

András László

Traditionalism and outlook on life

Contents

FOREWORD
INTRODUCTI
ON
THE SELF, THE EGO AND THE SELF MĀYĀ AND LĪLĀ
CONSCIOUS ACTIONALITY AND ITS SCOPE
DEATH AND IMMORTALITY OCCULTISM
AND METAPHYSICS EVOLUTION AND
INVOLUTION
MAN AND HIS WORLD
CRITIQUE OF THE ILLUSION OF PROGRESS THE
END OF KALI-YUGA
CREATION AS TRANSMUTATION, AND THE SPACE, TIME AND
"SUBSTANTIALITY" OF THE AGES
DEVIATIONES PSEUDO-SPIRITUALES
NOTES ON SOME PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND METAPOLITICS
THE TRADITIONAL CONCEPT OF GOD AND DIVINITY PRODINITIATIO,
INITIATIO SUPRAREALIFICATIO METAPHYSICA
PISTIS, GNŌSIS, PRĀKHSIS HĒROIKĒ AND MAGEIĀ THEOURGIKĒ WOMAN
AND MAN
AFTERWORD

FOREWORD

The primary aim of this book is to explore and illuminate more fully than before the view of existence based on the universal and integral principles of Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Metaphysica, to define it further taking into account previous definitions, but also to describe it in a way that goes beyond them. Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Metaphysica – and unless we indicate otherwise, this is what we mean by traditionalism, tradition, and in this context, tradition tradition, — a strongly defined — definable set of principles from which further principles can be derived to form the basis of a definable view of existence. This worldview — as a truly definable worldview — only began to emerge in the 20th century, after significant groundwork had been laid, that is, when Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Metaphysica and the worldview that directly followed from it had almost completely withdrawn from where it had once been omnipresent, namely the earthly-human world.

This retreat — after distant antecedents — coincides with the beginning of Kali-Yuga, or the Dark Age, the closing phase of Hesiod's Iron Age. Three dates can be established for this:

4182 BC = -4181 BC

3102 BC = -3101 BC

2022 BC = -2021 BC, in each case with a margin of error of approximately ± 108 years.

Accordingly, the end of the closing phase of Kali-Yuga, Kali-Yuga and the entire Mahā-Yuga can be dated to 2299 A.D. on the one hand, on the other hand, 3379 AD, and on yet another hand, 4459 AD, again with an accuracy of approximately ± 108 years.

The disappearance and retreat of the traditional world, closely linked to tradition, and then its complete submersion began around 510 BC = -509 ± 108 , and this process lasted in some respects until the early modern era, or, from other perspectives, until 1918 or 1945, and according to further considerations, it continues even today, until the very end of Kali Yuga, but it can never cease to exist, precisely because of the dependence of physicality on metaphysics.

However, it can be stated with certainty that around the 7th and 5th centuries BC, 6th and 5th centuries BC, changes took place that affected the very foundations; changes that did not yet bear the signs of the later excessive unfolding of decay, but were already closely related to it, either by playing a preparatory role or, on the contrary, by representing the last great flashes of Spiritual Light in the face of the rapid darkening that was beginning.

— on the contrary — represented the last great flashes of Spiritual Light in the face of the rapid darkening that was beginning — within the darkness.

The view of existence corresponding to the principles of Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Metaphysica, but not yet formulated separately, faded and receded into the background, becoming less and less alive, and even at the beginning of the modern era, after the historical Middle Ages, it still had an influence and its decisive power was more or less able to assert itself, but in most respects it was more of a general Conventionalitas Quasi-Spiritualis, intertwined with religious — in the West, Christian — concepts, forms and modes.

The view of existence based on the principles of Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Metaphysica — as a formulated view of existence — should have disappeared in many respects as early as the 17th century.

take root, and should have developed in the first half of the 18th century. This did not happen, nor did it happen during the 19th century. There were authors who wrote in this spirit — or in a spirit similar to it — Louis Claude Saint-Martin, Franz Xaver Baader, Comte Joseph Marie de Maistre in relation to the political right wing, and others — but what happened was that in the second half of the 19th century, *Antitraditionalitas Pseudospiritualis*—and, covertly, *Contratraditionalitas*—came into being, took shape, and spread quite widely, exerting a considerable influence.

An old and traditional statement, expressed in a metaphorical form, is that the Prince of Darkness — the Devil, Diabolos, Satan — is in fact God's monkey, who imitates God and divine intentions, that is, outwardly creates something that corresponds to divine principles, but internally and essentially with the opposite sign, and in time, as if anticipating the high-order and unambiguously spiritual-metaphysical tendencies that are about to manifest themselves germinally. The trends, movements and associations that emerged in the second half of the 19th century, and even more so in the last quarter, which nominally and verbally represented traditional spirituality, were in fact manifestations and representations of Pseudotraditionalitas — and, as we have already noted, of Contratraditionalitas in a hidden form.

The principles of Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Metaphysica, and the formulated form of the worldview that followed them, developed gradually and are still evolving today.

*The beginning of this movement, which was not without precedent, is associated with the name of Comte Albert de Pouvoirville, writing under the pseudonym Matgioi. He was followed, in alphabetical order, by the following authors and thinkers: Titus Burckhardt, Ananda Kentish Coomaraswamy, Julius Evola and René Guénon, who were of decisive importance, as well as André Préau, Leo Schaya, Frithjof Schuon, and, further afield, Karl Klaudius Leopold Ziegler. From several points of view, the broader circle of traditional authors and thinkers could also include Rudolf Pannwitz, Robert Reininger in the field of philosophy, and Taras von Borodajkewycz, Othmar Spann and Carl Schmitt in the fields of history, political science, sociology and related philosophy. Special mention should be made here of a figure known only by his pen name, Fulcanelli, who is significant not as a founder of a philosophy of existence, but as a probable true alchemist and alchemical author who appeared in this century. Rudolf Kassner was also not far from the traditional view, and others could also be mentioned in this regard. Raymond Abellio, for example, cannot be considered a traditional author and thinker at all, but his insights have often transcended — from the outside in — the traditional view. The discoveries of Massimo Scaligero, who was close to anti-traditionalism and in some respects even connected to it, often reflect a traditionalist approach (when he was able to free himself from the constraints of his worldview, *anthrōposophia*). However, despite their extremely valuable insights (and the particularly traditional-metaphysical characteristics of these insights), Raymond Abellio, Massimo Scaligero, Douglas Harding, and numerous other authors (mainly with an occultist orientation) cannot be considered authors with a traditional stance. Nevertheless, it is recommended to take them into consideration, and this also applies to authors with an occultist orientation who do not lack a metaphysical perspective.*

*In Hungary, Béla Hamvas drew attention to the importance of Julius Evola, René Guénon, Leopold Ziegler — and later Rudolf Pannwitz. Béla Hamvas himself wrote one of his major works, *Scientia Sacra*, in the spirit of the Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Metaphysica view of existence, and this spirit was more or less present in his later works as well.*

masterpiece, *Scientia Sacra*, in the spirit of *Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Metaphysica*, and this spirit was more or less present in his later works as well. However, it is also clear that while Béla Hamvas grew closer to traditionalism until 1944/45, this process reversed in 1945, and Béla Hamvas began to distance himself from Tradition and the spirit of Traditionalism (although he was never able to break away from it completely). Béla Hamvas sided with Christianity, in many respects opposing Tradition, and later — as a compromise — he formulated his judgement on this issue by stating that Christianity should be regarded as the culmination of Tradition. From then on, he was once again open to Tradition, although he strongly and unconditionally professed the primacy of essential Christianity—compared to anything else—until the end of his life. However, Béla Hamvas is still remembered in Hungarian cultural consciousness as the first and only representative, indeed the custodian, of Tradition and Traditionalism in Hungary. In our opinion, Béla Hamvas was the first to draw attention to Tradition, and he was — chronologically — the first representative of this spirit. In the strictest and most literal sense of the word, however, he was not an unambiguously traditional thinker and author. The author of these lines knew Béla Hamvas well and was fortunate enough to consider him a good friend of his father. He remembers his lofty personality and the (always to-the-point) dialogues he was able to have with him with undying love and respect. There was a great deal to learn from him, and the author of these lines owes a great deal to Béla Hamvas in this sense as well.

However, this does not change our position that Béla Hamvas — although he was a writer and thinker deeply influenced and inspired by Tradition — did not belong to the circle of radically traditional authors and thinkers, and although his views were not far from theirs, he held contrary views to some of them (in particular, certain views of Béla Hamvas are contrary to the basic outlook of Julius Evola, and some of René Guénon's insights are also incompatible with Hamvas's positions).

The author of these lines does not consider himself a follower or disciple of traditional thinkers and authors in the strict sense of the word, especially if this means adhering to some kind of intangible but nevertheless perceptible absolute standard to which he would have to adhere at all costs. From our point of view, there can be no question of such a thing. At the same time, however, we must also say that on issues where all traditional authors agree in their answers and judgements, we generally accept the position of those who agree, because we usually have no reason not to do so. In general, we agree with most of the statements made by all traditional authors; this simply follows from the fact that we define ourselves as belonging to the circle of traditional (indeed, radically traditional) thinkers and authors, and not because we believe that we should not deviate from the standard — which we have never recognised anyway.

There are some issues and numerous details on which even "classics" among traditional authors, and there are even issues on which there is not even partial agreement, even though one of the characteristics of traditional authors is mutual recognition and explicit appreciation of each other's views.

In these controversial issues — as in essentially all other cases — we wish to decide and will decide on the basis of sovereign principles and in a sovereign manner. We are aware that some consider us to be committed followers of the Evolian-Guénonian line, or rather, followers of this

line or lines. Our response to this is as follows: if the utmost respect for Julius Evola and René Guénon means taking an Evolian and Guénonian stance, then we are Evolians and Guénonians; however, if this means unambiguous and explicit "following" is meant, then we are not, and we also firmly reject others classifying us as such. There is no doubt that we identify ourselves with these two authors — above all other authors and thinkers — and, of these two, primarily with the spirit of Julius Evola. If we refer to anyone at all, it is Julius Evola above all others, to whom we refer, have referred, and will continue to refer. However, even Julius Evola's most concise statements, which we hold in the highest regard, are not "canonical" in our eyes. We consider them to be statements that must be taken into account as far as possible, at all times and in all places, by all people who are willing and able to think.

The foundation of the view of existence based on the principles of *Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Metaphysica* — as a formulated view of existence — cannot yet be considered complete. On the one hand, because it can never be completely complete, and on the other hand, because it has not yet been perfected in its foundation and grounding in the sense that it could be considered complete in a positive sense. The founders were the continuators of Matgioi's preliminary work, however far they may have gone beyond it — both in terms of horizontality and verticality — in symbolising what Matgioi had laid down, which is otherwise highly commendable. The foundation must continue for a considerable length of time. This process of laying foundations will not be complete even when the author of these lines has published all his planned writings, when his students have written everything they consider important in this regard, and when one or two generations of traditionally oriented authors living in different parts of the world have published a series of essential works. Until the foundation is perfected, there is still much work to be done—for many people.

This book — according to the author's intention — is a rough draft, a collection of loosely connected studies or rather study outlines, in a relatively simple and accessible form, deliberately avoiding any "literary" style, so that the individual chapters can serve as short introductions to separate books dealing with these topics in more detail. Accordingly, we will deal with a number of questions and issues, some of which are closely related to the "*Metaphysica Centralis*", but also some which are only loosely, indirectly, yet unquestionably connected to it.

Our writing is not philosophical, or only to a very limited extent, and it certainly cannot be considered a specialist philosophical work. Regardless of this fact, we will discuss certain issues in such a way that this discussion can also be interpreted philosophically. Most of our basic principles do not belong to the circle of "*Philosophia Metaphysica*" but belong to the circle of "*Hyperphilosophia Metaphysica*", but they can also be interpreted according to the terms of *Philosophia Metaphysica*. Our basic principle of existence, taken from the *Hyperphilosophia Metaphysica*, could be expressed in terms of *Philosophia Metaphysica* as follows: "*metidealismus immanentali-transscendentalis et transscendentali-immanentalis theourgo-magico-solipsisticus absolutus*". Obviously, we will not use this almost sea-serpent-length name as the name of our approach, but if the philosophical name of our *Hyperphilosophia* view of existence is expected, we must resort to this long term (as one that more or less accurately expresses our position). We could also say that our "*hyperphilosophia*" position can be expressed in philosophical terms as "*idealismus subiectivus*" "extremo-

permaximum absolutum. However, we must emphatically reiterate that we are not committed followers of this philosophical school of thought, but rather of the "hyperphilosophical" trend (and there is no other "hyperphilosophical" trend, in fact), which corresponds to such philosophical terms if its essence is to be interpreted and understood. Thus, acknowledging these indirectnesses, we naturally also defend philosophical "idealismus subiectivus solipsisticus", and even its limited representation, provided that it appears completely coherent and free of any vulgarisation.

Parallel to our rejection of the "canonisation" and will not budge on this, we must also acknowledge that, on the other hand — and in a higher sense — there is and must be a subtle and spiritual "canonicity" that is expressed more in criteria than in direct requirements. Each traditional thinker and author must derive the coherence of their own requirements from the coherence of the criteria. Thus, in this way, the requirements that traditional authors impose on themselves and project onto others may not coincide completely, but they will certainly be similar to each other.

This book — a collection of loosely but nevertheless coherent and interrelated studies — can be regarded as an introductory and generally panoramic summary. It deals broadly with the topics that the author of these lines presented to a narrower audience between 1960 — more precisely 1975 — and 1995, and about which he has also written shorter, as yet unpublished studies. The author of these lines is publishing a completely accessible text that can be understood by anyone, without any special training or education, and which is acceptable, at least in broad terms. Further books will be devoted to detailing and deepening the topics raised here.

