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Now, this is the last lecture, the 10th lecture that is a kind of result of this course that could be considered as Introduction to Noomahia. The 10th lecture is dedicated to Noomahia in 21st century. In the sociology, they say, now we are living in the shift, the transformation from modernity to the post-modernity. So we have identified the modernity as return or revenge of the Logos of Cybele. Now we could ask, ‘what is the Logos of post-modernity?’ 'What kind of noological structure is it?’ The Logos of post-modernity is in some way the finalization of the Cybelian revolution. So that is the kind of bringing to the logical end, logical consequence of the previous modernity. So we should not be deceived by the anti-modern speech of the post-modernism. Post-modernism is essentially modern. It is the essence of the modernity. It is not alternative.

The post-modernism as it is, in the French philosophy first of all, is based on the idea that modernity is not enough. So modernity is not pure modernity. That began with Frankfurt School when they said that ‘we need to enlighten enlightenment,’ that ‘enlightenment was not really enlightened so we need to purify the pure modernity’ and that is a kind of purge or ethnical cleansing of modernity, all the rest of what was tradition. So, post-modernity is an idea to bring the modernity to the end, to create the ‘pure modernity,’ In philosophical sense, it is the idea to gain the pure imminence, or pure matter, or pure body as in Deleuzian version. So everything in the modernity according to postmodernists was too much penetrated by the pre-modern, by tradition, for example, the reason. Human reason was a kind of slogan in the fight against the theocracy, against the church, and against theology. That was all made in the name of the human reason. That was the vanguard position of the modern fight.

But postmodernists have discovered that after the victory of the human reason over theology, and creating absolutely autonomous science and philosophy, they, in new condition have encountered a kind of domination, a kind of philosophical fascism. But this time, human reason, human brains were considered to be radical dictatorship. So before, the idea in modernity was to liberate (‘liberalism’) human reason from theology. Now it is to liberate the human being from the reason because the reason is dictatorship. The reason predicts what to do. It deals with unbalanced radical hierarchical systems on the classes, on the classifications. So now, we need to come, in the postmodernity, with the next stage. Not the liberation ‘of' the reason, but the liberation ‘from' the reason.

That is the concept of schizophrenic revolution of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari that was anti-Oedipus. For example, the concept of Freud was a kind of modern revolution against rationality. So that was as well an introduction to postmodernism, because the reason was put under question, under doubt, in order to explain the functioning of the brain on the reason by irrational motivation of subconsciousness. But Deleuze and Guattari in the pure postmodernity have discovered that was a reflection of the male understanding of the functioning of subconsciousness. And the complex of Oedipus was a kind of male projection, so they proposed to create a female, feminist psychoanalysis that will not be affected with some paranoid particularly male concept of irrational desire. So that was the idea to bring to the end, all the irrationalism and they have discovered that there are two types of the psychological system; paranoid one and schizophrenic one. The paranoid one was hierarchical and that was considered the reason is paranoid according to Deleuze Guattari, but schizophrenia when there is a kind of inner split of the self, its much more feminist, its much more equalitarian. So we need to promote schizophrenic attitude as the normative attitude of society. And that is as well the kind of fight against the brain and dictatorship of the brain. So we need to liberate the organs, different organs. They should behave at their will without this ‘Hitlerism’ of mind. So postmodernism is the fight against any kind of vertical hierarchies, not only traditional way but in the individual way as well.

So that first was the fight against everything in the sake of individual and now that is the construction of individual itself that is considered to be too Apollonian (in our terms). Because the man is vertical, for example, it’s not normal. It’s creating a kind of privilege for the head, for the brain. It is at the top. We should make quite opposite. We should crawl as a serpent. We should give full freedom to our organs and consider our body not as kingdom of the reason, but as a kind of parliamentary assembly of the organs that could organize political parties, vote to take some decision, not only dictated by reason, but promoted and supported by the other organs. The most radical idea was that the organs themselves are totalitarian because they have too many special forms. They are adapted and adjusted to one mechanical function so we should consider the body without organs. That is the concept. So the body should exist without any form, without any organic state. That we could achieve during virtual existence. That is the two-dimensional space and we should emigrate into the network in order to fill not with organs but with all our body. So that is rhizome. It is the concept that should replace individual. Rhizome is network mankind that is not united and interacting with each other as individual with individual but with organ with organ, in the completely schizophrenic sense. So one hand could behave itself in its own way than the other part.

