on which - and we are convinced of this - there is no room for debate, nor can there be any. On the other hand, however, it is also indisputable that, in the spirit of metaphysical-traditionalism, diabolicitas is not primarily expressed along the line of the moral-immoral relation, and we are inclined to classify as infra-national-sentimental aberrations all those opinions which depart from this position. The "sins", even the most serious, are always consequences or consequential and at least secondary (if not polyadditional) to the diminution of the mentalis-supramentalis-spiritualis powers, and diabolicitas plays a primary role in these diminutions as a diminishing agent.

The key phrase for deeper-more profound understanding here, as many other cases, is - Ahamatma Brahmasmi - that is, I-am Brahma. Aham is also, Átmá is also, and even Asmi is understood in a very different way, as I can say I am, or I can say I am, I am self(m).

The possibilities of a different order of being are expressed in these words, and even more so in the declarative sentence above. Something which, on the one hand, is infinitely remote, but which, on the other hand, is not only near, but more present than any present.

Essentially, though only potentially now, I-am-myself am the supra-personal and the impersonal Deity, but I-am-myself am also the personal God, and I-am-myself am also all the personality facets. I-am myself who remove myself from myself, and who oppose my removed-distant self with my removed-never-distant self. I-am-myself am the facing and the facing and the faced. This is the beginning of diabolicitas; the beginning, but it is not yet diabolicitas realized.

The Diabolos - whether superpersonal, impersonal, impersonal, personal, unipolar, bipolar, tripolar, pluripolar or multipolar - essentially becomes truly Diabolos when it is realized as Heteron, when it becomes directly an imperceptible Heteron, a Heteron that confronts the God-entity in such a way as to try to prevent - in any way, by any means possible - the realization of my self-realization in the God-entity - that is, in my Absolute Self.

Diabolos is the concentrated anti-auton invisible giant heteron. In the first and ultimate degree - that is, in its primordial essence - it is Auton, but it is the most fearless, the most impalpable, the most realized as Heteron and, crucially, the most powerful, the most powerful Auton functioning as Heteron.

If I change myself into Diabolos: I become a monster, - but only if this transformation is towards Diabolos and thus imperfect. If I integrate the Diabolos into myself, and myself into the God-Substantiality - that is, into my Absolute Self - then the Diabolos ceases to be Heteron and Diabolos. This could be the redemption of Diabolos.

According to the followers of the neognosticism of Eugen Heinrich Schmitt/Schmitt Jenő Henrik, Belial is the redeemable devil (according to Steiner, Lucifer is redeemable), but (a) Mammon is irredeemable.

If there is any basis for such ideas, it is only possible to try to uncover it in the light of our own illumination, and thus to form - indeed to make a basis - that basis, so that we can give meaning to such ideas by reconsidering them.

Absolutely "irredeemable" - irreducible - satanicitas - obviously - does not exist. However, it makes little sense to speak of redeemability (redintegrability) when a power or force, either supra-personal or impersonal or personal, by breaking from personality, deprives the aspirant, say the aspiring man, of all or almost all the faculties with which he could coordinate his aspirations in a higher, or even life-directed way.

In another context, Christianity speaks of the sin against the Pnema Hagion - the Holy Spirit - which is unforgivable. The Holy Spirit approximates to the Sivaic redintegrative-reductive-transmutational spirituality, - if one - motivated by some force - acts against it with extreme force, one will not be able to lead oneself back to oneself; this is expressed in the "inexcusability". Here it may be suggested that there is in fact a mammonistic effect, directed primarily against the Pnema Hagion, i.e. against my own Sivaism. In this respect, redeemability, though not absolutely excluded, is not really intelligible, nor could forgiveness be, although the latter, as a term, may be misunderstood, or more precisely, may be difficult to understand in a metaphysico-traditional sense.

We know that there is an extreme, fundamental and not at all merely theoretical difference between hetero- or heteronothism and auto- or autonothism.

According to heteronothism, which can be said to be general, God or Deity is something or someone else, either outside me or inside me, but even then it is completely different from me.

According to autonotheism, God or Deity as a state is indeed quite and utterly different from my state of being as a human being, but essentially and potentially, in terms of actuality, I am God and/or Deity. This does not imply without further ado that I am already here and now - in the sense of realization and actualization - God and/or Deity. There is no question, nor can there be, of my claiming this. However, if I reduce myself to myself, by myself and through myself, into myself - as my Absolute Self - then my now still potential being of God and Deity is actualized. The God/Godhead is therefore - as my essential self - an end and a possibility of power.

There is not much point in talking about whether there is a God or not. God and/or Deity can be, as and when I realize myself as God-Deity by and through myself back to myself - my Absolute Self.

Dialoguing with me - more precisely: a god who may be in dialogue with me - a god who is different from me in every respect and absolutely different, external, personal, and yet, as a living being, personal, invisible and infinitely powerful, yet human-like, thinking, willing, feeling and emotionally sentient, having emotions, being able to rejoice, be angry, be offended and forgive - cannot be God, if this designation is really applied to the highest, let us say, the highest Manifestation.

To a greater or lesser extent, heteronotheism assumes - perhaps more subtly - either the above, or something from which, by a shorter or longer route, one can arrive at approximately the above.

Heteronotheism - and we are sure of this - is in fact a disguised and multiply indirect diabolism, at the same time weakened, but not entirely without danger.

It is quite obvious that, in general, at the level of state manifestations, social life, cultural-civilizational traits, even the most vulgar heteronotheism is worth immeasurably more than the most restrained materialistic atheism. We have always emphasised this, and will continue to do so in the future.

The Realificatio Metaphysica and the Initiatio, and their various degrees of preparation - require spiritual-religious preparation. In this context, the question of the position to be taken in relation to theisticitas inevitably arises, and not at all incidentally. Raised in this context, it should soon become clear that heteronotheism is not much superior to materialist atheism. The very nature of realisation, its essence, its purpose, its implementation - becomes utterly meaningless and unintelligible in the weak and confused light of heteronotheism.

Just as we must defend Christianity - even militantly - against liberal democracy, social democracy and communism, we must also be equally resolute in making, in stating, our theological, serious - in some respects devastating - criticisms.

In Christian Gnosticism, there was perhaps - one might say: probably - autonothism - in the background of heteronothism. But Christian Gnosticism has been extramarginalised by the mainstream of Christianity, using all means and methods to do so. It appeared later, especially in those parts of Meister Eckhart's oeuvre which the Church condemned. The traces of autonothism are also to be found in Tauler's oeuvre, alongside and after Meister Eckhart, and later in some of the couplets of Angelus Silesius. The general self-understanding of Christianity, whether in Roman Catholicism, Eastern Orthodoxy or Protestantism, has excluded, excludes and will continue to exclude the possibility that the unconditionality of extreme heteronothism can be, even in the mildest terms, the subject of a dialogue. The secret and clandestine strands of Christianity obviously had their autonothism, but they could never - outwardly - assert themselves.

Heteronothism is a diabolism on the one hand, a blasphemy on the other, and heresy in the sense of supra-confessionalism.

Indeed, that deception which is anything but God-denying, is satanic, because it posits God not as God, but as an idealized man, as another, as an objective - though, of course, inexperienced - entity, as one of the existents, as the most honored existent, but still only as one of the existents, as an objective reality existing independently of consciousness, of the consciousness, as a person.

Satanicitas-diabolicitas can penetrate into the realms of prodinicatic, iniciatic and realificatory practices: this is how contra-prodinitatio, contra-initiatio, contra-realificatio is realized, becomes a dire reality. In these cases, it is either a question of practices constructed for such a purpose in the first place, or of the pre- or un-prepared performance of once adequate practices by people who may - indeed, probably - be completely or almost completely incapable of performing any semi-adequate practice. (True and truly adequate mental practice is hardly imaginably difficult, pseudo- and counter-practice can be done without much difficulty, with some persistence. To perform once adequate practices adequately is almost impossible even for the most accomplished,

their inadequate performance, on the other hand, only of little difficulty, and so they can be made into a practice quite easily even by those who are unable to do them.) In the present day, it is usually their own laziness - that is, a mistake - that saves the "practitioners" from falling into contra-transcendentale, in the line of pseudo- and especially counter-practices.

Diligent "practitioners" either become immersed in darkness or, the most dangerous exceptions, become contra-initiators themselves, even Saints of Satan, to end up, at the end of a long process, immersed in what they have prepared for others.

The reality of Satan can also be denied from the side of profanity. This attitude is pathetic and ridiculous, and essentially belongs to atheism, namely materialistic atheism, which is, of course, also a Satanic product. (What can and should be called materialistic atheism is defined by Satanic inferiority. We have no respect for this view of being, nor for those whose worldview it is, but despise - perhaps even regretfully despise - those who sometimes even take pleasure in denying in principle all that is more and higher than the most gross physicality.)