*Spring 1995 The
Author*

INTRODUCTION

Traditio Spiritualis et Metaphysica and Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Metaphysica are the principal and doctrinal foundation upon which our orientation to existence is based. These two concepts or conceptual categories—whose essence is far above and beyond concepts and conceptuality—have an external and superficial meaning, as well as a "definitio nominalis" that is, so to speak, well known: the

"traditio" is a derivative of "tradere", which is formed from the verb "trans-dare" and means means to hand over, to pass on, and ultimately, to tradition. "Traditionalis" and "traditionale" mean traditional, while "traditionalitas" means traditionality, that is, everything related to tradition and traditions and resulting from them.

If we were to speak only in general terms about tradition or traditions, we would not really be saying anything significant, nor would we be referring to any kind of actual definition.

could be said. Tradition — generally speaking — can be almost anything, and mostly does not extend beyond what convention and conventionality mean. However, on the one hand, we are talking about "spiritual

tradition," that is, an intellectual tradition (since the Latin word "spiritus" — within the present context — means spirit, and "spiritualis" and "spirituale" mean spiritual). On the other hand — and this is a further, significant restriction — we will be talking about a metaphysical spiritual tradition.

The word "metaphysica" — as a Greco-Latin word — can be traced back to the Greek expression "ta meta ta physika" (in Aristotle's book title: "tōn meta ta physika"). It has two meanings. The first, but lower-level meaning is: "those things that are beyond the natural". The second and higher-level meaning is: "those things that are beyond the created" (in the book title:

"those that are beyond the natural" and/or "those that are beyond the established"). The

"metaphysikon" — as a neutral adjective — means "beyond nature" or

beyond the established, and as a noun, it means "beyond nature" or "beyond the established"; its plural form is "metaphysika", its Latinised form is "metaphysicum", and its plural form is

"metaphysica". It is actually a Greek and Graeco-Latin word — a feminine, adjectival structure that has become a well-known and commonly used expression. The adjectival structure "philosophia metaphysike" and

"philosophia metaphysica" are adjectival constructions; from the Graeco-Latin version, the adjective and adjective "metaphysica" later became independent and gained a noun meaning (as well). We do not specifically indicate any deviation from this

unless we indicate otherwise — always understand both levels of meaning together in the words metaphysics or metaphysical, but we place the emphasis on the second and higher level of meaning.

Furthermore, we consider it necessary to note that metaphysics, in our

not refer to a branch or pinnacle of philosophy — "philosophia metaphysica" — nor to one of its schools of thought or methods, which some have extolled, some — such as Hegel — have rejected as underestimated, while others — such as the proponents of "philosophia existentialis" — have treated with ambivalence or even

declared it meaningless, as did the advocates of "logica-i positivismus" and "logicismus". In our usage, metaphysics hardly ever arises in a philosophical sense, at most in a philosophical sense and in a way that can be interpreted by terms.

In Greek, "Paradosis Metaphysikē", "Paradosis Pneumatikē kai Metaphysikē",

"Hyperphilosophiā Pneumatikē kai Metaphysikē Paradedomenē", "Paradosis Pneumatikē kai Metaphysikē" express roughly the same thing as our conceptual basis

. In Sanskrit, "Pāraparyātmavidyāsambandhi" expresses the same thing, albeit from a slightly different perspective. In Hebrew and Aramaic, the

The term "Qabbālā(h)" refers to a spiritual tradition, primarily Gnostic in nature, which stands behind and above the religious level of Israelism. Tradition and traditionalism stand above traditional religions, such as confessions and religions.

traditions are wrapped in religions and "religionality", then in confessions and "confessionalities", then in cults, cultures and "culturalities", and finally in civilisations and "civilisationalities". The "civilisation" that is not cultural —

is "pseudo- and contra-civilisation",

the "cultura" that is not "confessionalis" the

"pseudo- and contra-cultura",

the "confessio" that is not "religionalis", the

"pseudo- and contra-confessio",

religion that is not traditional, pseudo- and

contra-religion,

and finally, "traditio" that does not adequately convey and represent eternal and timeless metaphysics —

the "pseudo- and contra-traditio".

We can only speak of the inner, transcendent unity of religions in the case of traditional religions, and even then only through the unity of traditions, i.e. only indirectly. The unity of traditions is not entirely direct, but it is almost so, based on the fact that there is essentially only one "Metaphysica". This single, essentially timeless and eternal, in fact still inexpressible metaphysics is carried by the "Supertraditio Metaphysica", which — approximately — corresponds to what we call "Traditio Primordialis Metaphysica". Traditions are expressions of this super-tradition or "Traditio Primordialis" in Unity: in them, different metaphysics arise, which, however, are held in Unity by the spiritual reality of "Metaphysica Essentialis" — ultimately and ultimately keeps them in Unity, through which the essential essence of the traditions becomes reality.

unity, and then indirectly and downwardly the inner-transcendent unity of the "Religio Traditionalis". The unity of confessions, cultures and civilisations is so indirect that we can no longer speak of them as unity-forming elements and of their unity, even though they too — if indeed they are what they ought to be — are secretly connected, independently of external independently of their external differences and — not infrequently — extreme contradictions. However, we must state emphatically that statements such as "in fact, all religions teach the same thing" — since they are not articulated in accordance with the above principles — are nothing more than expressions of dilettantism in the worst sense of the word.

The inner genesis of the Traditio Primordialis Metaphysica and, through it, of the individual traditions, follows from Beyond Being and Non-Being, from the Beginningless-Infinite, and then from the Beginning.

It originates directly from the Origin of Creation and unfolds together with Creation — descending — as a supra-intellectual-spiritual "memory" and "knowledge" that relates to the Origin, beyond that to the Beginning, and beyond that to the Beginningless. The "Absolutum

Metaphysicum" or "Metaphysicum Absolutum" manifests its own reality beyond reality in the world of Being and the created world through a quasi-direct "memory" of the Beginningless-Infinite Centre beyond Being and Non-Being. The origin of the essential metaphysical tradition is rooted not only in the unfathomable depths of the past, but above all in the realm beyond Being. Antiquity — as the temporal counterpart of archaism — is only a "projected" carrier of "Traditionalitas Metaphysica". Traditionalism, although closely related to the past, is not essentially connected to the past, but to the original dominant archaism. Metaphysicalitas, which is passed down through tradition and unfolds together with Creation, has descended to the human level as Power-Dominance-Knowledge and appeared as "Supertraditio Primordialis", which was maintained, preserved and represented by the lords of the "Hyperboreia", the "hyperboreios" superhuman empire above empires. represented.

The word "hyperboreios" means "beyond the north", "above the north", in a lower sense "beyond the Arctic Circle", in a higher sense "beyond the Earth's poles", "above the Earth's poles", that is From Sarkesillag. We are talking about principles here, so — quite obviously — there can be no question of any interplanetary or interstellar spaceships possibly arriving here, regardless of whether they exist or not.

The borealis — anthro-biological — basic race (great race) includes the descendants of the "hyperboreans" who descended and were partially contaminated. Those belonging to this group were the guardians and maintainers — of course, only by their highest castes — of the borealis-hyperborean tradition. From this basic race, the Mongoloid-Mongoloid basic race emerged first, together with one of the primary branches of the boreal tradition, and those who remained furthest north, belonging to the Europid-Europoid great race, were the guardians and maintainers of the other primary boreal tradition branch. This branch split into several branches, and among these, those who spoke Indo-European or Indo-European (Indo-European) or Indo-Aryan languages preserved the purest Boreal — Hyperborean — tradition. These were later called — from their highest strata — were called Indos (Indo-Aryans) or simply Aryans. (Contemporary linguistics no longer refers to the entire Indo-European language family as Aryan or Indo-Aryan, as it did in the past, but only to one of the main branches of this language family, the Indo-Iranian or Indo-Iranian branch.) It is obvious that the Mongoloid race and the Europid race, or within the latter, the traditions maintained by the Indo-Germans, differed significantly from each other, but — in terms of their metaphysical essence, there was not and could not have been such a degree of difference between them that fundamental differences could have been or It would be possible to discuss this, just as it is not really possible to raise decisive differences in values in this regard, and even less so about contradictions that penetrate to the core. The differences and their significance must be taken into account and not forgotten, but if we truly wish to proceed in a traditional spirit.

Traditionalism is a broader category than tradition. On the one hand, any traditionalism implies all traditions, indeed all traditionality, everything that is connected with tradition and traditions, everything that follows or should follow from them — the at every possible individual and sacral-collective-universal level of human existence. In addition to traditionalism — although this will be discussed in more detail later — it is essential to mention the existence and nature of "anti-traditionalism" at the outset. Traditional thinkers and authors generally agree that there is no greater contradiction in the world of earthly human life than that between "Traditio-traditionalism" and "Anti-traditio-

anti-traditionalism . This is such an extreme contrast that nothing else can be compared to it; indeed, it is the consequence of most other contrasts.

broad sense, anti-tradition/anti-traditionalism appears in four basic variants:

a) "Abstraditio-Abstraditionalitas" or Extratraditio-Extratraditionalitas, i.e. tradition and non-traditionalism or tradition and non-traditionalism, always in the sense of tradition and traditionalism.

b) "Antitraditio-Antitraditionalitas" — in the strict sense of the word — that is, open or somewhat veiled tradition and anti-traditionalism, going as far as the persecution of tradition and traditionalism.

c) "Pseudotraditio-Pseudotraditionalitas" — false tradition and false traditionalism; characterised by a sometimes strong, sometimes weak, but sometimes very strong resemblance to tradition and traditionalism, which is, however, burdened with components that are incompatible with tradition and traditionalism.

d) "Contratraditio-Contratraditionalitas", i.e. counter-tradition and pseudo-traditionalism; this is also characterised by a resemblance to true tradition and true traditionalism, but oriented in a direction diametrically opposed to that of true tradition and traditionalism, combined with the "Contrainitiatio" and "Contrarealificatio" physical-spiritual-intellectual, spiritual-intellectual or intellectual practices.

It can be stated as a rule that all four broader interpretations — anti-traditional basic variants always appear together, but one of the four always dominates, always at the forefront of a specific foreground-background sequence.

Any of them can be in first, second, third or fourth place. There are numerous transitional variants between the basic variants. It is obvious that tradition and traditionalism are most severely attacked from the perspective of anti-tradition and anti-traditionalism in the strict sense, but all things considered, counter-tradition and counter-traditionalism are the most dangerous of all. most dangerous. The 20th century was the era of the most vehement anti-traditional offensives, but this will only intensify in the future.

For those who base their view of existence on the principles of Traditionalis Spiritualis et Metaphysica, knowledge of anti-traditional aberrations indispensable, and their study forms the chapter of general "studia traditionalia".

The view of existence based on the principles of Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Metaphysica is not a political worldview. It is a decisive factor in terms of principle and, consequently, also in terms of operational

spheres of life. The basic position that this view of existence takes with regard to politics is clearly in the spirit of "Metapoliteia" and "metapoliticitas". At the same time, it implies the possibility of opening up in the direction of both metapoliteia and meta-a-politeia.

The manifestation of this explicitly metapolitical worldview, based on the principles of Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Metaphysica, on the political and social plane is correctly interpreted true right-wing politics (dextritas, dextrismus). We may add to this that the political and social projection of the various versions and principles of Antitraditionalitas Antispiritualis et Antimetaphysica is, on the other hand, precisely interpreted left-wing politics (sinistritas,

sinistrismus). This is the largest, most tense, most diametrical and most striking political and social manifestation and potential manifestation — truly — irreconcilable contradiction. Moderate right-wing politics is, in fact, more or less — but mostly poorly disguised — moderate, or not so moderate, left-wing politics. In this respect, therefore, only extreme right-wing politics can be considered adequate, but it does not matter what this extreme right-wing actually is in terms of quality and purity.

Ordinary far-right extremism (*extremo-dextritas vulgaris*, *extremo-dextrismus vulgaris*) does not, in fact, meet the high standards of traditional far-right extremism, or only to a very limited extent. Traditional extreme right-wing ideology — precisely for this reason, but without denying its own extreme right-wing nature — prefers to call itself (as a distinction, but also on other grounds) the representative of ultra-right-wing ideology (*ultradextritas*, *ultradextrismus*). The ideal of the ultra-right wing is the traditional state and traditional society; its orientation is determined primarily and almost exclusively by principles derived from a traditional view of life. In many respects, the simplified formulation that ultra-right-wing politics is — at least approximately — a radicalised 20th-century adaptation (provisionally applicable to the third millennium as well) of the classical right-wing politics of De Maistre and Metternich-Winneburg is also accurate.

The far right or extreme right differs from the ordinary right or extreme right mainly in that the latter tendencies have been contaminated, more or less without exception, by the influence of the counter-left. Anti-leftism — a term introduced by the author of these lines, which we consider indispensable, is understood to mean radical anti-leftism, which, despite its opposition to the left, embraces left-wing ideas, goals, styles and methods in the name of anti-leftism. Ordinary right-wing politics, and especially common extreme right-wing attitudes — although not identical with anti-leftism — in different ways and to different degrees depending on the tendency — in almost all cases accepted and incorporates anti-leftist influences: from simple, superficial involvement to almost complete immersion. The various strands of common far-right extremism are generally contaminated by the influence of

However, we cannot deal with these issues here, but we will discuss this problem in more detail in one of the chapters of our book.