So that is as well, dissipation of the personality with avatars, with names in the networks. We could change the gender, change the age, and everything, and personality. We could dissipate ourselves. And that is not only roles, because the man in sociology is the assembly of the roles. These social roles and relational games are dissipated and distributed through the network and there are new kind of rhizomatic.

Rhizome in Greek is the root, but not the root of the plant, but the root as potato or mushroom. They are expanding not in the vertical but in the horizontal situation. And that is a kind of postmodern society that is the next step. That is not individual but dividual in some way. So there is a new stage of immanentism and materialism. It is not the materialism of the things. It is materialism of something that is below the things, beneath the things. Rene Guenon called that ‘infra-corporeal world’ and this ‘infra-corporeal world’ was peopled in the traditional religious understanding by purely underground beings. The idea to turn the man in the assembly of the daemons. That is the idea of Deleuze. And to open the possibility of the material spirit living through us and in us to reveal themselves and behave themselves freely as a kind of parliament of organs or desires and the machines of desires distributed through the network. This is a kind of destruction of any vertical forms including in the early liberal or capitalist version. Here there is a very thin change from classical liberalism (first political theory) in post-liberalism. That is the mixture between communism, or Marxism, not defending proletarian or the class struggle but defending materialism and egalitarianism united with liberalism. So postmodernism is a kind of cultural Marxism mixed with the liberalism (left liberalism). That is a new version. Old liberalism operated, dealed with the individual. And now that is dividual that is coming.

Normal human reason is replaced by artificial intelligence. Networks should replace the normal relations. And virtuality is replacing reality. I have dedicated yesterday’s lecture, presentation of the book ‘network warfare’ partly to this postmodern horizon, postmodern perspective. The idea is to replace what was, in the paradigm of modernity, called reality by virtuality. So virtuality is not only reflection of the reality. It is very interesting moment. In virtuality there is reflection of reality or translation of something real in something digital. After that, that is work with digital. Improvement for the sound for example, or image, photoshop working on the photo and so on, or cleaning of the sound on the music, and new emulation of the purified image in the reality. Printing in a 3-D printer, for example, printing back the reality. So the most important thing is the autonomy of what is digitalized. So this reality that is separated in the numbers in the computer, is considered most important thing. For example, the credit card. So they are numbers, something electronic, that is calculation process. We put money on the card and we take money. It comes through virtual instance. Here is the possibility to make with our money everything because they are not material. And virtuality is the idea when we don’t make this kind of operation too often. We don’t transform reality into virtuality and we don’t emulate reality back. We are satisfied with staying with credit card. Not putting the money, not taking the money. We have credit card, and we are satisfied, we are happy. So, not trying to, how it works, not trying to put it back. We see how it works so we are happy with having a credit card.

So, offline relations between, for example, dating. There is the photo; the photo of girl and photo of man (I presume normal relations). And there is online encounter, meeting, and there is offline. Offline can be disappointing but when you prove, you testify of the quality, the reality of the girl or young man you have seen in the internet in the reality, it’s a kind of emulation of this virtual personality. But we are invited in the postmodernity to accept these virtual images as they are. Living there, not making this proof, test how they are. You could create your personality, and after in the future, you could create your body. And that has already begun, emulation of body, printing on the 3-D printers different organs. This is purely avatar. Or for example, amelioration of the body now, with botox for example, fighting against the aging, or making some artificial adjustments to women figure or male figure as well (in modern western society). So there is a kind of emulation of body. In that process, we are losing a kind of individual. We became the combination of the parts. We could transform into numbers and calculational sequence and we could be emulated. We could disappear in virtuality and reappear in reality, passing maybe ameliorating some features. So that is not only reflection. That is something when virtuality becomes primordial, becomes something that goes first. So we could for example, emulate something that doesn’t exist in reality. For example, chimera, cyborg, centaurs, rusalki. We could print in the future and there are fantastic films about that, could print something that is not reflection of the reality, that is production of virtual fantasy. And we could people the world with these images and in some situations, when first we fire received credit card, we were not so confident with it, we tried to have some machine in order to take money to be sure that they are there. But now, little by little, we are happy with having card. We don’t testify anymore.