In the case of heteronodiabolism assigned to heteronothicism, the latter indeed corresponds to the former. The absence of a reductive-reductive practice does not allow for a real solution. Heteronothicism - and the heteronodiabolism that can be assigned to it - is not false doctrine, but inferior. If one calls the external, person- and creature-like, even human-like, angry, stern, powerful, invisible otherGod, and truly believes it, - then it is real. We would not, however, call this either God or one of the gods, but would say that there may be, and in some cases are, objective beings produced from and in consciousness, including quite strange beings. There are also other beings who are utterly malevolent, diabolically human-like. I would never deny the possible, sometimes actual, existence of such beings, - but we would not call them devils, satans, diabolos. They are the rarely manifested background beings of objective reality of consciousness; such can be dealt with, since they are "interesting", can be dealt with within the framework of a quasi-science of nature extended to the occult realm.

There are stages of autonometatheism at which satanicitas-diabolicitas is not denied, but is denied without meaning. In this way, and only in this way, and only under the coherent conditions of the corresponding level, can we switch, if not completely, then to a considerable extent, the specific and, in their determination, valid, even too valid, aspects of Satanic-attention at all lower levels.

\*

Finally, let us say a few words about Satan worship, the theoretical basis of Satanic sects.

The first of the basic types does nothing more than call God Satan.

The second assumes that there is a God, but that he actually created an evil, wicked, suffering world, and even within it he has forbidden and disallowed all that is relatively good. After death, according to God's plan, suffering destruction is one possibility, or, according to another possibility, very doubtful happiness. In spite of all appearances, Satan is the good, the benevolent High God of even greater power than God, who gives man happiness on earth and beyond earth, who forbids nothing. He who worships and adores Satan must deny the commands and expectations of the evil God, must act in opposition to them, thus weakening the power of God in his world.

The third basic type is overwhelmingly hedonistic. It is the unlimited enjoyment of life that is to be pursued, something that pleases the benevolent Satan, who will reward it with the endless pleasures of the afterlife.

According to the fourth basic type, Satan is also the Unlimited Lord (goodness is here relegated to the background), the Satanic God must be served by evil deeds, the most extreme, extreme evil deeds, surpassing all previous concepts, human sacrifices, ritual murders.

The four basic types are rarely found in pure form, and there is unlimited mixing and overlapping between the large number of variants of the basic types.

Satan worship is certainly satanic, and in all its forms, but it is not necessarily the most satanic possible. Counter-initiation and counter-realisation, which appears to be free from all evil, is certainly more satanic than the satanism of any satanic denomination. Liberalism or Communism extended to the World, or even left-wing anarchism, is more satanic than any nominally defined Satanism. Satan worship is linked to religions. There is Christian (anti-Christian-anti-Christian) Satanism, there is Muslim (anti-Muslim-anti-Muslim) Satanism, there are other, differently religious (anti-religious-anti-religious) Satanisms.

There are also forces connected with Satanism-Satan-worship but they are exclusively or almost exclusively negative, errant and errant forces, - sometimes manifesting themselves in totally unrestrained, frenzied forms, or rather in formsless forms. Satanism may also be associated with aspirations for realization, but these, remaining within the circle of Satanism, are hopeless in the direction of positivity. This is already true because of their extreme heteronism, but it is also true because of their low egoism and extreme inneutrality. At most, they can only achieve very small and very short-term results along the line of the lowest kakodaimonomageia/cacodæmonomageia. Otherwise - not unrelated to the prevalence of narcotic and other mind-altering chemicals among Satanists



enjoyment - can become "pathways" to mental disintegration.  
"passable".

The subject of satanicitas-diabolicitas is definitely something that needs further thought, something on which the author of these lines would have much more to say, and on which he would like to read writings published by his older and newer students and listeners.

### Occultism & Metaphysics

LÁSZLÓ ANDRÁS

The assumption of a close affinity between occultism and metaphysics, and even their almost complete identification, is almost universal in those circles in which metaphysics is not understood as a branch of philosophy, nor as a substantive approach to philosophy - nor is it considered as a transcendence of metaphysics from the original philosophy, which is related to philosophy, but precedes and transcends it. Occultism as a term is related in origin to the Latin verb 'occultāre' (meaning to hide) and the adjective 'occultus, occulta, occultum' (meaning hidden, concealed).

The word occultism itself, as a catch-all term for trends and ways of looking at things, became widely known and used through Eliphas Lévy, a major figure in Christian kabbalistics.

Occultism has had and still has an almost unrecordable number of trends, disappeared and revived, and even today new trends are emerging, new occult societies are being organised. A common characteristic of all occultist schools of thought is that they assume, and even claim, that the accessible through 'hyperempiria' - the actual existence of hidden worlds, planes, beings.

Some branches of occultism firmly admit and accept that there are occultist branches which allow themselves to be occultist only with reservations, and there are also those which deny in the strongest terms - on the basis of some consideration - their occultism, or even attack occultism outright, although they can be classified as essentially occultist-occultist branches.

In its orientation, occultism seeks to (and usually can) go beyond the scope of nature that physics can investigate and examine at any time, and in this respect the occultist endeavour can be considered as necessarily acceptable. However, we must be aware that the scope of nature ('physis') extends far beyond the range of possible interpretations possible in modern natural science, and even beyond the widest range of parapsychical and hyperphysical interpretations possible at any time

is. It can extend beyond the worlds of three, four, five, six, nine, twenty-one, sixty-four or 'n' space dimensions and one or any number of time dimensions - worlds - and still remain nature ('physis'). Only that which is truly beyond the natural and nature which is not related to any spatiality, any temporality, any substance - that is, not even a 'quite different' spatiality and a 'quite different' temporality with infinite space and infinite time dimensions and no mode of being of any 'quite different' substance. The occult planes belong to the world or worlds of nature in the broadest sense, indeed 'quite other', when actualized by a 'quite other' experience - but they do not belong to the realm of metaphysics, which is 'related to', derivable from, and reducible to, the Beyond Nature, the Beyond Beings, the Beyond Existences, and what is more - the Beyond Being and the Beyond Non-Being.

However, metaphysics also indirectly deals with the occult, as it were 'from above', recognising the legitimacy of the occult sciences when they function according to their highest potentialities and their actual purpose - since they once fully metaphysically imbued and inspired, and could be considered indirectly, indirectly, as superscientific and metaphysical sciences.

Metaphysics 'downwards' - from the aforementioned 'top view' - deals (or at least can deal) with what is related to the hidden background of nature, willingly applying the word 'occult' as an adjective or designation to these areas. Occultism has also had metaphysically inspired figures, teachers and authors; it has also had the need for a misunderstood or misunderstood metaphysical orientation - although in name only a few of the very many movements, and in reality far fewer. In the end, taking all these circumstances into account, it must be said in the final analysis that occultism is not metaphysics at all, and metaphysics is not occultism at all.

Occultism, as distinguished from the occult sciences, explicitly, resolutely and with the utmost determination insists on the latent actuality of occult planes and beings without having any super-philosophical-philosophical conception of the actual ontic-ontological structure of occult existence, and even more without having any super-conceptual experience of this structure.

On the basis of the metaphysical view - and the corresponding magical solipsism - we must say - in contrast to occultism and its representatives - that in the case of beings not coming within the sphere of direct experience at any given time, we cannot speak of ontic actuality, and thus of occult-latent actuality; - only ontic potentiality (actuable or less actuable potentiality) can be spoken of in a spiritually legitimate sense, if the with the realisation of 'hyperempiria', the actualisation has not yet taken place.

The various strands of occultism and the practitioners of these strands are not only ignorant of 'madness' in the ontological sense, but they know almost nothing about metaphysicality, and are almost hostile to it, insofar as they know anything about it. As mentioned above, there are one or two very exceptional exceptions, but these do not play a decisive role (between tendencies in the case of tendencies, and within their own tendencies in the case of individuals).

Some branches of occultism - for example, Blavatsky-Olcott and Besant-Leadbeater pseudo-theosophicalism - do speak of the 'Metaphysicum Absolutum' as the "Unmanifested" - but quite casually, for the sake of its nominal existence. At the same time, the most prominent of the 'visible founders', H. P. Blavatsky, even in his major work 'The Secret Doctrine', writes of 'great potential states' and even assumes some kind of temporality of nirvāṇa, completely contradicting the basic teachings of Buddhism, but also Hinduism and the whole metaphysical traditionality, and the real the spirit of 'theosophy'.