However, we cannot deal with these issues here, but we will discuss this problem in more detail in one of the chapters of our book. Nevertheless, we felt it necessary to make a few preliminary remarks in this regard, touching on some fundamental ideas, so that no one would be completely taken aback by the sometimes casual references that hint at the intimate connection between adequate right-wing politics and a traditional worldview whether implied or expressed openly. However, at this point, it would not be appropriate to discuss the actual basis of this intimate connection, beyond stating its existence with apodictic emphasis.

The theoretical aspects of the view of existence based on the principles of *Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Metaphysica* require, most definitely, not philosophical but "hyperphilosophical" considerations, even at the initial level of interpretative approaches. Nevertheless, this "Hyperphilosophia Metaphysica" can also be interpreted using the terminology of "Philosophia Metaphysica", regardless of the fact that the former cannot be identified with the latter, either remotely or partially

the latter. Using the terminology of *Philosophia Metaphysica*, the basic approach of *Hyperphilosophia Metaphysica Traditionalis* can and must be clearly called a solipsistic approach — or — directly — solipsism. If a philosophical name were to be chosen for this hyperphilosophical approach, it could be called, as we have already noted, something like this: *Metidealismus Immanentali-Transscendentalis et Transscendentali-Immanentalis Theourgo-Magico-Solipsisticus Absolutus*.

Obviously, we will not use this long name all the time to describe our approach. as a designation, but on the level of philosophy, this is still the most appropriate definition of our approach, which exists on the higher level of hyperphilosophy and is not even named "in se".

We are certain that, on the plane of philosophy, only *Philosophia Solipsistica* can be — conceptually — and also that the omission of *Consideratio Solipsistica* renders completely meaningless and invalid the very raising of the question of the existence of the concept of being, and above all any kind of orientation towards *Suprarealificatio Metaphysica*, its form and its definition as a necessity.

The easier discussion of certain philosophical and hyperphilosophical questions and issues — or those more closely related to them — may require, didactically, that methodologically — while strictly maintaining the solipsistic position — we should refrain from always representing the unconditional and foregrounded validity of solipsism. In such cases — as a methodological and superficial concession — we can go to the limits of subjective idealism and objective idealism, but never beyond that, i.e. we must not under any circumstances cross over into the realm of objective idealism. Meanwhile, we must be constantly aware that our concession is exclusively didactic, methodological, and superficially pragmatic, and that our concession has opened up and revealed to us not only a lower, but also a decidedly less real and true realm, so we must hastily return again and again to our solipsistic position, which we have never actually abandoned. It is almost unnecessary to mention that those trends that encompass both the object and objectivity, as well as the subject and subjectivity, and in connection with these, both objectivism and subjectivism, and that approach or approaches that transcend and surpass these, and even their unity, in everything, transcending all pairs of opposites dare to speak of their superiority: — in fact, somewhat covertly, but in reality simply and trivially "sliding back" into almost explicit objectivism, — regardless of whether their representatives realise this or not. This is the case in all such situations, and in fact it cannot be otherwise.

Here we must also mention that the adjectival forms *obiectivus*, *obiectiva*, *obiectivum* cannot be correctly related in meaning to the nouns *obiectum*, *obiectivum* and *obiectivitas* independently of consciousness or independently of the existence that can be posited existence. *Realitas obiectiva* — *does indeed exist*, is indeed real, and is indeed objective, but — obviously — is not independent in either its reality or its objectivity, nor can it be independent of subject-centred consciousness, but belongs to it and is its *realitas obiectiva*.

Lenin's "definition of matter", according to which "matter is objective reality existing independently of consciousness and reflected in consciousness", is nothing more than a completely non-philosophical and deeply sub-philosophical, a foolish and confused statement expressing the proximity of *dementia paralytica*,

which, however, reveals the confusion in which objectivity and existence independent of consciousness are linked without any factual basis, even in formulations that far exceed the level of the above "definition".

For a view of existence based on the principles of *Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Metaphysica*, tradition and traditionality are a secular reality, but in the generality of secular existence — a lost reality. There can be no doubt about the lostness of this reality, but — and this must also be said — this undoubted lostness is not absolute: it is still present as a hidden strand, and as a possibility it remains uncorrupted and incorruptible. The

The world of *Traditio* and *Traditionalitas* — in essence — was, is, and will be in archaism that has not been submerged in temporality or that stands out from it, rather than in past antiquity, although the latter corresponds to the temporal projection of the former. In this sense, the traditionalist approach generally views the past paradigmatically and appellatively, but since it seeks to connect with archaism beyond temporality through the past, it has nothing to do with a dreamy immersion in the past. In terms of realisation beyond realisation

, the traditional approach emphasises the primacy of the sharpest present, since the point-like present — in the sense of traditional principles — is the gateway to timeless eternity

. On the other hand, adherents of the traditional-spiritual orientation live in the spirit of building and realising the Golden Age. The coming Golden Age — in essence — is not the

future, but in a higher order of existence, of which the future is, in fact, the temporal projection. A person living according to traditional principles is not, in essence, a

temporal, but rather a personality turning towards timelessness and transcendence, yet one who, in terms of temporality, is a person of the past, present and future. It is important to be aware of this, because there may be misunderstandings that a traditional outlook is oriented exclusively towards the past, towards the surviving documents of traditional doctrines, towards what is no longer tradition, but merely the "memory" of tradition. Certainly, such a

misconceptions, but not among the relatively and partially authentic representatives of traditionalism.

According to some pseudo-occultist trends of the 20th century, the archaic paths of initiation and realisation are impassable for modern man, but the new era, the modern age
modernity also have their mysteries and schools of initiation — as newly opened paths.

We can actually agree with the first half of such statements. Modern man is incapable of initiation and metaphysical realisation, so archaic paths are truly impassable for him. On the other hand, we deny that new mysteries and modern initiation opportunities have emerged in the 20th century and the modern man of the present day. The man of the present day, as a modern man, is indeed incapable of following archaic paths, but if he eliminates his modern humanity and re-archaicises themselves, then — for the most exceptional among them — the true paths become passable.

The view of existence based on the principles of *Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Metaphysica* is inseparably linked to the most decisive and radical rejection of any kind of evolutionism, and even to the explicit denial of the existence of evolution. This

evolution is just as much a part of this as the uncompromising rejection of historical, cultural or strictly spiritual evolution. Evolutionism

Progressive forms, on the other hand, are those whose rejection becomes one of our defining criteria with particular urgency.

The theories of biological evolutionism — ascensionist — descent, i.e. those theories according to which man — as the pinnacle of the animal world — descended from animals, or rather primates, in the sense of ascending evolution: from the position of the traditional worldview, are completely absurd in many respects. For us, Lamarckian or Darwin-Huxley-Haeckelian theories of descent are just as unacceptable as their later, new and most recent modified versions. We do not accept the theories of phylogenetic trees and phylogenetic shrubs, which we consider to be absurd, nor do we accept the theories of reverse, involvent phylogenetic trees and phylogenetic shrubs, even though our approach in this regard is involutionistic, but also organic, desuper-gradual, proportionally creationistic and descensionally materialistic. The simplistic vulgar creationism, motivated by the demand for complete conformity to the most superficial and literal interpretation of the biblical story of creation, are also unacceptable to us because of their anti-spiritual and inverse-materialistic nature.

The pseudo-occultist trends of the 19th and 20th centuries, which "modernly" Based on the principles of evolutionism, progressivism and egalitarianism, they are enthusiastic and committed proponents of the doctrine of reincarnationism. Reincarnationism vulgaris — as a typically evolutionist-egalitarianist theory, which, incidentally, is not true in fact true, also belongs to the circle of views that advocates of the traditional view of existence can never accept. This does not mean that there is not a spark of reality in the doctrine of reincarnation, but it is certain that, as it is interpreted, this view does not correspond to the real truth in its fundamentals, and its consequences are extremely harmful.

Unfortunately, in order to explain what we actually affirm — in the current Dark Age — we must necessarily begin by discussing at length what we cannot accept under any circumstances, what we must deny or reject. That is why we deal in relative detail and at the outset with those concepts that are quite common but, on the other hand, completely unacceptable to us, but which we must reveal to our readers — as part of our views, even before the chapters that deal with them more closely, since our approach is coherent and the chapters are partly independent — sometimes even implicitly: they refer to each other. Solipsism, right-wing politics, and the rejection of evolutionism do not, at first glance, appear to be closely connection, — however, we assert most emphatically that these are indeed most closely and intimately connected and belong together. However, it is necessary to state this before providing supporting evidence, because otherwise the coherence of our arguments would remain hidden throughout. As we have already indicated, our chapters are loosely connected studies that stand on their own. Behind this deliberately loose connection lies a regulatory coherence, or rather, an essential unity. The immediately noticeable connection between the most diverse, almost completely different themes is expressed in the application of traditional perspectives. This is our guiding motif throughout, but it is much more theoretical and essential than formally aligned with the specific traditions

THE SELF, THE EGO AND THE SELF

Those who are capable of awareness must raise within themselves the most important — rightly called essential — questions about themselves, those that — switching to the first person singular — concern myself, my person, myself and the my personality, myself and the relationship between myself and the world.

There is no doubt that I exist among other beings, as a human being among other human beings, as a person among other among persons. At the same time, I am not just a person, but a person who experiences and grasps myself as a Self-Person. However, there is no more than one Self-Person; there is no other Self-Person besides me, and there are no other persons who are Self-Persons; a person is generally only realised in individual persons, but only in one person; in my person, it forms a unity with the lived reality of the Self-Person. I can assume that every human person can be like my Person, that is, that every human person is a bearer of Self-Personality. This assumption, which at first glance seems to refer to an obvious reality, has absolutely no well-founded. This assumption has no basis in any kind of experiential evidence. Such "obvious" assumptions — on closer inspection — have no meaning, value or validity, nor can they ever have any. If there were — as there actually (potentially) is — such a capacity that would allow one to experience whether a being that appears to be a living human person-personality is indeed a living human person-personality or not, but even the result of such a positive statement would not correspond to the experience of the being as the bearer of the Self-Personality — but even if this could be experienced, it would not be the same as the experience of the Self-Person, since only the Self-Person can experience this directly as the Self-Person, as my own Self-Person.

None of the multitude of persons who appear to be outside of me can be the Self, because Only I can be my Own-Person as my Own-Person. The objection that, from my point of view, the other person is not really an Own-Person, but from "their point of view" they are an Own-Person, has no basis whatsoever; at most, it demonstrates the objector's lack of understanding. There is no Other-Self-Person; to suggest otherwise is completely meaningless nonsense.

The Person or Personality — in Sanskrit: Svatva (in the strict literal meaning: Individuality or Uniqueness) — in abstracto can be a bearer of Self-Personality, but is by no means identical with it. Self-Personality in Sanskrit: Sva-Svatva (strictly speaking: Own-Ownership or Own-Uniqueness) — the Proprio-Persona and the Proprio-Personalitas — is essentially Me. The Own-Person Me, the Self — Aham, Ahamikā — Ich, Ichheit — can be the Self-Person, this makes the person my Person, and — through this — my Own Self-Person.

The experiential level of Self-Person-Self-Personality corresponds to the degree of intensity of Selfhood, which we should correctly call Self-Selfhood — in Sanskrit: Aham-Ahamikā, in German: Ich-Ichheit. Although Sva-Svatva and the Aham-Ahamikā that animates it are completely *unique*, they are not yet identical with Alanny. The Greek Hypokeimenon, the Latin Subiectum and the Hungarian Alany are synonymous. All three terms are rather unfortunate, because they are related to are related to subjugation, subjugation, and subjugation. Regardless, we will use

these words, although we prefer to use the Sanskrit equivalent
equivalent, the word which in its basic form is Ātman, and in its masculine singular nominative form
is Ātmā. Ātman/Ātmā appears in translations as Spirit, Soul, Self
, Self; in German as Geist, Seele, Ich, Selbst; in French as Moi, Soi, rarely as Je; in English as Self,
Me, Myself. In this book, the author translates it as Önmaga(m) in Hungarian, but sometimes also
uses the translation Önvaló. Sometimes he uses the Greek Hypokeimenon, the Latin Subiectum or the
Hungarian Alany
, but always with Ātmā in mind.

The author recommends the translations Selbst in German, Soi in French, and Self in English, always
making it clear — for the benefit of the less knowledgeable — that Selbst, Soi, and Self have nothing
to do with Jung's psychologia analytica complexa terms of the same form. (There is a virtually
unbridgeable gap between the concept of Hyperphilosophia Metaphysica et Traditionalis and the
various schools of modern "depth psychology" — as well as in other respects
.)

As an equivalent of Ātmā — and as a translation of Self — the author of these lines will gladly and
frequently use the Greek word Auton, and less frequently Tauton, especially as a contrast to Other,
the Greek Heteron or Thateron.

The uniqueness of the Self-Person and the Selfhood manifested therein is also unambiguous and
unconditional, but the uniqueness of the subjective Auton is absolute. Hyperphilosophia Metaphysica
Traditionalis professes and teaches the complete and absolute coincidence, even identity, of Being and
Consciousness.

The hyperphilosophy of archaic or quasi-archaic traditional teachings is not interpreted directly and
generally by philosophical terms, because they cannot be interpreted
interpretable. Thus, the coincidence-identity of Being and Consciousness did not appear directly
— formulated philosophically — as a doctrine, but the multitude of references that support its reality,
indeed that support it beyond doubt, can indeed be found in the original teachings.