We have more and more confidence in something virtual and we are replaced, we are transferred into the realm of virtuality and we become more and more virtual. Artificial intelligence is the kind of limit of it. There will be not anymore separate individuals. There will be a kind of network. Because artificial intelligence is not like one clever guy or girl. It is network distributed through many computers. That is neural network that is capable to create something new, to imagine something new.

There are two different kinds of artificial intelligence; weak artificial intelligence and strong artificial intelligence. Weak artificial intelligence is already constructed. It is a kind of databases of many knowledge of humanity put into the digitalized way. There are great masses of books, of knowledge, of technology, all present in the computers. And we could immediately access this book and they are inside of memory. So if we could grant permanent access to that, we are inside of this weak artificial intelligence that could make calculations instead of us, make comparisons, translations of languages, so transmitting as well some semantic elements. And that is ameliorating each day Google translates from English and into English better, with other languages not so, but with English better and better. So we could see how this weak artificial intelligence progresses.

But there is strong artificial intelligence. It’s appearance is awaited, anticipated for two thousand twenty, twenty five years, so it rests not so much time, and that is called singularity moment. Singularity moment is the appearance of the strong artificial intelligence that will be completely comparable with human. It will be not programmed operations but neural network. Neural network is algorithm (mathematical) that could create something that wasn’t from the beginning was put in. That is self development form of calculation. And the simplest neural network depends absolutely from operator. But developed neural networks are independent. More and more they become independent from operator so they could arrive at the conclusion that wasn’t planned by operator. In that manner, human reason functions. That is something that is autonomous but following some rules because human reason as well is following some rules. And this singularity moment is considered to be the shift, the greatest shift in human history when there will be not only human reason in the earth, or in the space. There will appear something comparable to us, but the next evolution, next step of human progress. That will be post-human species, post-human beings.

And there is, in modern philosophy, a tendency that is called accelerationism that invites us to bring this singularity moment quicker, quick, now, accelerate towards this singularity situation. That is studied and done by great corporations, by Google, Microsoft, and others. That is as well a hedging process. They invest billions in the creation of artificial intelligence. And the billions as well in hedging, in security, trying to identify the threats of this. So that is hedge fund for artificial intelligence and the development projects for artificial intelligence.

At the same time, the concept of what is human has changed in post-modernity. So post-modernity is going towards post-human, in new step of evolution. Because modernity is based on the concept that human beings appeared as a kind of progress of beast, so singularity is the next step. There was the development as a beast, after that the development as a man, after that development as a machine. But artificial intelligence is not machine. It’s something different. And what is interesting is that in order to have artificial intelligence, we need to understand that our brains as well are something artificial. So we could repeat our human brains only when they are considered to be something material, mechanical. And this is precisely the science of cognitivism, the conscious, the study of conscious body, conscious problem, trying to emulate the function of human reason. But in order to facilitate this, we need to turn present humans into machines. That will facilitate this process. And that is precisely the case.

And now the present human beings are more and more like the other. We are more and more artificial, because political correctness is new kind of totalitarianism.