In the majority of occult and occultist movements, the 'Metaphysicum Absolutum' (the Absolutum Metaphysicum) is either ignored, or only nominally 'recognized', or not considered feasible.

Most occult trends are - in doctrine - decidedly evolutionist; and sometimes, eschewing the most extreme forms of evolutionism, they experiment with more nuanced and subtle "spiritual theories of evolution". In contrast, the position of metaphysical traditionalism is that we can and should speak of involution rather than evolution - if by this we mean not only unfolding but also ascent - and ascent can be neither necessary nor lawful, but neither contingent nor a mixture of the two. True elevation can only be the result of a highly conscious, highly volitional, willful mastery of spiritual power, and free. Evolutionism is a distinctively antitraditional and antispiritual view, both biological, social and spiritual, whether it confronts spirituality openly or tries to define itself as a spiritual worldview.

The lowest form of occultism is spiritualism. While there is a difference between spiritualism and spiritualism, this fact does not change the fact that spiritualism is a blatantly vile and pernicious form of anti-transcendentalism and anti-metaphysics. The name itself is inaccurate and conceptually flawed. Spiritualism has to do with 'spiritus', spirit, as a word, and should mean a strongly affirmative stance in favour of the pre-eminent and supreme dignity of spirit and spirituality. What is meant by spiritualism as a term today is many things, but not really spiritual at all. It would be much more appropriate to use the term parapsychism instead of spiritualism. Spiritualism (parapsychism) is based on real facts, apart from the frequent deceptions, good- or bad-faith deceptions and the possibility of self-deception.

Both 'manifestations' and 'materializations' are real and actual possibilities - and it would be wrong to doubt this. But we also need to know the actual origins of these possibilities in order to see clearly when judging spiritualism (parapsychism). In the 'manifestations' and 'materializations' we can speak of the actual manifestation and presence of occult forces, which appear as beings and entities, as it were, functioning and acting. To this end, we must know that after death, people do not only have one physical corpse - in the narrow sense of the term - but also several and much more 'animate' corpses. Occultology speaks of etheric, astral, submental and other corporealities that become corpses after death, carrying characteristics, traits and even memories. However, these would not manifest themselves, as it were, but if they were inhabited by demonic beings, which would be used as clothing

or wrapped around themselves as borrowed bodies - demons can indeed manifest themselves at spiritualist séances by using subtle bodies as vehicles, and exceptionally in other circumstances when they do not even need a medium as a "human channel".

Subtle corpses are also corpses, which in some ways - though in a very different way from what generally happens with the most narrowly defined 'physical' corpse - also decompose. These are the 'decomposition products' - occult poisons that can cause psychic poisoning. The decomposing occult corpses and the demons that invade and animate them are by no means harmless to mediums and spiritualists, nor to others who come into closer contact with such circles and people; indirectly, spiritualism is the transmission of a poisoning that is pervasive to all and sundry, and which must be combated, among other things, but not primarily, from the metaphysical side and as a representative of traditionalism.

Among the occultist trends there are some more sophisticated ones, but spiritualism indirectly influences most of them. One of the bases of the pseudo-theosophicalism taught and cultivated by the 'Theosophical Society', alongside the counterfeit Orientalism and the perverted forms of Middle Eastern and Western traditions, was the 'reincarnationist' wing of Spiritualism, both ideologically and in terms of the members who joined.

We should deal with the question of reincarnation (reincarnātiō, correctly: redincarnatio) in a separate study - but we should already mention here that most of the occult movements strongly believe in it, even consider it to be their cardinal doctrine. This is also one of the doctrinal differences that separate the majority of the main lines of occultism from metaphysical traditionalism, from traditional metaphysics. The spiritual-metaphysical tradition radically rejects vulgar reincarnationism, and does not accept the more 'sophisticated', nuanced variants of reincarnationism. Reincarnation, as and in the sense taught by pseudo-Theosophicalism, Steinerianism, pseudo-Hermeticism and various manifestations of pseudo-Christianity, export-import Buddhism and Hinduism, and the falsifying and misleading Western advertising yoga from the East, does not exist at all. There is a certain occult transmission of forces, aspirations, attachments, functional qualities, a kind of regeneration, expressed by the corresponding Sanskrit word. This word - in its basic form - in the singular subject of 'punarjanman' - is the 'punarjanma', meaning 'regeneratio'. The root 'jan' - with approximate Hungarian pronunciation 'dzsan' - is the Indo-European equivalent of the Latin root 'gen', and both have the meaning of origin, descent, genesis, heredity, and the Greek roots 'gen' and 'gon' also correspond to this meaning.

There are many, complexly interrelated reasons why many experts in Eastern cultures, languages and religions believe that reincarnation is a universally held and taught truth in Eastern traditions - when in fact it is not, and this has been proven irrefutably from many quarters. Both Hinduism and Buddhism - but also other traditions - have doctrinal details that make the position in favour of reincarnation seem clear. A specialist with extensive knowledge of Eastern languages can translate these doctrinal texts in such a way that reincarnationism follows directly from them - and with a flawless, correct translation. But never

we must remember that translating languages with an archaic character is not like translating German, English, French texts - translating texts of classical-archaic character reflects a position based on presuppositions. Here, knowledge of language, culture, religion (religious history) is not enough - here, an inner metaphysical knowledge is also required, and this is something that most of the most outstanding scholars lack completely.

Occult vulgar reincarnationism is an anti-spiritual, anti-traditional, anti-metaphysical and anti-transcendental doctrine, and - it must be said - nuanced reincarnationism is nothing more than the equivalent of vulgar reincarnationism disguised by the cosmetics of consciousness.

Reincarnationist deviance, like almost all doctrinal currents that permeate the mind, is based on human affinities manipulated by dark forces. Methodically making downward-transcendentalism accessible, and even the intentions that propagate it, penetrate the "intellectual public consciousness" from the direction of certain background movements and background organizations. This intention, however, is not directed towards metaphysical awakening, but towards leading the subjective consciousness identified with the human incarnate personality, by plunging as deeply as possible into the vortex of existence, towards dissolution in the root-nature of the qualitative - in fact, towards annihilation. The false doctrines that somewhat veil the all-priority and all-transcendence of the existence vortex, the 'samsāra', are perfectly suited to these intentions; reincarnationism is most explicitly the extreme doctrine of orientation towards 'samsāra', even if the related 'commentaries' claim the opposite. The advocacy of metaphysical traditionalism takes on a partly defensive and partly counter-offensive stance - with all its tolerance and in spite of it - against the reincarnationism of occultism and falsifying Orientalism.

Occultism and export-import orientalism are dangerous even when they merely present their teachings to the human consciousness bound to their own personality, but they become truly satanically disruptive and destructive when they gives "self-transformation exercises" to people in a "helpful" way. More and more paths to counter-initiation and counter-realisation are being opened. Progress along such paths, while also requiring determined diligence, is in fact ridiculously easy compared to progress up and up along the true rectificatory, prodiniatic, iniciatic and realificatory paths. These practices - prepared by reincarnationism, evolutionism, substantialism, and other misleading doctrines - actually lead the human-bound personal consciousness towards the 'second death' and 'outer darkness'.

Since the adherents of an approach based on the doctrine of metaphysical traditionalism are tolerant, but not tolerantist (i.e. they do not accept the absolute necessity of tolerance, always, at all times, towards everything, including the forces of darkness), they oppose with the force of an intellectual offensive all tendencies and positions which claim that it is permissible (or even necessary) to give modern Western man, who is alienated from the spirit, exercises in self-transformation without his real preparation, i.e. self-archaization. It cannot be denied that the occult - and within it spiritualism - can be interesting, the interest of para- and hyper-physical phenomena and theories related to them cannot be denied, nor can the possible positivity of an interested engagement with them be denied - but the occult is not to be considered as a metaphysical

resolution cannot be confused with, nor fused with, the resolution, and if an attempt is made to do so, it must be resisted.

The situation is different, as has already been pointed out, with the occult sciences, which, in their archaic form, were indirectly metaphysical in origin. If these sciences are cultivated with the high order and in a perfectly adequate way, both these sciences (essentially supersciences) and the deep engagement with them can and should be welcomed - from all sides, including the side of the approach corresponding to metaphysical traditionalism. If this is not the case, if it is not done from the side of asserting and attaining a clear spirituality, if occultism is mixed into that which is associated with the 'occult', then rejection can only be the appropriate principled attitude in this area too.