In this case, Being does not only mean the Being of Beings, but beyond that — Pure Being
, but Pure Being and Pure Non-Being together, and their unity, as well as that which is beyond this
unity. Consciousness means Universal Consciousness, but never separated from consciousness in the
narrower sense — individual-propriopersonal. Being and Consciousness —
Beyond-Being-Beyond-Consciousness — is the Auton, and in fact not only the centre, but also that
which is beyond the centre, above the centre, but at the same time also the periphery of
Consciousness, and that which is the spatial entirety of Consciousness.

Sva-Svatvá and Sva-Svatvikā are made so by *Aham-Ahamikā* — that which is. *Aham* and
Aham-Ahamikā arise from *Aham-Ātmika* following a downward decrease in intensity.
Ahamkara is the name of that actionality and actor — literally: I-
creator, I-maker, which realises Aham, Aham-Ahamikā, by breaking — but not completely
eliminating — the close and continuous inner unity of *Aham-Ātmika* or *Sva-Svatvāham-Ātmikā*.

Selfhood — *Ātmaka* or *Ātmikā* — can only be experienced at the general level of conscious
forces as *Sva-Svatvāham-Ahamikā*, but even then not to an adequate degree: at a lower level of
Asmitā — Being. In the context of interpretations of traditional doctrines, the question often
arises as to whether the intense existence of the Self is positive or — on the contrary — negative,
because in relation to the teachings and their interpretation, both of these opposing views seem
valid and enforceable.

— because in relation to the teachings and their explanation, both of these opposing views seem valid and enforceable. *Sva-Svatvāham-Ahamikā* and *Asmitā* — as upward-inward closed fixation — are clearly negative, and fixation

Its intensification is particularly — but as an intermediate stage of a higher-level experience — or a precursor

— is indisputably positive, and particularly positive if this intensification does not result in fixation, but rather in the direction of immanent-transcendental opening, as it were inwardly and upwardly. The destruction of the Self — subordinated to a transmutatio — is just as valid a goal as the preservation of the Self and its inward-upward transformation: in fact, it is the same thing, in the sense of two different approaches. The Self is always guided by a higher Self, always striving for the realisation of a higher degree of Selfhood, and if not, then the transformation begins and proceeds in the direction of contra-prodinitiatio and contra-realificatio anti-metaphysica and ends in annihilation.

Selfhood can only be experienced at the level of consciousness of the Personal Self before progressing through transmutatio metaphysica. *Ātmikā* is infinitely close to this level, and infinitely far away. It is almost directly present, but between the Self-Personality and Selfhood lies the entire Universe or the whole Universe, the Universes

The sum total. The Self-Personal-Self is also a degree of Selfhood, a degree of turning oneself inside out from oneself.

When discussing these questions, we must be precise: I am truly myself and my Self *myself* — for the time being as My Own Personal Self; experiencing myself as Selfhood.

Here, the question of solipsism in relation to gnōseologia-ontologia-axiologia — essentially metaphysics — and the necessity of accepting it arises sharply and tangibly. the necessity of its acceptance.

Solipsism comes from the adjective *solus, sola, solum* — meaning 'alone' — the noun *solum* — meaning 'alone' — and the adjectival form *solo* — meaning 'alone' — adverbial form, as well as the pronoun *ipse, ipsa, ipsum* — meaning *self* — derived from these, and it is a compound word. Its meaning: self-only-ism In fact, as a concept, it means that if the Subject can only be applied to myself, and cannot be applied to anyone or anything else, then I am the only Subject, the sole Subject of Conscious Existence; every Conscious Actio-Functio is my own, as the Subject's Conscious Actio-Functio, and the Realitas Obiectiva realised by these is my own — as the Subject of Being-Consciousness — objective and real world. (Some shallow, ignorant and stupid philosophical handbooks and encyclopaedias prattle on about how, according to *solipsism*, only human, individual and personal consciousness exists: no representative of any version of philosophical or hyper-philosophical solipsism has ever claimed such a thing. In the case of solipsism, two possibilities of vulgarisation must be eliminated: according to one, however it is formulated, the Self-Personal-I-Self is the Lord and Centre of Being. To is obviously a serious and gross error, a completely anti-traditional, anti-spiritual and anti-metaphysical aberration. The other serious error of vulgarisation is to think of the Subject of Universal Consciousness as separate and distinct from the individual and personal experience of the Subject at any given moment. This — through idealismus subiectivus — leads us into the increasingly naive realms of idealismus obiectivus, since, apart from solipsismus radicalis — in fact — everything else — can be formulated philosophically — basic view of existence more or less veiled naive realism: apart from naive realism in the strict sense (the "philosophy" of those beneath philosophy), all varieties of materialism, all approaches related to positivism, and even all forms of objective and subjective idealism — but

solipsism that has not yet reached its full development and intensity—are, in fact, naive realism dressed up in disguise, wearing a mask. Therefore, only *Philosophia Solipsistica* can be used as a stepping stone to *Hyperphilosophia Solipsistica*, noting that *Hyperphilosophia Non-Solipsistica* does not exist at all and is completely inconceivable.

Hinduism's *Ātma-vādā* can be considered solipsism above philosophy, and Buddhism's *Anātmavādā*, which is seemingly — but only seemingly — contrary to this, can also be rightly called supra-philosophical solipsism in a figurative sense. Anyone who understands this differently does not understand the true nature of solipsism, nor that of Buddhism and Hinduism.

What solipsism refers to is the connection that exists between *Sva-Svatvāham-Ahamikā* and *Sva-Svatvāham-Ātmikā*, as well as that between the latter and *Maha-Paramātmāmika*. This reference is justified and metaphysically completely correct.

The refutation power of the counter-arguments raised so far against *Philosophia Metaphysica Solipsistica* has been philosophically pathetic and laughable, and in almost all cases, they have been emotionally motivated banalities. However, this cannot be otherwise. Even *solipsismus vulgaris*, which is limited to the individual, cannot really be refuted. The attempts to refute solipsism, which have been raised at an adequate and transformed to a supra-philosophical level, attempts to refute solipsism are completely hopeless.

The only dubitative objection that can be raised — and only for a short time — is relative and partial, but even so, only apparent, and this is as follows: the fact that the world exists solely and exclusively within my consciousness, together with my physicality in my own world, cannot be refuted, nor can it really be denied at all — however, it seems that I am not, or only to a very limited extent, the master of my own world. This suggests that the otherwise completely irrefutable, even refutable solipsism cannot be absolutely true. However, such suggestions are the result of weak judgement.

The following can and must be said in response to this argument: There is no doubt that I am not *yet* the unlimited master of the world that exists exclusively within me, my world; indeed, my dominion over it *is still* small and limited, but I want to and will achieve absolute mastery over my world *once again*. *Hyperphilosophia Metaphysica* is not simply *Solipsismus*, but *Solipsismus Magicus*, or — to be even more precise, and to ward off any critical remarks that might be expected from the extreme Guénonianism camp — *Solipsismus Theourgico-magicus* or *Theourgo-magico-solipsismus*.

This means that in the past, beyond time, I deliberately deprived myself of dominion and power, and even of the knowledge of it, which, from the point of view of my own centrality, was an infinitely conscious and free act, but from the perspective of the same eccentric result, it was an almost complete self-destructive failure, in such a way that the fact of the failure remained and remains obscure.

The currently completely solipsistic Conscious Being must be transmuted into an absolutely and directly complete solipsistic Dominant Conscious Being. This is the *Verificatio Absoluta* of solipsism realised beyond philosophy, and this is the ultimate and absolute goal of *Suprerealificatio Metaphysica* — as *Suprastatus Solipsisticus Metaphysicus Absolutus*.

Every transmutation of being and consciousness — in its first and ultimate essence autotransmutatio, and every — not diminishing, but truly meaning return in its original sense — reductio, — autoreductio.

The return of myself by myself, through myself, within myself, to myself and into myself. Already "hic et nunc" I am myself — I am myself, but not in an absolute sense, therefore myself to myself — in fact, absolute
I must become my Absolute Self. I am my Self as the goal of my Self, the accomplisher of the Goal-leading. My lower and relative Self, from which I reach my higher and absolute Self, so that it is precisely this upper Self that transforms me, that is, I transform my lower Self into my upper Self, into my upper and absolute Self.

I must become who and what I already am, but not only that, I must become it absolutely, that is, who and what I was, am, and will be, and who and what I could be, can be, and will be.

One of our primary propositions is that essentially only Auton exists, that is, only I-Myself, and the Other-Something, simply the Other, the Heteron, is in fact an unrecognised Auton, that is, an unrecognised I-Myself.

In fact, I am always Auton, but by no means always with the same intensity; I am almost always strongly Myself, but almost never to the extent that would be even minimally adequate; so from a strongly different perspective, this means that — already or still — I am ultimately weak.

I-Myself am the creator of the World and the Worlds, I-Myself am the sustainer of the World and the Worlds, I am the sustainer of the World and the Worlds, I am the destroyer-renewer and transformer of the World and the Worlds — but in such a way that I do not experience Myself as a dator in relation to these

processes, nor do I experience datation, but must content myself with the particular, relative, superficial observation of data. The World is only in me; it exists only for me, but I do not experience its creation as creator, its maintenance as maintainer, its renewal as renewer, nor even the processes that bring it to life. I experience this — it is fair to say — as if "sleeping through it" — through a kind of ontological dream. On the one hand, I want it this way, but on the other hand, I am deprived of my power

. In its own Auton background, it creates, maintains and renews the World and Worlds as Auton-Heteron, namely as non-experiential Heteron. The realitas obiectiva manifests itself as Heteron; this is largely — at least in theory — can be experienced, — but there is also an invisible, un-experientable Heteron, whose existence only through multiple layers of mediation. Heteron is always a danger, and the unobservable Heteron poses an immeasurably greater danger than any other Heteron, because through significant indirectly through multiple layers of mediation, but these effects — especially in the long term — are almost always destructive.

The Heteron-Auton polarity is the most extreme difference and opposition in Conscious Being. We must state this together with the fact that Heteron and Auton *are one*. However, this unity only exists from the Auton side, in the Auton, it does not exist from the Heteron side and in the Heteron, and it can never

be realised. Just as — because this is what it is ultimately about — the absolute opposites of *Samsāra* and *Nirvāna* are also absolutely opposite differences that form a unity, but only from the perspective of *Nirvāna*, and *Nirvāna*- in *Samsāra* and never in *Samsāra*.

The Auton and the Heteron — if one can speak of them in absolute terms — are not abstractions at all. Their meaning is only truly relevant in relation to Me-Myself; the extent of my selfhood is expressed in the reality of their bipolarity.

In fact, it is about me, my Self. I experience this, but there can be extreme differences between the degrees and levels of intensity of this experience. In the human form of existence (or, one might even say, from Nothingness) to Metaphysical Awakening, the degrees are immeasurable.

The abstractly proposed Subiectum Universale or Subiectum Intersubiectivum are unacceptable concepts precisely because of their abstract nature, although as terms, as in some respects we could also talk about them, — but generally we do not speak about them because they were constructed in an abstract manner almost exclusively in order to avoid solipsism. That is, so that I do not really consider myself to be myself — not even in the highest transcendental sense as the Subject of Being.

A significant number of philosophers could have arrived at solipsism, and many came close to it. Neither Berkeley, nor Hume, nor Fichte, nor Krause, nor Schopenhauer strayed far from *Metaphysica Solipsistica* — at the end of the 19th century and throughout the 20th century, many came close and even more could have come close to this truly, indeed, uniquely valid metaphysical approach. Ludwig Wittgenstein, in his logical-philosophical and glottological investigations, came to the conclusion that solipsism is real, but denied that it could or should be discussed. (In his later years, Ludwig Wittgenstein no longer pursued this line of thought, which was otherwise remarkable, in his logical discoveries.) Even such extremely anti-spiritual thinkers as Sartre, had he been more consistent — thinking through his assumptions about freedom — could have arrived at solipsism via objective idealism and then subjective idealism, he could have arrived at solipsism. For the thinker, the philosopher, it is what gives or would give true meaning to his life and work if he could arrive at this point. This would be the destiny of each of them.

Only Schubert-Soldern actually reached epistemological solipsism, in some respects Robert Reininger, and above all — complete metaphysical-ontological-gnoseological-axiological solipsism — Julius Evola, the most significant traditional thinker of recent times, on a philosophical level, but with an orientation beyond philosophy.

Most philosophical handbooks and encyclopaedias, when describing the views of the more daring subjective idealist thinkers, note that "in order to avoid solipsism, therefore..." This corresponds to the ideologisation of the rejection of the consequences of solipsism.

The acceptance or rejection of the consequences of solipsism—and thus the rejection of solipsism itself—does not primarily stem from the stupidity of these thinkers (Julius Evola also refers to a kind of aversion in his writings on the subject) but rather from fear, which prevails in the mindset of philosophers tied to a petty bourgeois and conformist lifestyle.

The rejection of solipsism by subjective idealists stems primarily from the weakness of their self-awareness, which is influenced by emotional impulses. Of course, the imperfection of mental powers also plays a role in this, since the retreating philosopher yields to emotions that oppose his intellectual insights — that is, to lower powers — and then seeks an ideology that presents counterarguments, perhaps with witty elegance.

For the thinker who has become intoxicated by the security of the existence of others, the consequence of solipsism, according to which there is no one and nothing outside myself, is truly frightening and frightening consequence of solipsism, which states that there is no one and nothing outside of myself.

Behind the poor counterarguments raised against solipsism, there is always fear-alleviating emotionality at work. The "counterarguments" are very often "moral" in nature: with the certainty of infallibility, they declare as a lapidary truth that solipsism is "immoral" and "inhuman". They also say why it is so, but in every case this is embedded in such vague, confused and shallow explanations that it is essentially irrecoverable.

