Noological Ethics of the Luciferic Graceful Type

Let us agree, from the outset, on referring to the most perfect

case of the luciferic graceful type, i.e., to the Hyperborean Initiate

or Tirodal Knight: it is necessary to think of this exemplary case

each time that the luciferic graceful type is alluded to in this arti cle.

Considering, then, this case of the Hyperborean Initiate, it is evi dent that Psychological Ethics will never be able to define or ex plain his behavior with regard to the “moral fact,” i.e., with regard to

the cultural fact that presents a “moral” character for the ludic type

and the sacralizing type. Why? Answer: because no such “cultural

fact” will present a moral character for the luciferic graceful type.

And further: by no means will any cultural fact be evaluated as a

moral fact; for the luciferic graceful type, neither the act nor the

finality of the act have any moral significance. In order to compre hend this answer, we should observe the fundamental ethical act

and remember that it is the relationship between the Ego and the

symbol that determines the moral character of the represented cul tural fact, when being interpreted as a “principle of justice or bene volence”: the ludic and sacralizing types, upon perceiving the cardi nal principles of Psychological Ethics, actually place moral mean ing on the cultural fact, i.e., affirm it as a particular value, endow

the axiological context with “moral value,” which is a particular cul tural value; well, none of this occurs when it is the luciferic graceful

type who interprets the relationship between the Ego and the

symbol: the luciferic graceful a#itude enables him to suspend the

dramatic tension and break the balloon law: we said in another ar ticle that the Virya then perceives “a comical situation; funny but

glaringly false. Under the luciferic gaze, the dramatic circumstance

loses its tragic or distressing atmosphere and reveals itself, instead,

to be contrived and fictitious” (page 850); then, if he wishes, he can

invert the direction of the symbol and apprehend its archetypal

essence without being affected by it, because at that moment the

archetypal process is “stopped,” since the tension is “suspended”;

but, what if the Virya does not wish to know the essence of the

symbol? Answer: that, the tension being “suspended” by the action

of the graceful will, the “relationship” between the Ego and the

symbol has been dissolved. But this “relationship,” this “relative

tension,” is neither more nor less than the representation of an ex terior “connection of meaning,” the bond that imparts particular

value to a cultural object, in this case, to a moral object: its dissolu tion implies its external non-affirmation. In synthesis, the luciferic

graceful type will never voluntarily place meaning on the entities,

as the macrocosmic objective of the Paśu’s finality stipulates, let

alone moral meaning: he will never interpret the dramatic tension

as an ethical principle and, consequently, whatever the cultural

fact represented, he would never express a moral value that can be

affirmed in the axiological context.

It is clear, in light of the Fundamentals of the Hyperborean Wis dom seen so far, that the Hyperborean Initiate, with his Ego isolat ed in the Odal Archemon, will as much as possible avoid “placing

meaning on the entities,” thus complying with the microcosmic ob jective of the Paśu’s finality. The Hyperborean Initiate is indifferent

to the superstructures of cultural facts and, that is why these can not capture him: if the astral Archetype of a cultural fact, for in stance, managed to establish a “connection of meaning” with the

Hyperborean Initiate, it would, not even for an instant, be able to

resist the luciferic graceful a#itude. The Hyperborean Initiate, if he

wishes, can move through the world being “culturally invisible,” be cause of the lack of mutual relationships with the superstructures.

It is evident then that the Hyperborean Initiate who has eliminat ed the connections of meaning between his microcosm and the su perstructures, will never add “moral value” to the axiological con text, since this is an expression of the ethical-psychological inter pretation of the connections of meaning, corresponding to relative

tensions between the Ego and the symbol of the cultural fact, con nections that, in this case, are non-existent. Of course, it need not

be insisted on that the Hyperborean Initiate achieves the elimina tion of the connections of meaning and his cultural invisibility by

permanently presenting that luciferic graceful a"itude that sus pends all dramatic tension between the isolated Ego and the repre sented symbols of the cultural fact, thus preventing the exterior

expression from corresponding to any moral or cultural interpreta tion of any kind.

Moreover, if the Hyperborean Initiate does not affirm any ethi cal-psychological value, what does his expression express? Answer:

the ethical-noological value, that is to say, “Honor,” the only moral

of the awakened Virya. When the Hyperborean Initiate expresses

Honor, his expression corresponds to the graceful will manifested

by the Ego in the luciferic graceful a#itude. And, as this a#itude is

permanent, it is clearly seen that the Honor of the Hyperborean

Initiate, which reflects this a#itude, is also permanent. Likewise, as

there are no connections of meaning, it is understood that the

Honor of the Hyperborean Initiate is independent of any “act” or

cultural fact. In other terms, the Honor of the Hyperborean Initiate

is an absolute value, independent of any cultural determination.

If the Hyperborean Initiate does not present a “permanent” lu ciferic graceful a#itude, Honor, always absolute, will be expressed

in the moments in which it is taken on: such moments are the

“Kairoi of Honor.”

Whatever the case may be, a permanent luciferic graceful a#i tude or in a Kairos, what is certain is that Honor is independent of

the context and has value only for the Hyperborean Initiate, who is

the one who produces it: Honor is of himself and for himself. In

every case, Honor is a value that values itself.

The moral value of Psychological Ethics depends on the Rela tionships between the Ego and the symbols, and of the symbols

with each other: because of this relative character, the moral value

is eminently logical and acknowledges the well-known reductions

to normative and legal forms. Contrary to the psychological moral

value, the noological moral value, the Honor of the Hyperborean

Initiate, does not depend on any relationship and does not ac knowledge any logical form: in any case Honor, which is a value

that values itself, constitutes its own law.

The Honor of the Hyperborean Initiate is expressed indepen dently of all context and, therefore, lacks contextual significance; it

is neither logical nor psychological, neither rational nor irrational:

it is, indeed, the ultimate reflection of the uncreated, the act of the

graceful and charismatic will; if it manifests itself in any form, it is

not archetypal but runic and is denominated “Hyperborean Mys tique.”

The Honor of the Virya is the most exterior manifestation of the

character of the Hyperborean Spirit: that is why, for the Hyper borean Initiates, Honor is the greatest “virtue” that a Virya can ex hibit, for its presence is unmistakable proof of the presence of the

Spirit, Honor, which is the exclusive property of the Hyperborean

Spirit, reveals the original character of the eternal and infinite

Race.

In synthesis, the Hyperborean Initiate, who is a luciferic graceful

type, whatever the cultural fact in which he participates or the act

that he performs, always acts with Honor: his “morality” does not

depend on any law or ethical-psychological norm, but on his will to

act, for Honor is the act of his will, his own la