#### POWER AND ORIGIN

ANDRÁSZLÓ LÁSZLÓ\*

Metaphysical traditionalism, as a theory of being, must also take a stand on the questions that raise the problem of the spirit manifested in the world. The way in which the spirit manifests itself in the world, the way in which it asserts itself or is eclipsed, is closely related to the cyclicity in which man, nature, the world, and above all consciousness, are involved. It pervades man, it determines man's external and internal world, except in those terrains where man retains his autonomy from his metaphysical base. The presence of spirit in the world manifests itself as dominion and power. Dominion and power are essentially traditional categories, and at the same time they are exposed to the intrusion of anti-traditional forces that can falsify them and create a pseudo-form of power (the opposite form), that is, a pseudo (counterfeit) form and give it a direction that is contrary to the original stability and original movement of power and dominion.

The basis of all true domination is 'suprēmātia', supremacy, which can only be real (actual, true) spiritual supremacy - the supremacy that comes from possessing metaphysical origin-consciousness. The existence of the 'suprēmātia' is most crucial in this matter. If 'suprēmātia' (the real supremacy) is not present, then only pseudo-dominantia can be realized. If spiritual supremacy is absent, then domination is not really domination, and the resulting power is usurped power. Dominion differs from power in that it is above power and possesses it. In ontological terms, Indian traditions speak of this abundantly, and power is called śakti (feminine word), which corresponds to the magical power at work in the world. The śakta (masculine word) is the possessor of power (the śakti). Dominion comes from the possession of power. The ruler has power, and his rulership is based on his actual supremacy, that is, on his having supremacy. He stands out from the circle of beings and men, and his dominion derives from this supremacy, which is the full

you can own it and keep it. Pseudo-dominantia can only retain the violence of power, i.e. the most extreme form of power. It usurps power, but not the totality of power, only the lowest part of it, violence. No usurpation of power can be imagined that could extend to the full extent of power. Usurpation can always be directed at the most extreme and lowest form, aspect and instrument of power.

The presence of spirit in the world is the awareness of the presence of the centre. So, if the consciousness of the centre is not present in the world, then the world is spiritless. Spirit is the consciousness of the centre in man and in the world of man. The centre and the axis - the centre and the axis - is what dominion and power, and, all in all, supremacy, must be based on. The ruler is, in essence, immovable, like the centre and the axis. Therefore, executive power is always lower than the power that the ruler directly possesses. The power directly possessed is the power to found, to move (to move) and to stop. The ancient king (Jupiter Stator) means "Jupiter the stopper". This stopper is both founder and also includes mover: it moves and stops. It lays the foundations, establishes a solid base and rules. The world's equivalent of the spirit as a primary metaphysical expression is monarchy, where the state is headed by a king, emperor or prince who is the unlimited possessor of the fullness of power. Everything that can be symbolized horizontally and vertically, and that extends to these areas, is in his hands, he possesses it absolutely without limit. Just as God possesses being (in being he is present as the lord of being), so in the earthly socket of being, the state, the king, the ruler, the monarch is present. Traditionalism must extend to the various spheres of life and there show the paradigms (patterns) according to which the traditional state can be constructed or established.

It should be known that in the present, let alone the future, the possibility of such a build-up is infinitesimal. The full spiritual penetration of the traditional empires was already in decline around VII-VI-V BC. There were still intellectual upsurges antiquity and the Middle Ages, when the traditional state was (if not perfectly) established. The Roman Empire was a traditional empire, as were the later Eastern and Western Roman Empires. The Western Roman Empire, revived by the Carolingians - Charlemagne's Empire - was also traditional, as was the German-Roman Empire.

Hungary was also a traditional state during the Turul dynasty - the Árpád dynasty - in parallel with the Saxon dynasty and the German-Roman Empire of the Hohenstaufs.

In the East, these were much more preserved, if we think in this respect of the Chinese, but even more so of the Japanese empire, where the imperial presence was manifested until very recently. The highest form of monarchy is the deity-kingdom, when the deity appears in the world as an Avatāra (descendant) and occupies the position of World King. The World King, whose name in Sanskrit is Cakravarti, meaning "the turning of the wheel". The "spinner of the wheel", the "master of the wheel" can only be the one who is in the Centre and emerges from the Centre. The Divine King is replaced by the Sacral King, whose mission comes from the Sky, from the Sky. Then come those kingdoms which are kingdoms by the grace of God. This is a demotion, but the spirit is still present, alive and working. Then come those formations from which these powers are no longer present, and there is a form of government which

demonstratively represents the un-unfinished state of the spirit. It represents that it is not representative of spirit (of heaven, of transcendence). The republic is such a form of government.

Traditionalism, while not primarily concerned with the terrestrial, also takes a very strong stance on issues relating to the world. For the world must provide individuals with a return to the spirit (the origin). The state is therefore an imprint of the spiritual world, but also a paradigm in which the inner order of the spiritual world is expressed and which provides the model for the world that man builds within and around himself. The rule which is based on supremacy and which holds power can only be aristocratic, autocratic and theocratic. Autocratic means that the ruler has unlimited power based on himself. The aristocratic means that the rule of the best prevails. The theocratic means that aristocracy and theocracy derive their origin from the existence of the Godhead, and that in autocracy the divine principle is at work, and that in autocracy the divine principle is expressed in all respects, and that in aristocracy the rule of the best is manifested through the divine rule. Theos means god, aristos means the good, the best, agathos means the supreme, auto means self. Theokrateia and theokratiā (theocratia) are the Greek and Greco-Latin forms of aristokrateia and aristokratiā (aristocratia) and autokrateia and autokratiā (autocratia). These are the basis for the ascent back to the spirit. The rule of the dēmos, of the people, is the dēmokrateia or dēmokratiā (democratia). Even in the case of the dēmos, where a true spiritual dignity is manifested, "democracy" is a demotion and a downgrading from the former. But usually it not, and the dēmos is normally no more than a mass. Today, every political tendency wants to speak in the name of democracy, and its aim is to affirm and enhance it. From the point of view of spirituality, democracy and democratism are to be rejected. From the point of view of spirit, of traditionalism, democratism has no right to exist. The only duty of the Ruler - and this too is an inherent one, not the following of a principle - is not to rule against the people. But he does not have to rule in the name of the people, because the people are immeasurably inferior to the true Ruler.

We need to determine how the traditional vision of being - which applies primarily to the intellectual spheres - manifests itself in the political and social spheres. The inalienable political aspect of the traditionalist approach to life is the political worldview that we call right-wingism (dextrism), and from this follows the most radical right-wingism. There is no place for democratism in radical right-wingism. When we talk about dictatorships, we need to know what dictatorship means. Dictatorship means a temporary state, where the autocrat (the ruler) exercises executive power by issuing direct orders, e.g. through a dictator. Temporality is inherent, but dictatorship can be negative or positive. A proletarian dictatorship or a clique dictatorship is a dictatorship of certain circles or groups of people, in which there is no higher determination of any kind, and this cannot be acceptable. Dictatorship, if it does not manifest the truly higher - but precisely darkness, and the lower - is the rule of darkness, scotasmokratiā. Dictatorship which uses terror, and in the background of which scotasmokratiā prevails, must be rejected. It is as left-wing as democratism, liberalism, socialism. Terror and liberalism are also left-wing - so are terrorist dictatorships and democracy.



From a socio-economic point of view, it is obvious that socialism and communism in particular are totally anti-traditional. Communism is the political worldview that can rightly be called satanocracy, satanic rule. Communism (Bolshevism) is the clear expression of Satanic rule, but also bourgeois democracy in the context of the world of darkness, and capitalism in the economic plane. These are not traditional formulas.

At the social level, the last traditional manifestation was feudalism. The original feudalism, which had not yet been corrupted by the expansion of the money economy. In any case, the negative outgrowths of feudalism are linked to the development of the money economy, which means that the peasantry (serfs), for example, are forced to do more and more work, and not as much as is absolutely necessary. The essence of feudum is that everything belongs to the king. Everything is his property, but not capitalist property, but truly royal property, and he gives it away. What he donates becomes private property, but not in the sense of capitalist private property. The land given as feudal land could not be sold because, in the sense of the property hierarchies, it ultimately belonged to the king, it was his.

This process continued downwards (the feudum gave birth to another feudum) and finally reached the serfdom of the serfs. The word serf did not originally have any pejorative meaning (the Latin form of the word is *jobbagus*). Everyone was a serf of the king. The serf was the owner of the land, his private property, not in the capitalist sense, but in the sense of a hierarchy of property rights.