Solipsism is the basis of the *consideratio-concentratio-meditatio-contemplatio* view of existence — not dialogue, and even less so debate. It can be said — as truth and as reality — that this view of existence can and must be supported as truth — but there is hardly anything more absurd and ridiculous than to engage in debate on this subject.

Everything can be proven and everything can be refuted, but nothing can be proven perfectly and nothing can be refuted perfectly. The *realiveritas* of solipsism can also only be proven — it is true that it can be proven more than the *realiveritas* of any other view, but it cannot be proven perfectly; it is also possible to refute the *realiveritas* of solipsism, although much less so than anything else, but it can never be refuted perfectly.

realiveritas of solipsism can also be refuted, although much less so than anything else, but it can never be completely refuted. The positive-

Argumentation is by no means superfluous, but ultimately it is not decisive. All truth can essentially only be recognised intuitively, and this is especially true of the truth of solipsism.

. Adequate argumentation is legitimate and important, but it can never be so perfect as to be completely sufficient. The *ratio discursiva*

can lead to an insightful recognition of the truth of solipsism — this is certain — but not to a possessive recognition, and this is also certain: for this, the *functional-* — which we call *intuitio intellectualis*.

Let us repeat what we have already said; the vulgarised — that is, the solipsistic assumption applied only to the Self and not to the Subject — is also much truer and much less refutable than any other — extra-solipsistic assumption, regardless of the fact that we do not accept *solipsismus vulgaris* at all, indeed, we reject it outright.

The validation of the solipsistic view of existence is decisive and essential in relation to *propædeutica paradoxologiae*

. The most important chapters of traditional teachings — essentially — either implicitly or explicitly and explicitly suggest the principled existence of the solipsistic basic view. The solipsistic basic solipsistic approach is not entirely direct in its explicit presence, nor is it ever conceptually sharp. Nevertheless, only those who are unaware of the solipsistic approach of the most metaphysically significant sub-doctrines of traditional doctrines

— especially in the concentrated metaphysical teachings of the Hindu and Buddhist traditions — who, regardless of their training in this area, approach the essential content of the teachings

. The essential traditions are carriers of solipsistic doctrines, and a meaningful relationship with them can only be established on the basis of a solipsistic standpoint. From the point of view of the principles of *Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Universalis Metaphysica*, we can clearly state that this can be understood as a dogmatic assumption.

Metidealismus Immanentali-Transscendentalis et Transscendentali-Immanentalis Theourgo-Magico-Solipsisticus Absolutus — as a philosophical and, above all, hyper-philosophical

view of existence cannot remain the luxury of exceptionally theoretical moments of worldview, but must become a guiding principle of perception, in comparison to which the Idealismus Obiectivus can only gain a certain — and always only relative and particular — *raison d'être* as a didactic-methodological "relaxation".

It is wrong to possess this approach only on a conceptual level and in form: it must be transformed into a living approach, so that it remains an approach. One preliminary exercise in spiritual transmutations may be the deliberate development of an attitude that can serve as the basis for such an orientation. That is, sometimes, as often and as intensely as possible, in this way. With this inner attitude, one must experience both the outer and inner worlds: people, animals, plants, mountains, the sun, the moon, the planets and stars, buildings, cities, human actions, speech, movements and gestures.

It is right that the reader — especially of mythological sacred books — should first read them in a contemplative manner, as is customary, looking down from above with greater depth and power, so that the characters — the actors and speakers — are "they", other people, and the supreme being is "he", someone else, or — impersonally — "it" and something else. After passing through this phase several times, it is possible and necessary to reach the level when it is advisable to change this: from this point on, every character—actor and speaker—is Me-Myself. In the Book of Genesis, Me-Myself is the Creator, Me-Myself is Adam and Eve, Satan appearing in the form of the Serpent, Me-Myself is Cain's ancestor Abel. In the Bhagavad-Gītā, I am both Arjuna and Krishna. When we read the words of Jesus Christ, "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life," we must first understand that "He" is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, and we must do so unconditionally, but at a further and higher stage, I must say, referring to Myself, that I (Myself) am the Way, the Truth and the Life; in the first stage, it would be *hairesis* if I were to say Christ's words in the second stage according to an adequate interpretation, but in the second stage, it would be a deviation in the spirit of *hairesis* if I were to remain with an adequate interpretation in the first stage. During all these spiritual operations, I am obviously aware that this is not yet completely the case. I am potentially the Creator and Krishna and the Way, the truth and the life, that is, I am not yet any of these, but in the timeless, eternal future, I can become these things — the anticipation of this is interpretive scripture reading in this manner, which, if done correctly, can have positive preparatory significance. All of this has negative value. could have consequences, one might argue. They would certainly be right, but we believe that those who are mentally alert and relatively ambitious, if they truly understand — both rationally and supra-rationally — what is essentially at stake here and what they really need to do, can take the risk of these preparatory and autocorrective operations, especially if they receive "concrete" instructions for these from their more advanced Guide, optimally — from their Master, or even your Guru.

In general, but especially now, in the advanced stage of Kali-Yuga, without exception, everything, including all spiritual practices — even those with the most positive orientation — can lead to negative results. Therefore, extreme caution is recommended for all spiritual practices — if these are recommended by "gurus" who present paths for the modern world — who are, without exception, all false gurus — then caution is not enough and only rejection can be valid. The Thinking and actitudo recording exercises carry the least risk of misinterpretation,

and the method of reading and interpreting sacred texts that we recommend actually belongs to this broader category. In the case of personalities with a psychotic or psychopathic constitution — especially those with weak intellectual abilities — such preliminary exercises can also be dangerous, but we believe that, even if we have to take everything into account, this "taking everything into account" cannot be unlimited, and if we can give an adequate intention to those who deserve it, we will not conceal this for the sake of the "integrity" of those who do not deserve it
"safety" of those who do not deserve it.

The vulgarisation of solipsism — as we have already mentioned — can arise in crude forms in relation to the bondage to the human personality.

— in its crudest forms: in relation to attachment to the human personality.

We have noted that this cannot be refuted; indeed, if it is not raised in the sense of being bound to human personality, it cannot really be refuted. On the other hand, this vulgarisation takes place in the sense of an abstraction

in the sense of an ideologica, through the universalisation of the Subject, which is truly universal, in the sense of a bad

sense, through its universalisation aimed at complete separation from the person. This leads to the abolition of solipsism, regardless of the

. These vulgarisations can also appear at the level of philosophy, although they do not appear very often, because consistent and all-encompassing solipsism

is almost never declared as a basic position by practitioners of philosophy. At the same time, vulgarisations can also appear in connection with hyper-philosophical orientations, for example, thinkers who profess the Traditionalitas Metaphysica view of existence, rational-supra-rational in his borderline considerations, as has already been seen (this led to the rejection of the most vulgar form of vulgar solipsism, which one could agree with, but which ultimately, by failing to make the necessary distinctions, concluded in a general rejection of solipsism and even in a declaration of its rejection on traditional grounds

. The eminent traditional thinker and author Frithjof Schuon, whom we hold in high esteem, expresses similar views in some of his otherwise excellent works.

We must briefly examine the question that has already been raised in the form of an allusion, and which has been the source of the most varied doubts, uncertainties, and confused interpretations to date, and will certainly continue to be so in the future, especially if nothing is done to clarify it. The problem

problem is therefore as follows:

The Self or Myself (Aham; Ātman/Ātmā), Selfhood and Selfness (Ahamikā; Ātmaka, Ātmikā, Ātmā), Self-Selfhood and Self-Selfness (Aham-Ahamikā; Aham-Ātmaka, Aham-Ātmikā, Aham-Ātmya) are in fact spiritual positives that should be preserved and maintained, as certain schools of thought assert this most emphatically, or else negatives to be eliminated, as other schools of thought—which also seem reasonable—teach.

Sanskrit Ind-Hindu terminology speaks of the Great Self, Great Selfhood (Mahāham, Mahāhamikā) and the Little Self, Little Selfhood (Alpāham, Alpāhamikā), as well as the Great Self, Great Selfhood (Mahātmā, Mahātmakā, Mahātmikā, Mahātmyā) and the small self, small selfhood (Alpātmā, Alpātmakā,

Alpātmikā, Alpātmyā). These are sometimes interpreted as meaning that those marked with "Great" are unconditional and superior positives, while those marked with "small" are reprehensible, inferior negatives. In other words, they abuse the above

great and perfectly adequate terminology with stupid banality — in the spirit of the most far-reaching misunderstanding and

misunderstanding. If this had only been raised by interested parties and were still being raised today, we would have to adopt a gently regretful attitude, but since it is "experts" and

It is also often heard from "masters" (and even recorded in writing) that we must speak out with determination against this complex of misrepresentations, ambiguities and misunderstandings.

We must speak out with determination against this complex of misrepresentations, ambiguities and misunderstandings.

The designations "Big" and "small" lead to the misunderstanding that — half-explicitly — the small self and the small self are indeed me, and I am myself, while the Big Self and the Big Self are the Universal Self, the Universal Self, which are related to me but which — as it were — are radically different from me, and which I should strive to attain. In this case, what is designated as small is nothing more than the lowest level of the Self/Self-Personality, while what is designated as Great is, in fact, a completely inexperienced, utterly abstract Universal Heteron cogitative fiction.

In fact, with both the Mahā and Alpa prefixes, I refer to My-Self with a complex adjectival structure: on the one hand, to its truly universally powerful level, and on the other hand, to its even smaller, more limited proprioindividual-propriopersonalis or already barely proprioindividual-propriopersonalis level. The extensitas and intensitas of the self-experience of the Self-Myself — together — determine, as it were, to what extent I can experience the Self-Myself only as My Own Person, or beyond that, as My Selfhood, or even beyond that — truly as the Self-Myself, the Self-As myself, and finally as myself-myself, as Ātmātmaka, Ātmātmikā, Ātmātmya), and along these lines, only as proprioindividualis and proprio personalis, or, transcending these, as proprio-supra-personalis, as the realiser of the Individuum Absolutum and as universalis. Each degree is positive in relation to the lower one, and and, compared to the higher, it is both positive and negative. It is positive because it is a prerequisite for higher experience, and negative because it holds back one's own momentary level of experience.

The Person or Personality, the Own-Person or Own-Personality, the Self-Self, and even the Self-Self, all truly apply to me, my Person, my Own-Personality, my Selfhood, my Self-Self. Elimination, annihilation, even killing, destruction, elimination, and sacrifice commonly and generally mean nothing. No one has, nor can have, any image, concept, or invention regarding what all these actually and truly mean — beyond mere attractive or alarming words — if the conventional Hinduism, Buddhism, and yoga interpretations remain, unfortunately, the banal phraseology of the vast majority and their "explanations" that explain nothing.

Destruction and sacrifice and all other similar expressions — in fact — symbolically represent extensivificatio and — mainly — intensivificatio along a vertical axis: the extensivificatio and intensivificatio of self-preservation, symbolically — we repeat — mainly along a vertical axis. intensification: the extensification and intensification of its own self-experience, symbolically — we repeat — mainly along a vertical axis and inward-upward, but even more so toward the inner-upper centre, that is, toward my absolute self. I must experience my own person extensively and, above all, intensively that it is as if it is destroyed in the experience of my own Self Self, and then I must experience my own Self so extensively and even more intensively intensively that my own Self-ness is destroyed, sacrificed or sacrificed by me in the experience of my realised Self-Selfhood, and finally I experience my own Self-Selfhood with such human and supernatural extensiveness and intensity that in this experience, transcendence destroys, sacrifices, and is sacrificed by my Selfhood — in my Selfhood or in my Selfhood. Destruction always means transcendence, self-transcendence, self-surpassing through the transcendental and at the same time immanentificational realisation of the existing-possessed level . In adequate transcendence, the transcendent level or experiential

With the cessation of actionality, it gives way to a higher level or self-experienced actionality. There is no other valid self-annihilation or self-sacrifice, nor can there be, because the current self-consciousness-extinguishing operations (e.g., death by anaesthetics suicide or death resulting from an overdose of narcotics or psychedelics) can in no way be considered the actualised "start" of valid self-annihilation. If we do not state this — at least in such a brief and relevant outline as we have done above — we will find few chapters or even lines on this subject, although there are some that, albeit from a slightly different perspective, — essentially shed similar light on this truly problematic, yet clarifiable issue. The most serious books on yōgā — especially when taken together — reveal what is meant by each term, especially when are supplemented by the most authoritative books on Hinduism and Buddhism. (The author of these lines will touch on this issue again — very briefly and sketchily — in this book, in the chapter on initiation and realisation, as well as in a later, planned writing, he intends to deal with this topic in more detail and at greater length, from a higher perspective and in greater depth.)

If anyone speaks, or if we speak, about the destruction or sacrifice of the self without being aware of this — indeed, without being acutely aware of it — it will hardly be more than a string of the most banal, which is also irresponsible misrepresentation, even if it is unintentional in this respect. Egoism vulgaris — selfishness — is the weakness of the Egon-Auton, the Aham-Ātmā, the Ich-Selbst, that is, the experiential extensitas and, above all, the intensitas of the Self-Self, and more specifically, from the compensation or overcompensation of this weakness. Egoism vulgaris is, in fact, a search for support, a distorted, external and inferior approach to self-assurance, which, in terms of spiritual-metaphysical realisation, can only be judged negatively, as it ties the consciousness of the Self-Self closely to the sphere of the Self-Person (myself) and its its spiritual and physical carriers.