They try to persuade us how its necessary to think, what is normative way of thinking, and praising the liberty and freedom. At the same time, we become less and less free. And any challenge to that process is regarded as a crime, as a mind crime, a crime of opinion. For example, if you don’t agree with that, you are Fascist, if you try to defend something, for example, Auschwitz or Stalinists, that’s the same. So you could not challenge evolution. You could not challenge the progress. For example, you could not say ‘stop let us conserve what is here.’ The hysterical reaction of American society against Trump’s victory is a demonstration of how intolerant progressivists are. Trump is not an alternative to that. He doesn’t plan to stop the researches into the artificial intelligence. He doesn’t protest against the gay prides and so on. He’s very tolerant. But he is less progressive than is needed so he is fascist. There are Russians who are fascist behind him. So if you aren’t a progressivist, you are an enemy of progress. All the consequences we could see in the prohibition of my book on Amazon, in the free world where everybody has absolute right to express anything, except if that is something that challenges the status quo. You are free, completely liberated to be liberal; right, left, center liberal. But you are not free not to be liberal. If you are not liberal, it’s suspicious. Maybe a terrorist or fundamentalist or Russian or Trump-ist and so on.

That is now, a caricature. We see how this kind of political totalitarian propaganda works with no reason at all, because everything now is virtual. For example Russian intervention in the American elections. Virtual. There is no proof. And they could not prove it in the world of networks. There are repeated sentences. That is considered to be a kind of algorithm. For example, everybody cites the New York Times or Washington Post as if it is the truth, but it is algorithm. It is emulation of the status quo, that could be completely with no relations with the reality. Or you could easily exaggerate something, some little element, you could combine. For example, I’m giving many interviews to the western press, but only the fragments that correspond to what they expect from myself are shown. For example I gave to BBC interview that Russian oligarchs have financed Hillary Clinton’s campaign. No, no mention of that. When I was asked whether Russians intervened in the Trump elections, I answered ‘no’ and they said ‘yes.’ So if they receive completely opposite reaction, they don’t care. So they emulate what they need. That is a kind of emulation independent from previously destructed and processed information. So in postmodernity, the information goes first. And information you could imagine or combine. So nobody could verify. If we see the image, if we read something, if we repeat it, if it is distributed in many other agencies, then that is the truth. So it is emulation and not reflection.

In the metaphysical sense, that is the shift from the real to the virtual. So the virtuality is more important than reality. Because it is not reflection of reality but the basic emulation of reality. And there is indignation of the old style people who say ‘lets defend reality in front of virtuality’ but it is impossible because the reality was brought by the modernity. Because in the world of tradition, of Apollonian Logos, ideas existed. Ideas were the real beings, or spirit, or God, or something hidden, or something heavenly, or something divine, existed as the basic ontological argument for the reality. So reality took its being from the fact of being created by God. Creation was the ontological explanation of the reality. When we have made a step from the Logos of Apollo and the spiritual basis of the reality, when we have accepted the reason as such, the man as such, the world as such, nature as such, as substance without the author, we have already cut the relations with the metaphysical basis of the existence. Reality is virtual. That is why this shift from the reality to the virtuality is possible. Metaphysically speaking, we could not defend reality, without saving first spirituality. Because this metaphysical foundation of the reality was not real, was pre-real. Ideas exist in the reality, eternal ideas of the thing. If we could cut them and deny that, we have the things, but the things, as reality, is not real in the last sense. It is already something virtual, something emulated, it is simulacrum and not the thing. And virtuality is the last conclusion of this process. In post-modernity, nothing new. It seems to be very new and very modern but it is logical conclusion of the modernity.

So if we consider now, what is noological analysis of post-modernity, we should recognize that it is not something new, comparing with modernity, but is the final phase of modernity. When we have spoken about the Logos of Cybele, the post-modernity is the absolute domination of the Logos of Cybele. Logos of Cybele was expanding during modernity and now it is already expanded. So there is the difference of moments of Noomahia. There is the fight and when the fight is over. So that is a kind of Kingdom of Scarlet Woman, in the Christian eschatological sense, and full domination of Great Mother, in its complete version. That is why there is feminism now.