He had private property, but this property was in the form of a fief, so his private property was also his lord's property, and primarily the king's. The pure forms of feudalism were encountered in the ninth to the fourteenth centuries; after that (with the rise of the money economy), the pure forms of feudalism became more confused and took on characteristics that can and should be judged negatively. But this does not belong to the original image of feudalism and its perceptibility. While capitalism is antitraditional (state capitalism even more so), feudalism, when it appears in its pure form, is essentially traditional. Left-wingism is in all cases anti-traditional and right-wingism, if it is in fact right-wingism, is traditionalist in character. It should be noted that not a single right-wing tendency has mixed left-wing elements throughout history. Strong left-wing - in fact, counter-left-wing - infiltration can be detected even in the case of extreme right-wing tendencies, and these (in this respect and sense) also manifest themselves as anti-traditionalism. (In Hungary, all 53 parties that have tried to manifest themselves in the political spectrum today are invariably left-wing parties. However they define themselves, they are still left-wing, because they are always linked to some form of democratism, and all democratism is left-wing.

The fact that all parties are right-wing or even extreme right-wing from the point of view of the MSZMP can be safely ignored.)

Traditionalism considers two aspects to be indispensable. The first is that feudalism must prevail - whatever the chances of that prevailing at present. The other is the idea of empire, which could be called imperialism, but since this is already associated with confused, negative images, it is better called imperialism. If we look at Hungarian history, from the time when the House of Árpád died out in Hungary, after the rule of the Anjou, the rule of the Habsburgs (the Jagellos and others were only episodic here) was essentially characterised by the following: Hungary was in a personal union with the German-Roman Empire. The Kingdom of Hungary was never part of the German-Roman Empire.

Empire, since the Hungarian king was a king with imperial rights (not like the Czech king) and was bound to the German-Roman Empire (from the beginning of the last century to Austria) by a 'unio personalis'. In Hungary, feudalism was felt much more deeply among the Hungarian lords than in the German-Roman Empire. In this respect, the Hungarians took a more traditional position than the various parts of the other empires involved in the Persian Empire. However, within the German-Roman Empire (later within Austria), the idea of empire was much more deeply felt, so in this respect it was more traditional. These two conditions (feudalism and imperialism) should have been in perfect synthesis. While the symbiosis of Hungary and the German-Roman Empire - in retrospect - cannot be regarded as positive with absolute clarity, the usual attitude which rejects the intrinsically positive nature of the Habsburg Empire is completely wrong.

This personal union, although not perfect, was a formation in Europe that we must not reject.

In the context of the intellectual manifestation of domination and power, we must also talk about nationalism. Nationalism was born, not without precedent, at the time of the Reformation and emerged in force in the French Revolution of 1789. This form of nationalism is anti-traditional and left-wing, because it is based on levelling, and levelling means levelling, and this always results in a downward levelling. The essence of nationalism is that whoever belongs to the 'nātiō', the nation, is essentially equal, and this is what gives the nation its cohesion. Historically, 'nātiō' has meant different things; e.g.

In Hungary, for a long time it meant only the nobility. Everyone was a resident of the kingdom, a subject (*rēgnicola*), but not part of the 'nātiō', only the nobility. Internationalism, which is also nivellative, can also be traced back to the nivellative nationalism that unfolded in the French Revolution. One of them was based on the idea that everyone is French, German or Hungarian, the rest is irrelevant, and this is what gives cohesion, the intellectual and all other foundations, it is what binds the nation together. The same can be thought of further by extending it to the whole of humanity. But there is also a positive and right-wing form of nationalism. This nationalism assumes an internally divided nation; a nation divided horizontally and vertically. It postulates a differentiated nation, capable of integration, a nation engaged in levelling, a nation spiritually guided from the top down and spiritually directed upwards. This corresponds to right-wing nationalism. In the case of internationalism (internationalism), although right-wing internationalism cannot be ruled out in principle, internationalism is used and has been used against the world by the darkest anti-spiritual and counter-spiritual forces to such an extent that cooperation with it is spiritually impossible. Nor is it possible to strive towards the spirit on the basis of narrow nationalism. There is a spiritual transnationalism (or supranationalism) that unifies on the basis of principles that transcend nations. This manifests itself in particular forms, such as supranational churches, monastic orders, etc. (There is also a radical party in Hungary which calls itself transnational, but this has nothing to do with transnationalism, because it is a typical internationalist, cosmopolitan party formation.) It is connationalism which is the positive affirmation of internationalism

is based on the idea of the commonwealth of nations, and also means collective nationalism, i.e. the unification of nationalisms and nations.

Right and left are terms that date back to the late 18th century. They were used to express the positioning of members of parliament. Members of the former conservative governing parties were right, while those who advocated subversion were on the left. The term is not the most felicitous, but there is no better word. That is why the term can be applied thousands of years ago, but it can also be applied to today or to the future.

If you want to name one truly right-wing politician in the last 250 years who has most clearly demonstrated this spirit in politics, it was Metternich, much more than, say, Hitler or Mussolini. Metternich represented a right-wingism in which there was no room for any kind of counter-left-wing infiltration. Of course, as a result of manipulative upbringing and education, for 99.9% of Hungarians, Metternich's name rings as loathsome as that of the most vile political villain. This perception, however, is fundamentally mistaken and even stupid. Metternich represented an almost pure traditionalist state ethos and never had a single anti-Hungarian manifestation in his life (careful and in-depth historical research has clearly shown this.)

At some point in the Middle Ages or earlier, everyone and every current was 'right-wing', because all currents were traditional in their essence. The anti-tradition could only manifest itself on the periphery, as a marginal force. Differences can be made backwards, such as the contrast between Guelphs and Ghibellines in the Middle Ages. The Guelf was a dynasty whose original German name was Welf, the German equivalent of Ghibelline was Hohenstaufen. The two dynasties had fundamentally different positions. The Guelf dynasty fully recognised the supreme primacy and supremacy of the Pope. It was their position that the Pope could be emperor if he wished, but if he was not emperor, he was still supreme over the emperor. The Ghibelline position, on the other hand, was that supremacy belonged to the emperor, and that the emperor could, if he wished, assume papal authority, but that even if he did not assume it, he was still superior to the pope. This was very well established at one time, since the German-Roman emperor was called the Vicar of Christ - Vicārius Christī - and the pope was called only Vicārius Petrī, St. Peter the Baptist.

Peter's vicar. This was the case for a long time (many centuries). If we want to label it in today's terms, it is obvious that both the Guelphs and the Ghibellines were 'right-wing' tendencies. Irrespective of this: the Ghibelline tendency was more 'right-wing' because the monarch was traditionally understood to be superior to the high priest. All priesthoods have something lunar (lunar-like), and therefore mediating, about them. For example, the Aztecs had a high priest next to the king, whose name was 'Snake-Assassin', and although he was male, he appeared as the king's wife. In India, next to the king - the Rāja - there was the Purōhita, the high priest, a brahmana, who, although male, related to the king during the ceremonies as if she were his wife. There was no sexual implication, it was simply an outward manifestation of inner prestige. Although the monarch was himself a high priest, he was in any case superior to the high priest. Even so, in retrospect, it can be seen in stronger and weaker ways

to distinguish between 'right-wing' tendencies, and at the same time, to use the present and last century's terms, the Guelf and Ghibelline positions were, as noted, both together and separately 'right-wing'. In Hungary, Koppány and

In the case of the opposite of St Stephen, they both had a traditional approach.

At one time, the forces of anti-tradition (though they existed) were of peripheral importance. They could not yet penetrate, they could not yet penetrate the world of man, but they were already working from within, invisibly, through the decomposition of consciousness, and they had great results, but they could not yet have done the work of disorder. The medieval states (though far from perfect) were alive and sustained by the pervasive force of those vestiges which were truly representative of tradition. Even in their residual state, they dominated and (even in that state) were able to marginalise or extra-marginalise the offensive forces that sought to disrupt them. Revolutions are essentially left-wing. The English revolutions of 1648, the French of 1789 and 1830, the French and European revolutions of 1848, the French of 1870/71, the Russian of 1917, European revolutions of 1918-19 were all - fundamentally and to the extreme, and increasingly to the extreme - in the hands of the forces of domination of the anti-traditional (scotazmocratic, dark) and them in full. 1956, however, is a different revolution, not even a revolution, but a Freedom Rising and a Freedom Struggle. In 1956, there was no left-wing movement in Hungary. It cannot be linked to 1848 or 1918, 1956 is infinitely superior to them in rank, dignity and orientation. This does not mean that in 1956 effective traditionalist forces were making their voice heard - because such forces are only sporadic in the world - but the orientation was the same as the orientation towards which tradition would have directed this movement.

When the Bolsheviks called this a counter-revolution, they wanted to brand this Freedom Uprising. If it had not been the Bolsheviks who invented it, we might as well accept the label 'counter-revolution', because counter-revolution - as a fact, as a possibility, as a concept - usually always carries some positivity. All in all, however, it would be more correct to stick to the terms 'freedom uprising' or 'freedom struggle'.