However, there is also egomismos hieros or egomismus sacer (egomismus sacralis), which is clearly not an abstractus fictivum of a subtle version of egomismus vulgaris, created with the intention of thereby granting "rights" to common egomismus after all. ensure, or even "rehabilitate" it, so that we can ultimately place it on some kind of pragmatic-moral pedestal. This is out of the question, no matter how much some ignorant and narrow-minded "critics" would like to portray it that way. Egomismus sacer, for which egōn-autonismos hieros — as a terminological designation — might be even more appropriate: in the common sense of the word sense of the word, it is not egomismus at all, but in some respects rather the opposite of what what is usually described as "selfishness". The essence of egōn-autonismos hieros is the radical affirmation of the principle of the adequate exaggeration of the I-Myself-ness and its consistent practical implementation. The theory and practice of egōn-autonismos hieros is an organic and prerequisite part of spiritual metaphysical realisation — from the very beginning of its preparation and foundation — an organic and prerequisite part of it. As a theory, it is closely related to theourgo-magico-solipsismus.

Egōn-autonismos hieros has indirect implications for the general spheres of life that careless malice might associate with certain forms of common egomismus — completely wrongly and mistakenly. This is related to the fact that the believer and practitioner of egōn-autonismos hieros rejects all life practices, in which it is worth "sacrificing" oneself for something greater and higher — more specifically, one's time,

physical, mental and spiritual strength, and health — for something less worthwhile, for others or for other things. With an inner — perhaps unconscious — intention to find an excuse for not fulfilling their own

also physical, mental and spiritual — tasks. Their own tasks — which are essentially always spiritual and metaphysical in nature — are preceded by all other

probably also crucial tasks, take precedence in terms of emphasis and timing, at least in the case of a truly spiritually oriented person. Furthermore,

prerequisite for helping others is that we put ourselves in a position from which we can provide this help. To illustrate this with a very common, simple example: if several people find themselves in danger — including myself — my primary task is to rescue myself from this situation — at least partially and relatively — because until then I would not be able to help others in any meaningful way, and only then

I will attempt — after quickly weighing up the situation — to rescue the others. This, of course, is no longer egōn-autonismos hieros, but it is still its indirect and commonplace manifestation.

derivative of the profane, but by no means invalid — exemplary — presentation. A spiritually oriented personality cannot afford the weakness of ordinary egomism, which is completely foreign to it anyway. Egōn-autonismos hieros, on the other hand, is a requirement, as we have noted, while its indirect and lower derivatives

in some cases may be decidedly enforceable or merely permissible, or possibly even rejectable, assuming the existence of a perspective and judgement that is, so to speak, necessarily associated with spiritual orientation

necessarily entails a certain perspective and judgement in this regard.

The Self (Sva-Svatva), the Self-Personality (Sva-Svatvaka, Sva-Svatvikā), the I (Aham), the I-Creator (Ahamkāra), the I-Self (Aham-Ahamaka, Aham-Ahamikā), the Self(m) (Ātmā), Selfhood (Ātmaka, Ātmikā), Self-Selfhood; (Aham-Ātmaka, Aham-Ātmikā), the Own-Personal-Self-Selfhood (Sva-Svatvāham-Ātmaka, Sva-Svatvāham-Ātmikā) — Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Universalis Metaphysica Hyperphilosophia Metaphysica's terminus circumcentralis, usually accompanied by presentations of neologisms related to these traditions in their original Sanskrit forms from the Indo-Hindu and Buddhist traditions.

Such a terminus circumcentralis is the Self-manifesting Self, the Jivatma, which is essentially identical in its first and ultimate essence to the Selfhood of the Whole Universe, the Maha-Paramātmā or Mahā-Parama-Brahmā.

One of the essential teachings of Buddhism is Anātma-vāda or Anātmaka-vāda/Anātmikā-vāda, *which appears to be* opposed to Hinduism, or rather Vēdānta-Darśana; in particular, Advaita-Vēdānta-Darśana. The essential meaning and significance of this teaching is that the Self manifested in Samsāra is not the (true) Self or Selfhood in Samsāra. This is not actually contrary to Ātma-vādā or Ātmaka-vādā (Ātmikā -vādā), but rather complementary to and indirectly confirming it. The integral traditional position — in summary — ultimately decides in favour of Ātmānātma-vāda

(Ātma-anātma-vāda) or Ātmakānātmaka-vāda, Ātmikānātmikā-vāda, which makes it possible and easy to "open up" to both of these complementary and mutually reinforcing teachings of decisive importance.

The problem of the Self, the Self-Self and the Self-Self is the most essential problem of hyperphilosophia Metaphysica and, consequently, of the most relevant Philosophia Metaphysica, in its most essential aspects.

indirectly and partly directly related to the praxeological foundations of Suprerealificatio
Metaphysica.

All this is only valid when and as long as it is really about my Self-ness, my Self-hood, and my Self-hood of myself in the theoretical sense, and when and as long as this is the case, these are thus, in this way — at the centre of the considerations underpinning praxis considerations that underlie praxis. Obviously — and this must be repeated several times — we are not talking about the personal-individual Self-Self, that is, the Own-Person(ality), nor are we talking about some kind of Abstractum Universale, but — at least initially — about the self-transcendent Self-Self that manifests itself (also) in my Own-Person. Own-Person (also) manifests itself in my Own-Person. Identifying these without further ado is just as serious a mistake and error as their extreme separation. Both positions would be a rejection of tradition, and at the same time, either of these two would represent a fundamental obstacle to realisation.

MĀYĀ AND LĪLĀ

One of the most important Sanskrit terms in the Hindu, Buddhist and Jain traditions : Māyā. Thinking in terms of the Indo-Germanic or (Indo-European) language family, this root can probably be traced back to a root triad m, ma-, ma-, meaning to enchant, to deceive, enchant, confuse, and other similar meanings.

The Greek equivalent of Māyā was Mageiā, later Magiā, and in Greco-Latin Magia. Magic is a common concept and word in virtually all European and European-derived languages, even if its approximate equivalent exists and is used in the host country.

In Sanskrit, Māyā corresponds to the general concept of magic and illusion, but in the Hindu, Buddhist and Jain traditions — and partly through their mediation in other traditions — it appears in a very specific sense. Its primary meaning here is also magic and illusion, but as Universal Existence-Magic, Universal Existence-Illusion, which is at the same time Universal Consciousness-Magic, Universal Consciousness-Illusion, that is, the Magic and Illusion of Universal Consciousness-Existence.

It is not a question — as we have already pointed out in other contexts — of there being no Realitas or Realitas Obiectiva, because the existence of these — namely their real existence — the traditional view never questioned this, but rather, on the one hand, that Realitas Obiectiva is not independent of consciousness at all, but rather exists exclusively through and within consciousness, and on the other hand, that Being, or rather Existence — Realitas Illusoria: real, but at the same time illusory Reality.

If we were to apply the notion that Everything is Different from Reality only to the infinitely Beyond-Being-Beyond-Non-Being Absolutum Metaphysicum, Metaphysicum Absolutum, then in comparison to this, no entity would be, or could be, real. Realitas Illusoria is not — decisively — related to the comparison between the Absolute and the Relative.

In general, we must say that everything that exists — truly and really exists. Even if it is a man-made or natural object, even if it is a mineral, a plant, an animal, a human being, a perception, an idea, a thought, objectivity, actionality, subjectivity. These are things — and they really exist. At the same time, their real existence is not only completely real, but also completely illusory. The contradiction apparent here is entirely superficial. To be illusory is, in fact, to be [means](#) to be enchanted by magic, in magic, as magic, and enchanted. Banal approaches that claim that beneath the "veil" of Māyā lies "true reality," entities in their true form, or some kind of undifferentiated and chaotically homogeneous fundamental reality, are mistaken. Even such eminent thinkers as Béla Hamvas did not always refrain from attempting such erroneous approaches.

The interpretation of *Māyā* as a veil is not incorrect if it is properly applied and interpreted. Such interpretations — sometimes even from the pens of otherwise significant and distinguished authors — are unfortunately mostly weak, and often completely wrong.

According to some, the root ma in Māyā is either the same root ma or is related to the root ma, which is the radical basis of the word maṭṛ, meaning mother. Ananda Kentish

Coomaraswamy also holds this view, and the inclusion of this meaning in the general meaning — not directly as mother or maternal, of course, but in any case, in such a way that the aspects of motherhood are present in principle: it significantly enriches the range of meanings close to the essence of both *Māyā* and *Matṛ*. In this regard, it should not be forgotten that the mother of Prince Gautama Siddhārtha, the bodhisattva, the later Śākyamuni-Samyak-Sam-Buddha, was named Mahā-Māyā, and this has a deep and lofty symbolism and significance: on the one hand, it derives from the Universally Great Magic, and on the other hand, it derives from the Lord of this Universally Great Magic.

The fact that the child prince and Bodhisattva's mother, Mahā-Māyā, dies on the eighth day after giving birth, suggests that the Bodhisattva breaks away from his dependence on the Universal Great Magic.

Māyā, as we have said, means above all the Universal Magic of Universal Consciousness: existence through magic, within magic, enchanted by magic. The power of Universal Magic is *Māyā-Śakti*, the feminine Power-Deity and Force-Deity. This Power and Force operates in the fullness of Universal Magic, but Power and Force are the Power-Force of the Magician, and the Magician is the Lord of Magic: the *Māyāvī-Māyēśvara* (*Māyā-Īśvara*). Dominion — the power possessed by the Ruler. *Śakti* is Power and Strength (as well as the one who represents it), *Śakta* possesses Power and Strength, He is the , He is the Ruler. Whichever of *Śakti* or *Śakta* we say, the other is always understood together with the one said.

Mahā-Māyā-Śakta — in the first degree — Mahā-Paramātmā — as Saguna-Mahā-Para-Brahma Īśvara-Trimūrti, that is, Mahā-Brahmā, Mahā-Vishnu, Mahā-Śiva.

Mahā-Māyā-Śakta — in the second degree — is Mahā-Paramātmā — as Saguna-Mahā-Para-Brahma Īśvara.

Mahā-Māyā-Śakta — in the third degree — Mahā-Paramātmā — as Nirguna-Mahā-Para-Brahma.

Mahā-Māyā-Śakta — in the fourth degree — Mahā-Paramātmā — as — Atiguna-Mahā-Para-Brahma Sadasat (Sat-Asat).

These degrees are, on the one hand, infinitely different from each other, and on the other hand, infinitely connected. The point is that Mahā-Māyā-Śakti-Śakta is in fact Mahā-Paramātmā, or Ātmā and Ātmātmikā, which manifests itself in my own Self-Selfhood. In other words, Mahā-Māyā-Śakti-Śakta — according to my first and ultimate essence — actually and potentially — I am Myself.

For now, I am magic, enchanted and creatura, but potentially I am the Magician and the Creator, and the Creator Creatoris.

There are states of being in which their long-term and meaningful purpose, that is, their teleologicum — if it exists at all — is so deep that it is incomprehensible. These states of being can rightly be called states of hypoteleologicum.

There are also states of existence in which the existence of a long-term meaningful purpose is very likely, and indeed, its necessity arises almost as a requirement. This is the level at which teleologies prevail. A long-term meaningful purpose may arise in relation to a human way of life or in the case of a man-made object. Clear answers can usually be given to questions relating to this. If we apply this to natural beings, such as plant or animal species, the seemingly legitimate questions, the answers — even with their possible inner knowledge — remain inexpressible: it is impossible to say what the long-term meaningful purpose of the red bouquet tree is, or what the long-term meaningful purpose of the mountain gorilla is, or even why such an animal exists at all. Here, teleology is not yet or no longer relevant, but the answer — if there is one — cannot be formulated.

However, there are states of existence or spheres of existence that transcend this — on the one hand their order of existence and, on the other hand, their power—above everything that has or should have a meaningful purpose in the long term. This is the plane of the hyperteleologicum and the hyperteleologica. The question of why something exists at all is not only unanswerable because it is inexpressible, but it is simply so. Total universality has neither a reason nor a meaningful purpose in the long term. Consequently, paradoxically, even that which has a purpose does not have a meaningful purpose in the long term. Realisation has an unconditional purpose, a meaningful purpose in the long term — but in the course of the fulfilled absolute of realisation, the goal disappears, the path taken also disappears, and it turns out that there was in fact neither path nor goal. (The Tao, for example, as Principium Principiorum is the unity of the Way and the Goal, but in such a way that this Way and this Goal — and their unity — in their transcendence and surpassing transcendence — never even existed.

Based on the principles of Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Metaphysica Universalis reject questions about the reason for the existence of the Total Universe — and through this, the various entities — and their long-term meaningful purpose. various entities, and the long-term meaningful purpose of the individual. However, , if the questioner is extremely persistent in his questions, he may receive a specific answer conceived in the teachings of Tantra, which he will only appreciate if it is truly of a high order. This answer to questions about the meaning of existence and beings is the Next: there is something from every game, every game, they play with everything and everyone, that is, the Player, the Master of the Game, plays.

The Game, *Līlā* — from another perspective — is approximately the same as Magic, *Māyā*, — and *Līlā-Māyā* and *Māyā-Līlā* are not entirely unknown terms either.

The Game may have rules, sometimes strict rules, which the Player generally obeys, even though nothing binds his infinite power and dominion.

There is nothing more joyful and nothing more serious than the joy and seriousness of the Game. The implementer must be aware of this — attitudinally — and must adhere to it.

The Player — *Līlāvī*, the Lord of Play, *Līlēśvara*, none other than the Magician — *Māyāvī*, the Lord of Magic — *Māyēśvara*: this is *Ātmā*, or Self. Potentially , even here and now, I am the Lord of the Universal Magic Game of conscious existence. I can actually be the Player-Magician and Lord of the Universal Magic Game of Conscious Existence if I lead myself back to myself through myself, completely and absolutely.