Some words about feminism - there could be different forms of feminism. Modern feminism as well is different. But I would like to accentuate that there could be feminism that I’m calling Hecate feminism, that is based on the very special figure of Great Goddess Hecate, that was in the Greek history and early Greek history, Hesiod, described as the Goddess that gives every fruit, every desired thing, but when Hesiod mentions what Hecate gives, he has said ‘the wisdom, the bravery, the victory in fight, and the cattle’ and there was no mention of agricultural crop. So Hecate in the original sense was Turanian Goddess, was a kind of feminine archetype of Turanian type. Afterwards they were associated with Persephone or Demeter, and put into the realm of night and underground. But originally, Hecate wasn’t chtonic deity. That was heavenly feminine female figure. And Hecate feminism, it is the dignity of the woman that reflects patriarchal values, as Athena (the other Greek deity). Athena is pure state of what is purely patriarchal; it is wisdom of the priests and the victory and heroism of the warrior. That was Hecate feminism. Maybe it could be returned to the Indo-European feminine principle from the wrong or deviated form of patriarchate, materialistic patriarchy. So Hecate feminism is restoration of the dignity of the woman as the friend and ally of the man, the Indo-European man. That is a kind of Indo-European feminism that is against the Logos of Cybele, because it is glorification of feminine principle of purely Indo-European Logos. So that is interesting that in Hindu tradition that is the concept of Shakti. Shakti is not something that goes against the male principle. It is a kind of power of this male principle. That is Shekhinah as well in the Kabbalah. So that is feminine principle of light and not chtonic deity, but that is not the case with today’s feminism because post-modern feminism is absolutely anti-Indo-European and purely Cybelian.

And that is not the beginning of the liberation of the woman. It is a kind of total destruction of the man that began with the modernity. So, materialistic limits put on the man and discreditation of the priesthood, of the monks, the warriors as types was already the victory of the matriarchate. And bourgeois type is matriarchal as such. And when women in the modern world pretend to have power, that is, as with Deleuzian metaphysics, is not something new. It’s the finalization of the process. So the power of Cybele, today, is open and manifest. And interesting remark with feminism; traditionally women can’t expect happiness; it could happen, it could not. It depends from some transcendental moment. The woman can meet the right man, have the right babies, and right families and be happy, or could not. That depends. But modern Cybelian feminism says lets say goodbye to this happiness. Feminine happiness is an illusion. It is more dreams, that is not real. There is no such kind of women happiness and every woman should say goodbye to that. There is no happiness, it is an illusion. It is patriarchal trick in order to keep women under control. You will never have feminine happiness but instead you can have power. So you exchange that problematic feminine happiness and non-problematic fight for power and will for power. So that is not a claim for more happiness or more equality. That is the fight for power in the society. And that has almost already succeeded. We are not in the beginning or first stages of feminism. We are in the last stages of feminism. And this fight for power and the concept of woman as power reflects the essence of the feminine principle in tradition because the pure state in the Indian tradition, in the Purusha, the male principle is wisdom with no power. It is pure light of thought. And the power is already feminine. But this liberation of the power from the wisdom is power as itself, a kind of blind power. That is what is going on with present day feminism. That is finally arriving to such absolute feminine power, woman loses herself, her nature, and her content. She becomes absolutely blind might, a kind of vitality. So there is the blind force of things themselves, pure gravity, pure matter, matter in the state of no orientation. So no more happiness, but new power, and emasculation and disappearance of man. Man should disappear. They lose man in such situation, their position, their archetype, and the idea of recognition of homosexuality as the norm in the western society is the end of the man, is the end of the balance between the genders, that is destroyed, everything is optional, you have not these two poles. And that is a victory of Cybele which is now open and manifest, not only implicit as in the modernity, but explicit, as now.