In no way should it be confused with the manifestations of the dark forces concentrated in revolutions.

If we look at the facts, events, happenings and trends of the past in the sense of traditional political science, we can rightly say that Hungary is still a Kingdom. In 46 years, only injustices have been committed by the authorities in Hungary. For 46 years, the country was under enemy occupation, and enemy occupation cannot create national assemblies, governments, national parliaments. In legal terms (*dē iūre*), Hungary is in fact still a Kingdom, where there has been interregnum for 46 years, so there is no legitimate head of state, no parliament, no government. *Dē factō* (in terms of the facts) In Hungary, power was usurped by a power hostile to the elementary interests of the Hungarian people, assisted by puppet figures. The 1990 "elections" did not change this, since the current "elected" power is based on, and derives from, the succession of the previous power. Likewise, what has been adopted as the coat of arms is completely irrelevant: the crowned or non-crowned coat of arms. The coat of arms of Hungary is the crowned coat of arms, and no legitimate body has abolished it, because no such body has existed since then, i.e. since the beginning of the Soviet occupation. (The coat of arms is the small crowned coat of arms, and the crowned middle coat of arms can also be used, and if it is ever created, the crowned upper coat of arms. However, this was only in draft form, it had been planned for several centuries, but had not yet been developed, as it included areas such as Serbia and Jerusalem. Since the King of Hungary is King of Jerusalem and Serbia at the same time. A crownless coat of arms - not a coat of arms,

is a shield. Even the coat of arms of the counties used to have a crown above it, usually a nine-pointed crown.)

At the moment, the possibility of a truly traditional structure being created, either here in Hungary or in any other part of the world, is immeasurably small. The possibility that a formation resembling such a structure could emerge is also very small. But the chances of restoration should not affect the principles, the principles should not be affected. A principled standpoint is needed here, but it can be assumed that there are periods of relative brightness, so-called lucid intervals, in the life of an increasingly darkening world. These may not be the original traditional light awakening, but they are still relatively brighter brief periods in which restoration must be attempted, even if this restoration could only last for 24 hours. Even if it were only for a day, and only partially, it would still be in the spirit of this doing that we should live, act, function, think and feel.

Political orientation is at most secondary to intellectual orientation, but that does not mean that it is not also important in a very profound and pervasive way, for example, for the individual. Even people of high quality are very often characterised by the fact that they have a significant lack of principle, that is to say, they lack internal coherence. Károly Kerényi, whom we otherwise have little respect for, had the witty remark that contemporary man and his views - even those of a scientific or higher level and their views - are characterised by 'incoherence', 'incompetence' and 'inconsistency', due to a disturbance of principle. Anyone who takes a pro-spiritual stance, but at the same time sympathises with the political left, will inevitably experience an inner disorder of posture. Acceptance of any hierarchical set-up is crucial to traditionalism. Anyone who says that his aim is to meditate and at the same time denies the legitimacy of hierarchy must also deny the hierarchy of degrees of consciousness. For all hierarchies derive from the hierarchy of degrees of consciousness, and the world is an imprint of that hierarchy. Anyone who says that all men are basically equal cannot be serious, and probably never has been. It is a very particular position, and one can stake one's life on such an idea and not believe that what one says is true. He suspects something that must be true, though he doesn't know why people should be equal. For life constantly disproves this egalitarianism. For men differ greatly in character and spiritual degrees. There are people of approximately the same spiritual degree, but apart from that, there is no real basis for egalitarianism. Further: the egalitarian principle does not represent any moral good, nothing ought to be so according to some normative order, because if it were so, it would be better. Precisely because it is not so, it follows that all levelling is levelling down, and all equalisation is based on levelling down. Anyone who wants full equality of rights can at best only achieve equality in the absence of rights.

Dominance and power must manifest themselves organically. If a state is only a total state, then it is not in the spirit of traditionalism. To totality must necessarily be added organicity, the orderliness of inner life, which derives its forces from the spirit and the supra-life. This order must be central and spiritually pervasive, and this centre (from which the pervasiveness derives) is also the centre of the goal towards which the

both collectively and individually. Each human individual carries within him or herself the image of the status, or state, or perhaps carries it without having such an image: everything is confused and darkened. Such a person can only aspire to such an idea of the state, that is, to the non-state. For the states of today are very largely non-states, and societies are non-societies, if we call them (or deprive them of the right to be called) from an original, originalist point of view. From the point of view of a true idea of state and society, the states and societies of today can be described rather as masses, aggregates, apparatuses, inorganic organisms functioning as instruments of the exercise of violence. Traditionalism is based on a true idea of state and society.

One that is alive, that receives its life from higher powers, that is organically and hierarchically structured, where there is and cannot be any opposition and contradiction between the individual and the collective, where everyone is in his place and where everyone is striving towards the Sky, that is, towards a deeper and higher, and above all, a more complete self.

\* \* \*

There is no rest for those who live among men for worldly ends, nor for those who spend their lives in solitude for spiritual ends. He who lives among men for the sake of serving God will have peace.

\* \* \*

Only when man has freed himself from the confusion of regarding the material world as real and important can he understand and fulfil his true vocation.

\* \* \*

The fear of death comes from the fact that people only see life as a tiny part of life, limited by their own imagination.

\* \* \*

We know the divine law both from the traditions of all religions and from our consciousness, if this and that are not disturbed by passions and affectations; but we can also know it by experience, if we apply it to life. All the requirements of the law which give unshakeable salvation are requirements of the true law.

\* \* \*

**András László**

## **On questions of our sovereignty**

The situation of Hungary from 1945 to the present day is rarely correctly assessed and interpreted. It is not worth talking about the communists here, since for them the desecration of our Homeland and our Nation was the basis for the "construction of socialism". However, it is regrettable to note the distorted views that are still being held by adults and mature people who seem to understand the political context. One of them must be singled out, one on which incomprehension is considered intolerable and which has a criterion value, since failure to accept it either indicates that the person concerned does not really understand anything and should not say a word about politics, or that his love of his country and nation, which was previously beyond doubt, is now questionable. So what is this really about?

Today, with the exception of feral communists, everyone talks about Hungary being under Soviet occupation from 1945 to mid-1991; some dare to speak - more cautiously - only of a Soviet military presence. But anyone who does not want to define his or her place on the political left cannot be content with this. We must say and say with the firmest determination imaginable: The whole of Hungary was under enemy military occupation from 1 April 1945 to 24 hours on 30 June 1991. It was not a 'foreign' military presence, but a hostile and repressive occupation of the most vile enemy, the subjugation of our country by the enemy.

The occupying presence of the hostile Red hordes on a hostile basis cannot be qualified as such, but this indisputable fact had, and still has, implications which must be mentioned, albeit briefly. The hostile occupation was an illegal usurpation of power, aided and abetted by political and historical scum, in the role of servants and puppets, pretending to be representatives of state power and administration. A country under enemy occupation, whose every move was determined and dictated by the enemy occupiers: it could not conclude any valid treaty or agreement, because that could only be based on sovereignty, but a country under enemy occupation and determined by the enemy occupiers cannot be sovereign.

Hungary - after the enemy occupation - did not and could not have a legitimate government within its borders, and - we must say so! - in fact, no government of any kind

was not. There was no real Parliament within the borders of the country, no real head of state.

Accordingly, as we have noted, the treaties could not have had any force, i.e. they could not be considered treaties then, nor can they be considered treaties now, in retrospect. In this respect, we must first of all mention the so-called 'armistice agreement' itself, which, as stated above, can in no way be considered a valid treaty, or even invalid, because to apply ordinary invalidity to such a degree of invalidity would be the most absurd euphemism.

The enemy invasion began there and then, when the Soviet hordes invaded. Much has already been written about their beastly presence, so we will not go into it here. The complete occupation of the country may have been perfected between 4 and 10 April 1945, but let us accept the 'official' view - 4 April. It was the first absolutely clear day of mourning in the country's history. By comparison, the Battle of Mohács and the beginning of the Turkish occupation, though also disasters, pale in significance. There, too, the enemy triumphed, but an enemy which, if it represented something totally alien, was not fundamentally anti-God and anti-human, as the Soviet and Communist enemy did, in the most terrorist way and by the most terrorist means.

The Trianon Peace Treaty was also completely unjust - and completely unjust - but there and then, respectable and qualified politicians with legal authority were present, and with a broken heart, they gave in to coercion and signed this shameful, Masonic-composed "peace treaty". The so-called "Paris Peace Treaty" was quite different, even compared to Trianon, because in Hungary, as we have already noted, there was in fact no government, no parliament and no head of state, because what there was did not have the same rights as those who "take power" in a pub when drunk. The Bolshevik thugs put in the velvet chair by the enemy (in 1919) and their treasonous lackeys who collaborated with the enemy had no real authority to make peace, and the enemy was an enemy with whom no peace could ever be made: no legitimate Hungarian state could have made peace with the Bolshevik-Communist Soviet rule; with the British and the Americans, perhaps - with far-reaching reservations - but never with the Soviets.