Either I am enchanted in the vortex of magic, or I am the Magician, the Master of Magic. Either they play with me — as an accessory or puppet of the Game — or I myself am the Player, the Master of the Game.

There is also an intermediate stage, but it is almost imperceptible: this is *Līlōnmukti* (Līlā-un-mukti) or *Māyōnmukti* (Māyā-un mukti).

Universal Play and Magic still take place within the cycle of Samsāra, but there is also Magic and Play beyond Universality.

The complete Bauddha-yāna can be divided into three levels: the first is Hīnayāna or Small Vehicle Vehicle, originally separated after the emergence of Thēravāda, extremely Thēravāda-following, although they never called themselves that. Here, the levels or degrees represent a circle. In essence, from a certain point of view, it can be summarised as follows: there is an infinite difference between Samsāra and (Pra-Nirvāna, Apari-Nirvāna, Pari-Nirvāna, Mahā-Pari-Nirvāna) due to the complete realisation of Nirvāna.

The next higher and more complete stage is Mahāyāna, the Universal Great Vehicle. Mahāyāna teaches the essential unity of Samsāra and Nirvāna, which, however, exists only from the perspective of Nirvāna "side".

An even higher level is Tantric Mahāyāna, or Vajrayāna, the Diamond Lightning Scepter Vehicle. Here, not only is the essential unity of Samsāra and Nirvāna stated from the perspective of Nirvāna, but also that this is obscured by Māyā, yet it goes beyond this and defines the task of Samsāra as Nirvāna, Nirvāna as Samsāra, and then Samsāra back into Nirvāna in a timeless transformation. This is already the realm of Magic and Play beyond Universality.

It has been mentioned that interpreting Māyā as a veil is generally a commonplace misunderstanding and a conveyance of this misunderstanding. Māyā's coverings and veils — when approached correctly — can be important and truly traditional interpretations.

Māyā — as Magic and Illusion — precisely on this basis, to use a metaphor, veils Samsāra — that is, the essential unity of the state beyond conditions, Deflammatio Metaphysica, making it nearly impossible to recognise this unity.

To use a completely different but essentially similar expression: the Samsāra aspect of my own Self Self-Self-ness and the Nirvāna aspect of my Self-ness — as a unity — is veiled from actual consciousness by Māyā.

Māyā — as Magic — is at once veiled, or creates a veil, which conceals my infinite Self from my actual and finite Self. Māyā, Magic and (in this case) the veil-like quality — obviously — I create myself in the background of my Self, From my own side, I deliberately and freely realise this forgetting, which is, however, a tragedy and fatality that is opaque to the current consciousness of my Self-Personality bound to my Own-Personality is transparent, but indirectly reveals itself as tragic and fatal.

I can and do distance myself from myself — on a divine level. Thus the god-human Avatars can manifest themselves in the earthly-human world. But as Myself

, I can and do not only distance myself from myself, but also break the continuity of consciousness between the two levels of consciousness; — I do not completely sever the continuity, — we could say: ontically, — but I break it: noetically. Continuity thus on the one hand, it becomes discontinuity, and on the other, quasi-continuity. The conscious connection does not cease completely, but the light of true consciousness no longer functions in this connection. Complete separation would be complete annihilation; this does not happen in the general establishment of the human form of existence (although this possibility does exist), but a relative and particular — yet high degree and great power—does indeed come about: this is the general earthly-human state of being and state of consciousness.

Demotion — at its root — can be nothing other than *a* perfectly conscious, deliberate and completely free, one might say — playful and magical *act*. This cannot be done from this side, should not be understood differently. From the other perspective, that of degradation, this is already a lapse, a fatal fall that defines the entire form of existence. Christianity's main lines of Christianity — as a transmitted and inherited error or, according to the general interpretation — sin, which Roman Catholic Christian theology tends to regard as concupiscentia, a propensity towards sin, which, however, in our view, is above all a clouding of consciousness, because it is always primary in relation to morally judgementable behaviour and the actions resulting from it.

The lapse did not happen to the person, but rather caused them to do something that required retribution on some level — but at its origin, at the beginning and the beginningless, it was different: it was a free act of divinity, arising from free will and complete perfect consciousness. At the very root — even more primordial than the Man of the Beginning — the Godhead was not Man, but Myself. Not human, not personal, but even more universal than the universal, which precedes even Ādām Qadmōn(i), Manu, or even Mahā-Manu.

Degradation and enchantment—although far from being synonymous—are closely related. Degradation is a concomitant of enchantment, and the greater the enchantment, the greater the degradation.

Vidyā, or metaphysical awareness, metaphysical knowledge, metaphysical vision, is the action-qualitative condition and means of liberation from enchantment. *Avidyā*, or metaphysical stupidity, metaphysical ignorance, metaphysical blindness — is also closely related to *Māyā*, but it is not identical with it. Generally speaking, humans — from the mildly oligophrenic to the genius, including both — experience the seven degrees of *avidyā* from the bottom up. is at the fifth level. (*Vidyā* also has seven levels, starting above the seventh level of *avidyā*, counted from the bottom.) The near-identification of *avidyā* and *Māyā* expresses a significant degree of ignorance and misunderstanding. *Māyā* is present even in some of the levels of *vidyā*, expressing the aspect of enchantment.

Essentially and potentially, I am the Lord of Divinity, enchantment and the Game. Currently — already and still — I am not that, but I am in it — enchanted — in the Enchantment, in the Game. I have enchanted myself. My task is — if this I make it my task to enchant myself by myself and through myself — by gradually taking control over Magic — becoming my Magical Self beyond Magic, — doing this and Auto-Reductio Absoluta are one and the same.

Between my own personality and my essential self — although they are more closely related than anything else closely connected (since these are gradations within myself) — there is — as it were, a "wedged-in" Pantholokosmos, — the totality, ensemble and unity of all Complete-Cosmos. I am within the Kosmoses and within a Kosmos — as part of them, but my Kosmos and all Kosmoses are within me as parts of my Self as part of them. My absolute Self — according to its centrality — is the transcendence of the Cosmos — the Hyperkosmiā —, the beyondness of the Cosmos — Metakosmiā, that is, I-Myself — in such a way that I am part of the Cosmos and the Kosmoses, and in such a way that the Cosmos-Cosmoses are within me, but first and foremost, in my ultimate essence, I am Hyperkosmiā — Metacosmic. The threefold relationship to cosmicity according to these: the determination of one's own threefold relationship (of which the highest, the third, is in fact no longer a relationship): the only adequate interpretation of relationships, and the one that most closely corresponds to the view espoused by proponents of the Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Universalis Metaphysica. Other interpretations may also perfectly valid if they do not essentially contradict what has been presented above. Superficial — mainly apparent — contradictions in wording can generally always be resolved and should be resolved, but even if this does not happen, there is still nothing reprehensible about it, and additions with different wording are to be welcomed. However, we cannot accept anything other than rejection of interpretations that contain fundamental contradictions and the aggressive and arrogant representation of this adherence cannot be accepted in any way other than rejection. Tolerance is an inherent part of the representation of the traditional view of existence, but this patience — although it is "long-suffering patience" — However, it is not unlimited, and even if it is not replaced by "impatience" in a given case, rejection must sometimes be applied decisively, especially when, in addition to violating principles, there is also a risk of a misleading effect.

The illusion aspect of Māyā is not unrelated to the dream world of deep sleep and the perceptual world of the waking state, as well as their relationship to each other . Dreaming sleep and the world of dreams — from a psychic-psychological point of view — differ significantly from the perceptual world of the waking state — but from an ontological perspective, the differences are not at all significant. There is no doubt that the general level of earthly human existence and consciousness is awake (although spiritually not really *awake*) bound to a certain level — dream-filled sleep is no longer strictly a *human* condition, even if it is experienced by humans and — apart from quite exceptional cases — is one of the conditions of human life. Consciousness in dreams is reduced, on the one hand, because the state of dreaming is fundamentally of a lower level, and on the other hand because this is not really a human state. Beyond these circumstances, the state of dreaming fluctuates much more in intensity than the equally fluctuating state of wakefulness.

All things considered, however, we must say that the dream world of dream-filled sleep is also a waking world — in a certain sense, this world also exists in reality, Realitas Obiectiva — of course, not as an "objective reality existing independently of or independently of consciousness", but experienced in consciousness and exclusively in consciousness — the objective reality of consciousness created, maintained, continuously transmuted and defined by the Subiectum. Just as in wakefulness The world of consciousness, perception, and anything else is, in a certain sense, a dream world, a world of dreams and illusions, but it is real, if not created by the Subiectum realised and defined objective reality of consciousness.

Without criticising the classical — Greek-derived — assertion that when awake, humans live in a shared human world, while in their dreams they live exclusively in their own inner, uniquely individual world, we must conclude that this statement — which is also accepted by traditionalists — is true only in relation to circumstances that can be grasped from the waking state — in terms of psychic-psychological expressibility — originally — certainly — as a result of considerations of this nature, probably not directed towards the most highly spiritual, and from a traditional perspective.

— In any case, this is the only acceptable way. The waking state is realised in the proprio-individualis — proprio-personalis world — and at the same time in the waking collectivitas world, just as dreams are realised in the proprio-individualis-propriopersonalis — dream — world, and — at the same time — in the dream collectivitas.

Of course, essentially, from a solipsistic point of view — outside my own conscious world-worlds, there are no other worlds, no other beings, certain states may exist in potentiality, in quasi-actuality and in full actuality. Even the extra-

Solipsistic psychology should not say anything else when asked whether someone speaking to me in a dream is actually me or not, other than

that essentially the other person who is speaking to me is also me, and I am also the listener, and otherwise the other person who is speaking to me — while maintaining the above — is indeed someone else, and I am only the conscious listener. However, even then, the proponent of this psychology

say anything different if the corresponding question were asked in relation to the waking world: if I meet someone and they speak to me, but is the speaker really someone else, or am I actually myself? From an extra-solipsistic and psychologistic position, one could only say that essentially this other person is also me, but in the direct and superficial reality of the moment

reality, the other person talking to me is really someone else, while I am really myself. Dreams are much more elastic, even more malleable, than the objective perceptual realities of waking perception.

This means that their establishment is not yet so

distance and indirectness, and therefore dream entities are — in general — less rigid entities. At the same time, we must be fully aware of the facts: not only in waking life, but also in the more malleable perception of dreams, we do not experience the

datation of perceptions, or even their datatio, but only their datum; and here there is no question of a creative-sustaining-transforming Subjectivity or actionality, only the

remnant consciousness of the observer, which is also remnant-like even within this.

Between the world of dreams and the waking world — there are many differences besides those mentioned above,

— none of which escape our attention — but there are even more similarities, and even correspondences, although this is not really important. What is important is that the similarities and correspondences are all related to higher and deeper explorations of reality and consciousness, while the differences are related to external and superficial aspects.

If someone says that they walked through meadows, valleys and mountains in their dream, and someone else replies, "That's not true, because I saw you lying here in your bed," the respondent is foolish. The appropriate response would be: surely that is so, because the reality of dreams is true reality. In my waking state — which is also a kind of dream — I experienced you lying here in bed. Neither statement is true.

substantial and qualitative advantage over the other. A consistent adherent of a radically solipsistic view of existence — he goes considerably further than this before concluding his arguments, to avoid the development of an absurd polemic under such circumstances.

No representative of a purely psychological orientation could be so captivated by the most naive vulgar realism to such an extent that they fail to notice the differences between the perceptual world of dreams and

the perceptual world of wakefulness — despite the differences, and even in spite of them close similarities, and even correspondences, between the perceptual world of dreams and the perceptual world of wakefulness. Indeed, it could not be, but nevertheless, with a few exceptions, virtually all practitioners of psychology, the great names of the "profession," are bound to this naive vulgar realism, in the sense of captivity, , almost all of the great names in the profession, regardless of which school or branch of psychology they follow.

Some psychological schools of thought attach extreme importance to dreams and draw far-reaching conclusions from their analysis about the personality, character and state of mind of the person being analysed, and the nature of these. state of mind, and their nature. Such conclusions can indeed be drawn with varying degrees of validity . Much less attention is paid to the events experienced by the person being examined, the people they meet — or if they do pay attention to these things, it is only to take the circumstances into account, but they are not analysed, and no complex and far-reaching conclusions are drawn from them. This is wrong, because these are far from independent — either symbolically or concretely — from personality, character, and mental and spiritual state. It is precisely by examining the older, more rigid, deeper layers that it would be possible to gain a detailed and comprehensive understanding of the life of the person being studied. knowledge, while dreams, though also old, are nevertheless less old, less rigid, more flexible and malleable, and are of eminent importance when examining the less profound layers.

However, with regard to what is most alive, a deep and sharp consideration of momentary thinking could provide the most reliable information, but psychology does not deal with real thinking at all. During "ability tests", it can be concluded from the solution of tasks requiring mathematical-logical skills that the person in question would be able to solve the same tasks a second time — this can be determined primarily, and secondarily that they would probably be able to solve similar tasks . This tells us nothing about true thinking ability, not to mention thinking, which psychology does not deal with at all . If thinking does come up, it is immediately referred to as "skills that can be observed in chimpanzees", followed by task-solving thinking, which is the real thinking is, in fact — with a slight exaggeration — almost a degeneration.