Now we are coming to post-liberalism. When liberalism, the first political theory is left alone, there is no second, no third. And when they try to exclude Fourth Political Theory as possibility. So, the first political theory is as well changed in a kind of post-liberalism. There is no more individual. There is the dividual, something divided, something tomic, as atom wasn’t atomic. Atom, when it was discovered, it was as well recognized as something that you could divide more. So that is not atomic. Atom is undivided, indivisible. If there is something divisible, that is not atom. But you still call atom something that is divisible, so you still call individual something that is not anymore considered to be ‘in-dividual,’ ‘in-divisible.’ So it is something already rhizomatic. That is a transformation that goes with globalization. Globalization destroys any kind of society, including destroys modernity. Liberalism is devoided of any kind of national boundaries, borders. It is pure cosmopolitism. There is no race, no ethnos, no society. Everybody could live in every point of the space. Today, it is the freedom of the individuals but tomorrow that will be the freedom of the networks. Because it is a kind of matrix with artificial intelligence and with bodies emulating bodies. The concept of body as well could change but we are promised to have immortality instead, but immortality of the machine, because the machine could not die. The machine could be adjusted or decomposed or recomposed, so machine doesn’t die. And when we say, we become immortal in the physical way, in the imminent way. In that moment we stop to be human. And that is singularity moment that is appointed for some years in front of us. We are living not in the hundred, two hundred years before singularity. We are living close to the singularity.

Some questions concerning what is Russia in that. Russia, we should not mistake. Russia is conservative society that tries to delay the process described before. Russia is not alternative (present day Russia). It is a kind of, trying to stop or delay the movement in one way, in that way, that is anti-acceleration power. We say ‘not so quickly.’ Our society, our president, our government says ‘Not so quickly. The direction is good but not now.’ That is purely conservatism. That is not proposition to restore Apollonian Logos. That is pure inertia. ‘Not yet. Not now. That’s all right, quite right. But not so quickly. Let us die calmly.’ That is a kind of purely irresponsible, but very sane as instinct reaction against postmodernity. But the most radical formulation of Russian Logos today in modern Russian Federation, is very shy defense of reality. The best and bravest in Russia pretend to defend reality against virtuality. They are materialists absolutely, and some modernists absolutely. But they don’t want to make the last step in that direction. There is strong traditionalist feeling in the people, there is in our Church a radical group that protests against the status quo, basing on Mount Athos, basing on the Elders Tradition, but that is absolutely marginal minority that has no influence on the society. They are considered to be completely crazy. Because our society is archeo-modern, It is modernist in the old sense, It cannot and doesn’t want to accept post-modernity but no will, no desire, no capacity, no thought to return or to go to the pre-modern Logos. That is bad news, I presume, because it seems quite different from outside. From outside, Russia is conservative revolutionary power that fights against the West, against all that. It’s not so! Maybe we should not stress too much at this point, but Russia, that is the great possibility because our Dasein and our people is bearer of this Katehonical mission. And we could see that in the reaction of the people. We have Russian Dasein. Russian Dasein is based on the Dionysian much more than the Apollonian Logos, but it is imprisoned. Our identity is imprisoned. This imprisonment is not only the Liberalism of ‘90s, as well as Communist period of Cybelian domination. But that was as well the late Romanovs Tsardom that was Modernist, Archeo-Modern, pro-western and so on.

So, Russia is in trouble; its Logos, its people, its Dasein, its existential horizon. But 'nothing is lost when there is something that is not lost,’ as Curzio Malaparte has said. So I think that we are in a situation that is structurally close to the situation of Serbian people. We have different scale, different power, different space, different number of population, but the problem is the same. And Russia could not be regarded as the answer or alternative to what is going on. It is only the other place where the Noomahia still continues, with domination of the Cybelian Logos. So we are inside of Cybele. We are not outside of Cybele. That maybe was remarked by Milos Crnjanski in his final result of his book, that Russia is good but that is not the answer for Serbian quest for identity. Milos Crnjanski’s result or summary is a tragic one because Serbs become kind of in exile, in permanent exile, with no motherland left for them. But all the hopes on Russia should be measured with this pessimistic but very open solution of Milos Crnjanski because he loved Russia, and Serbians love Russia. And that is good, but when we have too much incorrect expectations, we could miss the question and unity in fight with something that already accomplished and perfect. So that is very important to Serbs and to all the fighters of identity to know that Russia fights. Russia is not yet defeated formally, because our people is, because it exists. But we have so great problem with Russian Logos, we could not yet start to continue the situation when our effort to create Russian philosophy was cut drastically by Communists. So we are outside of the place where really philosophy begins. We are outside. And this place is not attained, not reached yet. We are fighting to go to this moment. And because of great damage we had during last hundred years, we could not restart the process. In Russia today, there is pure social madness. We could not speak with nobody. As people, we are very good and open and very Christian, but as a kind of bearer of some intellectual ero. With so big people, so few people capable concretely to think, it is unimaginable. That is a kind of deep, dogmatical sleep (not dogmatical in the positive sense, it’s adogmatical), modern, post-modern sleep, conservative sleep of the people. So we are sleeping but that is good thing that we could be awake, lets hope.