Legally elected or appointed statesmen of Hungary were handed over by the allies of the Soviet Union - as "war criminals" - to the Hungarian agents of the power usurped by the Soviets, who could in no way be called Hungarians. The "people's courts" were not, of course, courts of law, but the most vile and repulsive teratomas of the terror apparatus. Many legitimate Hungarian statesmen were murdered, - because the execution



was usually carried out on those who had been legally convicted, and here there was no question of a legal conviction or any kind of conviction, because that would have required a real court.

In Hungary, there are not simple injustices or violations of the law, because in order to violate the law, there must be at least in principle a legal framework. Real legality in Hungary has been sunk by the beastly enemy and their even more abominable servants, and what they have put in its place has nothing whatsoever to do with any law or legality.

The 1956 uprising and fight for freedom against the allegedly the "pacified" enemy has once again gone to open war. There were and are those who, even after all this, have not opened their eyes, or if they have, not enough.

We - and this is obvious - have not accepted Imre Nagy, nor will we ever accept him. The former Minister of the Interior, the minion of Beria, outdid Gábor Peter during his time as Minister of the Interior, and this was well known at the time, but the degree of vile behaviour that János Kádár produced is almost unique even in this country. Who did what willingly and gladly or on command - this may be interesting from the point of view of the investigation of the causes, or perhaps from the psychological approach, but it is not in any way relevant. Kádár may have done what he did voluntarily, he may have been forced or compelled to do it - in the end, it makes no difference. No decent man could be asked or forced to take on the role of executioner of the nation, and this is no different in the case of incomparably lesser roles.

Hungary - through the turbulent internal movements of 1988 and 1989 - 1990, the year of the so-called regime change. There can be no question that there were changes, but that the system has not really changed is certain. If, symbolically, the total regime change can be considered a 180-degree turn, then the change cannot be described as a 45-degree eighth turn, but rather as a 30-degree twelfth turn. That much change may indeed have taken place, and in the 'system' at that, but no more, but in 1990 it was not even possible to do so, as the country was still under hostile military occupation. It was more than a year after the 'free elections' that the enemy occupying troops left Hungary. By then, it had already been internally ensured that no real and meaningful regime change could take place. thus, the current parliament has no real legitimacy, as it is based on the succession of the communist system ensured by the enemy occupation.

Approximately after the next elections, our country and our nation will be in a position to have a real and complete regime change, not automatically, because elections do not become truly legitimate due to the temporal distance from occupation, but only if the then Parliament and government have absolutely distanced themselves from their predecessors, which

would otherwise be a prerequisite for these bodies to be clearly considered de facto, de iure and de veritate as Parliament and government.

The failure to disassociate oneself from the alliance with the enemy and from the creators of this alliance makes it impossible to speak of a real and complete regime change. Those who collaborate with the enemy occupiers, the collaborators, are not considered enemies according to the generally accepted official view; those who oppose the enemy are still considered enemies. The change to the enemy - the most vile and accused enemy possible - and the backstabbing of those who oppose the enemy is still considered a political merit according to the generally accepted official view. Paying homage and wreaths to monuments erected to the enemy is still a common and official act. Paying 'homage' to the 'resistance' (i.e. the insidious backstabbers of those who fought on the enemy's side) is still, so to speak, compulsory.

The dark forces that rule the world - the Freemasons and their associates, and those who are integrally linked to them - still oblige the official policy-makers of Hungary to limit anti-communism severely - to the great delight of communists and "ex-communists" - but to take action against the perceived or real right, especially the extreme right, as hard as possible. The dark forces in Hungary are not yet aware of what ultra-rightism is and how it differs from extreme rightism, but once they do, they will know who they are really up against, 'the dark forces', scotazmokratism.

The sovereignty of a country and the nation living in it can only be discussed if it cannot be determined by foreign and coercive forces. This is particularly true in relation to the coercive role of foreign and hostile forces. Hungary has been under enemy occupation for more than forty-six years. Hungary was part of the sphere of interest of the Soviet Union until the dissolution of the Soviet Union, after which it was not automatically removed from the sphere of interest of the Commonwealth of Independent States, and if the Soviet Union were restored, by whatever name, Hungary would again be part of that sphere of interest.

Since the spring of 1990, Hungary has been under the economic influence - and a very decisive influence - of the Western countries, especially the United States, without having completely broken away from the Soviet Union. The Western countries and the United States, on the other hand, are under the influence of (secret forces) (in a very different way, but under the influence of the same forces as the Soviet Union), and as strongly as possible.

The forces of darkness and their agents in Hungary have the current political opposition under their control - and through the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank - they can control the governing coalition and the government itself. A

within the ranks of the governing coalition parties and among the quasi-right-wing opposition and independents, there are those who reject these evil influences and even attempt to counter them. They are certainly - in this context - our allies.

The road to sovereignty is a long one. A road that can be seen as largely a struggle, a fight. The restoration and realisation of sovereignty, and its subsequent consolidation, must represent - symbolically - a 180-degree turn from the period immediately preceding the 1990 elections, and a more than 150-degree turn from the current situation. It implies a *de iure* restoration, if only momentarily, of the situation before the hostile occupation. From this base, the restoration of the country in its entirety could be launched. But this must be preceded by the self-assertion of state power and administration, which would begin with a definitive and declarative break with all the consequences of the enemy occupation and the economic occupation with hostile motives.

This could also be achieved by means of the "constitutionality" and "legality" in force; not before the elections of 1998, which will presumably be held, but not later than the elections of 2002. Until then, everything must be done - however modest our means and possibilities - to strengthen fundamental moral, human and national values, not only in Hungary but also in Europe and the world.

#### **METAPHYSICAL SPIRITUALITY - METAPOLITICITY - POLITICITY - APOLITICITY**

A view of being based on the principles of an integrally universal spiritual and metaphysical traditionalism stands in its inner being on the level of 'metametapoliticitas', - taking a position in favour of 'metapoliticitas', and - again taking a position in favour of either 'politicitas' or 'apoliticitas'.

These are not just words. 'Metapoliticitas' does not only mean what is beyond 'politicitas' and 'apoliticitas', what is higher than these. It does have such a meaning, but more importantly, the full acceptance of 'metapoliticitas' has (already) transcended the dilemma of turning away or retreating from 'politicitas' and 'apoliticitas' to any extent.

It has become or is becoming increasingly at home in higher spiritual dimensions. He may be interested in politics, he may be involved in politics in theory or even in practice, but it is not in the political sphere that his spiritual qualities will primarily manifest themselves. The inner centre of gravity will increasingly shift from the World to the level of the Supra-world.

And 'metametapoliticitas' does not want to use the possibility of opening up at any time - and of any nature - even though it fully possesses it.

Adequate 'politicitas' and 'apoliticitas' are always rooted in 'metapoliticitas', and 'metapoliticitas' is rooted in 'metametapoliticitas' and, according to its orientation, intends to return to and from it.

'Metapoliticitas', subordinated to 'politicitas', is expressed and defined as ultra-right conservatism, according to the principles of traditional spirituality.

Obviously, there have been Holy Wise Men who have not even descended to the level of 'metapoliticitas', but there is nothing to be underestimated in 'politicitas' if it is defined by higher principles and if it does not renounce the direction of transcendental reintegration.

The aspiritual or antispiritual - and therefore abstract, antitraditional - politician: cannot be considered a real politician. For him, politics - whether he sees it or not

is not - is in fact a pit, even if it adheres to true right-wingism, and the forces of attraction and repulsion of the pit will influence, to an extent that cannot be underestimated, and indeed with almost decisive intensity, the political practices it pursues and implements.

The truly intellectual man, if he wants to deal with politics - both theoretically and practically - can in no way do so in the way that is common among the political scientists and politicians of modern times.

The man who is truly spiritual and who wants to realise politics in this respect sees and experiences the whole of politics in principle and in practice as an external rite of a deeply, deeply inward realisation, in his capacity as an operator. Politics conceived, lived and practised otherwise has never had, does not have and cannot have any real validity. And this is only possible if the metapolitical actus is not only present in the background of consciousness, but is decisively superior to the political actus in terms of its power and intensity.

The true politician - especially the true political leader - is always and more strongly the bearer and indirectly the representative of 'metapoliticitas', both inwardly and spiritually, than of 'politicitas', although - and this is obvious - he must be very strong in the latter.

However great the importance of powerful global political movements may seem, we must say without underestimating them that their significance is secondary to the inner significance of deeper, more profound spiritual processes. World political movements (and political movements in general) are all 'expressions' and 'projections', arising from deeper-more profound levels of reality

Historical and political realities, as processes and as states, are bound to processes of consciousness-states of consciousness (as everything in the world is bound to them). In a looser sense, history and the politics that seem to shape it are bound to the macro-collective consciousness of the universal earth-human world. In a sharper, more rigorous and more 'realiveritas' formulation, all that was, is and will be, all that could have been, all that could be now and all that would be possible in the future - is exclusively a conscious reality or possibility, namely the conscious reality of the I-self and

possibility, that is, my conscious reality and my conscious possibility. This includes, of course, history and politics.

Nor would it suffice to meet the indispensable requirement that a politician - especially a political leader - must be highly coordinated, differentiated and integrated. He must be, he must be, but at the same time he must be much more than that. He must become a personality that transmutes himself and his states of consciousness upwards, a personality that transcends the individual.

An inner transmutation - a transformation of self and world - which must be accompanied - in the sense of a rite - by a transformation of the so-called outer world.

In every field, on every plane, in every direction and in every aspect, we must do what can be done, and even include the not-quite-possible in the realm of the impossible that is possible.

Nothing can be left out, not even the so-called external world, but the proximity of essence - and this is the same as my proximity to myself - will always precede and surpass even the so-called inner, let alone the so-called outer.

The transmutation, first internal and then increasingly adcentral and circumcentral, can be and should be conceived as a quasi-alkymic transmutation; in which, as a totality, the 'invisible' transmutational operations are accompanied by 'visible' ritual operations/operational rites, partly for display and partly for support.

Only as a political quasi-alchemy does politics have meaning, real validity, legitimacy and value, and only if it is truly oriented and aspires to the most appropriate direction. The extent to which it has changed or can change the general political image of the so-called external world is not indifferent, or even important, but not essential. Ritual always a ritual, not a pretext, and can never become a pretext.

Politics, especially in the present day, must be a quasi-alkymic rite not in the sense of peaceful activity but in the sense of a series of acts of war. In this respect, everything is serious and everything carries weight. No true political leader can be one who, if it is really necessary, does not sacrifice everything, even his life, for the cause that is his priority. But this also implies that in him and for him the principle of 'more than life' in political terms is eclipsed, outweighed and surpassed by the principle of 'more than life' in all respects.

Sacrificing one's life for the noblest principles and goals is to be appreciated and respected in every respect, and even less noble goals are to be considered as a

should also be extended to. However, even from a metaphysical perspective, a real sacrifice can never be merely the loss of something in the process of sacrifice, but must also be an ontological higher step, made real by the sacrifice, and thus the taking possession of a surplus. The sacrifice of life must never, even for the noblest of ends, consist in immersion in death, in surrendering my being with life to death in death. On the contrary, in the process of dying, in fact conquering death, I must raise my life to the supra-life, that is to say, to the circumcentric circle of myself.

What the right-wingers who sacrificed their lives after World War II experienced throughout their lives, in their terminal period, immediately before death and at the moment of death itself, is not known, but there is no reason to doubt that some of them were able to surpass their former selves in death. (This cannot, of course, be absolutely ruled out in the case of the communists who sacrificed their lives, but since one of their defining principles was materialism and materialistic atheism, which denied soul and spirit, this is much less likely.)

The one who chooses adequate politicity as his so-called external task of life must make this choice from the depths of his being, but in such a way that metapolitical - non-political in the sense of politicity and political fetishism - attitudes, principles and considerations must take absolute precedence in his own life, in his worldview and in relation to it, in his political practice, over justifications limited to the political sphere.

Only those who do politics - in the sense of dealing with practical politics - have the right to do so by virtue of metapoliticity. No one else.

Adequate politics is the perfect synthesis of real politics and ideal politics, and it is in fact the manifestation of ideal politics in real politics. Ideal politics links real politics with rnetapoliticity.

The greatest - and singularly greatest - master of the synthesis of realpolitik and idealpolitik, which can be said to be more or less perfect, was Clemens Wenzel Lothar Fürst von Metternich-Winneburg.

In historical antiquity and in the Middle Ages, there were no politicians in the modern sense of the word: there were rulers, there were leaders, there were statesmen, but there were no politicians in the strict modern sense.

The statesmen of the modern age and of more recent times had to be - at the same time - politicians, and some respects (even if their field was not political foreign affairs) diplomats. Metternich was indeed the greatest diplomat, the greatest politician, the greatest statesman. Someone who never made a single mistake, who never made a single error in his long career - someone whose life and work were truly blessed for the Empire, for Hungary and for Europe as a whole.

The - ultra-extro-conservative - politician of the present should choose Julius Evola as his guide and Metternich as his role model as statesman. As a guide, but also as a role model - obviously - there are others to be considered.

The 'Suprerealificatio Metaphysica' - i.e. the Metaphysical Realisation - and the set of degrees and series of degrees which prepare it, are infinitely more important than any 'actitudo politica', however important they may be.

And the ultimate and absolute goal - the 'Absolutio Metaphysica' - infinitely surpasses all other goals of great importance.

Within the broadest scope of metaphysical traditionalism, nothing is insignificant - or, to put it another way, even the least significant within this scope is of great importance.

However, there can be and are degrees. There are more important than the important, - and - beyond all that - there is also the infinitely essential, the absolutely important.

Adequate politics is a very important field; but there are more important terrains, which belong directly to the field of metapolitics, and which always remain within it.

An intellectual man, motivated by the needs of convenience, can never give up his political activity, neither because he is tired or old, nor because he is disappointed in everything and everyone in this field, nor because he is offended by his neglect. These factors cannot be so strong that he would abandon or give up what in many respects he was prepared to give his life for.

Political activity can or should be renounced if and only if it is really done for some kind of essentially clear spiritual surplus and true superiority. In such a case, resignation is not a collapse, not a flight, not a weary prostration, but a climb to higher heights - such a thing is not only a right; it is, so to speak, a duty. (The possibility of deceiving others and oneself in this respect may also exist, but with sufficient spiritual vigilance and inner reserve the actualization of these possibilities can be averted.)

There are cases in which it is more appropriate - with real justification - to take on a metapolitically motivated politics than to take on an apolitical one, which is also metapolitically motivated. This seems to be increasingly the case in the 21st century. The conscious assumption of apolitics does not imply a lack of interest or even a complete indifference towards politics and the political, but rather an orientational emphasis and transposition. Even in his apolitics, the intellectual retains his ultra-extro-conservative stance. Proper apoliticism is not the worldview of the cowardly, but neither is it the worldview of the irresponsible.

We believe that there are still opportunities in politics, albeit very limited, and that there are likely to be opportunities in the 21st century. This will be limited mainly to historical-political enlightenment, with little or no involvement in the 'making' of politics.

There can be brief global political vacuums - after a world war, at the height of a global economic crisis, during a continent-wide uprising - when - with little chance, but still - almost anything is possible. We must be prepared for such eventualities.

Julius Evola, in his late formulations, spoke of the almost complete disappearance of political options, of the justification for the choice of 'apolitheia' becoming explicit.

We believe that the political possibilities will disappear in the 24th century - in terms of their transferability to practice - until then they will only diminish - shrink - with "rapid gradualness".

The large-scale opportunities probably ceased after the tragic end of World War II. This was not obvious at the time; as World War III was generally seen as an imminent opportunity to put the world order in order. Today it is about obvious that there is little prospect of relative recovery on such a scale.

That this is the case is also expressed by the fact that between 23 October 1956 and 4 November 1956 there was every chance for a local but fundamental regime change in Hungary, but in 1989-1990-1991 there were no more such chances, and only a very relative regime change took place, in about ten years.

So, as we have already noted, no one can give up representing a particular political line because they have lost interest in politics, or because they hate politics.

The conversion to apoliticism is indeed sometimes not unjustified, the conversion to pure metapoliticism - upwards - is, if its conditions are clearly spiritual, also justifiable.

Metaphysical traditionalism and its political and social dimension: ultra-extro-conservatism are inescapable. In this respect, there is and can be no room for any kind of debate.

The achievement of 'metametapoliticitas' can occur through process of 'Suprarealificatio Metaphysica'. Not much can be said about this. There is a stage of 'sapientialitas' when only the true causes can acquire full significance, and the causes which are in fact higher causes begin to become insignificant.

For our part, we are committed to enforcing transactivity (activity over activity) on all levels. In this area, there will always be transparency about what we should do when.

Dr. András László

(Pannon Front 24. 1 December 1999)