If we go to the next moment, what is the problem of the post-modernity? The post-modernity is the problem of Dionysus, because we could not appeal to the Logos of Apollo directly, because it is out of reach of our understanding. That has disappeared long, long ago, as such with the end of Middle Ages, maybe earlier. We have only the figure of Dionysus that is the sun inside of the night. So that is hidden intellect. That is hidden Logos. Being in the Hell, but not being the Hell, being inside of the night, but not belonging to the night, being inside of the world of Cybele but not being the part of function of the world of Cybele. I’m calling that in completely other type of philosophical direction, the radical subject. Radical subject is the subject that is in the center of the night, not being the night. But there is the problem of the black double of Dionysus. Because there is something Titanic that imitates Dionysus and that is his mirror or his double, as Adonis (the black double of Dionysus). And the problem is how to make distinction of them. That is the problem of simulacrum and in the religious sense, the problem of Anti-Christ, because Anti-Christ is not scarlet woman herself. It is not Cybele. It is a creation going from the abyss. And it pretends to be Christ. So the problem of Anti-Christ, or the problem of simulacrum, or the problem of double of Dionysus is the center problem of post-modernity because it pretends to be radical subject. It pretends to be this figure of Dionysus in the center of that. And that is not Christ. Radical subject is not Christ. Christ is heavenly God and man as well. But that is something that is quite different and Dionysus is the figure that is really problematic. And I gave the name for one of my books ‘Radical Subject and its Double.’ So that is the problem of Dionysus in other words. So we need to find this point that is in the night and doesn’t belong to the night. And we shouldn’t mistake it for its parody that exists close to it. So that is metaphysical explanation of Noology or Noomahia in 21st century. And I think that is the deepest analysis that could be given to the situation.

To finish this course of lectures, we could ask ourselves where the place of Serbia is in this last moment of Noomahia. That is open question and we could not answer it abstractly. So it is up to Serbian people to decide this place. It is very important to define the noological space to make this analysis, to carefully identify the main figures, main tendencies. But that depends on the decision. And what is important is that decision is possible always up to the moment when the singularity comes. So we have very limited time for decision. Having Dasein, Dasein, being there, it is always open possibility to decide in one or the other direction. So the choice is possible when there is human. Human is there when Dasein is. But I think if we will be irreversibly replaced by artificial intelligence and devoided of our deaths, (the condition of existence, of Dasein, according to Heidegger) we will seize to be what we are. And we will lose, irreversibly, the possibility of a decision. Now we have a small amount of time in front of us because something that is approaching is more terrible and horrible than the death or torture or catastrophe, much more terrible. It is the end of the human Dasein as we know, as the result of the not correctly taken decision. According to Heidegger, European Dasein, Western Dasein has decided not to be. And that is the definition of the modernity and post-modernity. It has decided not to be and not to awake in the night, in the middle of the night, where we are. That is why he said ‘Only God could save us’ in the last interview, because decision was wrong and was already taken. Multiplicity of Dasein that is based on Noomahia preserves the possibility to decide otherwise. If the West has decided, I think that this kind of decision not to exist was taken for us, for Serbs, and for Russians, by the other. That was not our decision. And we didn’t decide finally. So we should do it. We have time, very small amount of time to make this decision. And that is the end of the ten lectures of the Noomahia as introductory course for this study.
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