To dream something in advance is not so different from the events of the day appearing in the dreams that follow them, the former being "extraordinary" and interesting, the latter "ordinary" and self-evident, without any lacking in interest. The root of these is not in dreams or in wakefulness, but in a much deeper and higher background, the hidden Heteron, but above all, in the sphere of action of the actual Auton. In summary, we can say the

following:

Both the external empirical world of the waking state and the internal imaginative empirical world of the waking state, as well as the empirical world of dreams and the world of narcotics...

The world of empirical states provoked by psychedelics is objectively real, but it is the real world of conscious objectivity defined by the Subiectum and existing exclusively in consciousness; at the same time, all these worlds are illusory, dreamlike worlds, regardless of the significant differences between them. The world of the empiria of all states of consciousness: real and illusory. The world of all and any states of consciousness and the empiria and empiricism: the Universal Magic — Sarva-Mahā-Māyā — and the

Universal Play — Sarva-Mahā-Līlā, and their existence is thereby and thereby, and thereby and thereby.

The existence of my own personality is also a reality produced by Māyā, and its difference from Autauton is also realised by Māyā. Heteron — although essentially an illusion, and in fact Auton — as long as it exists — despite its illusory nature — is a solid reality that should not be disregarded. The Heteron — unrecognised Auton, but until this realisation occurs: an illusory reality of enormous power. Heteron's most powerful, strongest and most dangerous aspect: the unexperienced and inexperienceable Heteron, whose existence can only be known indirectly, but whose nevertheless manifests itself in its effects — both indirectly and almost directly. The Heteron — in its totality — is much more powerful than the Auton consciousness bound to My Own Person, yet it is this Auton consciousness that, connected to its origin, is capable of eliminating the illusory reality and power of the Heteron, because in this it becomes clear that the Heteron is in fact an unrecognised Auton, whose Heteron-ness ceases to exist upon recognition.

Not only the uniqueness of Auton, but also the uniqueness of the Self-Person is an important thesis of the autologia-autosophia chapter of Hyperphilosophia Metaphysica Traditionalis, yet at the same time, the ontological rank of these two differs fundamentally. The Auton manifests itself in the Self-Person — consciously and consciously. Here, at this level, it can be experienced for the first time — understood from below — and, of course, the awakening of Auton-consciousness makes the Self-Person into the Self-Person, my own Self-Person.

The Auton-consciousness that flares up in my Own-Person — as a level of identification — does not yet mean the possession of the Māyēśvara-Līlēśvara levels — as levels above Existence: this is obvious, it only means the possession of the potentiality for this. In other words, not yet having realised it, I cannot say that I am God. God is beyond the first and beyond the last. opportunity, in fact, power opportunity, and potentia, potentialitas or potentialitas actually means this. Potentialitas is not yet possibilitas (potentialitas actuabilis, and possibilitas is not yet virtualitas) realisation according to power (possibilitas actuabilis), but virtualitas is not necessarily productualitas and præactualitas, and even the latter is not actualitas itself. In fact, we should not be talking about whether God exists or not. For God is not only beyond Existence and Non-Existence, but also Being-Being and Non-Being-Being and their unity, and even their theticum and anti-theticum. However, if we were to attempt to make a statement of a highly particular and relative nature within the realm of existence, we could say that it is not correct to say that God exists, and even less correct to say that God does not exist. it is more correct to say: God's existence is a possibility. He exists when his existence is realised. The power to realise this possibility lies within me; indeed, I am this possibility. God exists when it is realised, if I myself realise it. If I realise it above existence, then it is above existence and non-existence.

States beyond states do not wait for the realiser to "arrive". They are not like the topoi of the world, which can be reached, at least at first glance, because upon closer examination of this issue, it turns out that the as-yet-unperceived and the as-yet-unimagined, nor the as-yet-unthought place — say, the home of a friend's home — do not actually exist. If we think about it, then it exists conceptually — on the plane of thought; if we imagine it, then it also exists imaginatively; and if we see it, experience it, then it also exists experientially. However, independent of all this, there is not even a topos, let alone realities beyond the ultimate and beyond reality, which differ from the apparent

, only exist when we realise them by achieving them.

Nirvana — Deflammatio Immanentali-Transscendentalis et Transscendentali-Immanentalis Metaphysica Absoluta — is not a latent objective reality that exists (also) independently of consciousness (as nothing does), which secretly "waits" for its realiser, but rather a Suprastatus transactionalis, which is beyond attainment, realisation beyond realisation, but only existed as a possibility of power. The

The existence, validity and terminological legitimacy of potentiality are indisputable, and its conceptual application is not essential in every context, but unfortunately, it is very often — without any real basis — confused with potentiality, even though these are two different concepts.

without any real basis — with potentiality, even though these are two different conceptual realities. Here and in the following, we place great emphasis on the fact that these two concepts and terms should always be used interdistinctively, especially considering that potentiality plays an eminent role in the approaches of

Ontologia Hyperphilosophica, even more so than potentia in the Aristotelian-based theologico-philosophia et philosophico-theologia scholastica thomistica, and of course, in a significantly different interpretation.

Māyā-vāda and — closely related to it — Līlā-vāda are not only organically significant doctrinal and practical parts of Hindu and Buddhist Tantra-vāda and Tantrayāna, but also of the entire Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Universalis Metaphysica and its

a central-axial set of assumptions based on the principles of the philosophy of existence. Within the framework of the Traditionalitas interpretation we represent, the consequences of these teachings appear to be of even greater importance than the general concepts of Traditonalitas, with a radical, partly because the proponents of extreme Guénonianism would like to treat these closely praxis-related teachings as secondary and — if not

deny them, but — push them into the background and keep them there. — However, we emphasise the paramount importance of Māyā and Līlā-vāda much more because — in our opinion — these and their consequences most strongly represent the increasingly almost obligatory intransigence of Radicalitas

Traditionalis, which is becoming increasingly obligatory, and also because the indispensable philosophical and, above all, hyperphilosophical theourgo-magico-solipsismus is most closely and truly inseparably — explicitly interconditionalis — related to these teachings.

The author of these lines briefly refers to Béla Hamvas's study entitled Māyā, in which he makes the critical comments in the sense described above. This article appeared in issue III of ARKHÉ, a quarterly journal on traditional philosophy.

CONSCIOUS ACTION AND ITS SCOPE

Based on the principles of Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Universalis Metaphysica is a hyper-philosophical view of existence that can express its gnōseological, ontological, axiological and, above all, metaphysical position in philosophical terms — as

Metidealismus Immanentali-Transscendentalis et Transscendentali—Immanentalis Theourgo-Magico-Solipsisticus Absolutus.

This designation, due to its inherent explanatory intent, is rather long and may seem "sea serpent-like" to the maliciously uncomprehending, but nevertheless we must accept it, because it alone expresses everything that — quite simply — cannot and must not be omitted if we want to use philosophical terms — with a certain requirement for definition — to describe our hyperphilosophical view of existence. Thus, from this interpretation approaching our overly long designation, we must still consider it short, and note that from a hyper-philosophical point of view, we are reluctant to accept the designation "-ism", at most it can be considered a compromise made for the sake of philosophical worldview "classification" for the sake of compromise. The pneumatology of Hyperphilosophia Metaphysica Traditionalis, defined by the above-mentioned philosophical , but also from a praxeological point of view, pays special attention to conscious action, conscious acts, and conscious functions. Conscious functions are — in part — related to the human form of existence, namely:

1.1. thinking

1.2. imagination and perception

1.3. perception

2.0 feeling

3.0 willing (will)

99.99% of people spend most of their waking hours experiencing conscious processes that, although part of the human condition, are not truly human in nature, but rather subhuman consciousness experienced at the human level, with very little reality. consciousness. This combination of states and processes is the automatic spontaneous flow of associations : a chaotic and dull swirling of monological processes, words, thoughts, images, and inner gestures. This automatically expressed spontaneity is the opposite of free spontaneity. Heteron forces maximally dominate consciousness processes. If they were to gain even more control, it would correspond to a loss of self-awareness or falling asleep.

The Indo-Hindu Yōga tradition — in Sanskrit — calls the states of consciousness that dominate the above-mentioned condition Ksīpta and Mūḍha. The word Ksīpta literally means thrown or cast. Ervin Baktay — acceptably — translates it as castness. The commonly alert state of consciousness also belongs to this circle, but it is characterised by

restless inner turmoil and a lack of true alertness. Mūdhā means dull confusion. These two levels of consciousness dominate in the automatic, spontaneous flow of associations, but although Kṣipta also has a very strong meaning, it is mainly Mūdhā that plays a decisive role. (Incidentally, it should be noted that these two functional states are also the most pronounced and dominant in dreams.)

In the strictest sense of the word, the automatic, spontaneous flow of associations cannot be considered a truly conscious mental process, although in a broader sense it certainly is. This state and process is not only an unambiguous expression of a serious inner state, but also carries an aggravating pathological and toxic force. Incidentally — as will be discussed later — if in life the Kṣipta and especially the Mūdhā dominates, and these will probably also be dominant in the final phase of life. If these are the determining forces in the final phase of life, then they will most likely also be dominant in the terminal moments, leading to a death whose conscious transition and survival are highly doubtful. The forced mental attention that is characteristic of attempts to learn subjects that do not interest the student, who is probably already tired, is also one of the most damaging processes. It is not as damaging as *assotiatio automatistica*, but — due to its tiring nature — perhaps even more harmful. Associative automatisms are no longer tiring; they are so much a part of the processual turmoil on the conveyor belt of Heteron forces that, with the cessation of resistance, the accompanying feeling of fatigue also disappears. On the other hand, sleepy dullness and may even intensify.

We have already mentioned in passing that problem-solving thinking can be considered, with some exaggeration, but only some, a degeneration or degeneration of thinking. Task-solving thinking belongs to the lowest levels of *Ratio Discursiva* and, as a functional quality, has more negative than positive aspects. It is undoubtedly thinking, but it is the unchangeable dregs of thinking.

Thinking related to the higher levels of *Ratio Discursiva* is real, valid and valuable thinking, but it is — in any case — a mental functionality that must be surpassed, and — this is also a positive aspect — can be surpassed. Rational and discursive thinking, compared to all lower levels and functionalities, but in relation to all higher levels beyond this, it carries hindering and retarding forces. It cannot simply be abandoned or rejected, and if someone tries to do so, they will go astray. It must be overcome — in a way that is also a transcendence.

There is no such thing as "ideally" perfect and completely clear rational-discursive thinking. Even the clearest rational-discursive thinking is inventive thinking. We could also say that it is somewhat reduced inventive thinking, or somewhat reduced invention. *Inventio* — in our terminology — is what is usually referred to as the highest degree of *intuio*. (For us, *intuio* is an almost superhuman qualitative ability and, at the same time, an act.) *Inventio* is, in our formulation, a downgraded *intuio*.

Rational-discursive thinking is almost antithetical to intuitive-intellectual (super-rational) thinking, but nevertheless: the former follows from the latter, and although the latter is, so to speak, dead within the former, the former implies the seeds of the latter.

rational-discursive thinking—since it is not truly and directly living thinking, as opposed to that from which it arises—produces lifeless, almost dead thoughts. The Thoughts that are born die immediately after their birth. Thoughts are the cadavers of the living thoughts of higher thinking. Thinking that cannot truly living, originate from living thought; thoughts that are dead are the are the dying, dead, miscarried products of the living thoughts of living thinking. The enlivening of thinking — and thus the enlivening of thoughts — is one of the tasks of the spiritually striving individual tasks, once he has truly begun to think, once his conscious by a flood of associative automatisms, if they can already control their thinking, and if they possess a truly high degree of rational discursivity and dialectics at a high level. Behind individual-personal thinking, and indeed above living thinking and behind it, there is a flow of quasi-universal thinking above thinking, a world thinking.

The representatives of Steinerian anthroposophism are quite remarkable in this regard. They made observations that are entirely acceptable up to this point — almost without exception.

We also accept the existence of a worldview that transcends individuality and personality, that transcends life and thought — not only on the basis of conclusions, but also on the basis of certain experiences — but we consider this to be only a very high degree , above which even higher levels are possible. At an even higher level, it turns out that world thinking is also my thinking, — in the in the sense of the solipsistic conception of existence.

This is not accepted by the followers of Steinerian anthroposophy, who profess the existence of multiple essential Selves and many essential Selves in the ultimate sense, and who, while maintaining their worldview, cannot accept it, but we are unwilling to accept essential polyegomicity or poly-egoniā, and thus the partial and relative agreement that existed with regard to the former comes to an end here.

Thinking is a spiritual function and action. The Spirit (Pneuma, Spiritus, Geist) is the highest member of the human tripartite division — trichotomy. The Spirit — according to an approximate ad hoc quasi-definition used by us: Subiectum in Actu. So it is not not substantia or subsistentia, but the (self-determining) act of the Subiectum, that is, the more it is Subiectum, and the more it is Actus, and the more it is in Actu, the more it is Spiritus.

The Spirit stands above thinking, and also above world thinking, which is above thinking.

I always think — through my own Spirit — as myself. Thinking (and other conscious functions) has a very complex, closely physical bodily basis. The carriers in this case are the body, more specifically the nervous system, the central nervous system, the brain, and the functions of the cerebral cortex. It is not the organs that are the carriers, but the bodily-organ system-organ functions. The very act of carrying out strictly physical bodily functions is extremely complex, much more complex than even the most daring assumptions would suggest. This carrying out is distinctly indirect. The strictly physical bodily functions—as carriers—directly carry aithēr functions, which in turn carry astral carriers, and the astral carriers — in several "layers" — carry spiritual functions, and only these carry the actual processes of consciousness, consciousness functions, including thinking.

Thinking is therefore not a physical, nervous system, central nervous system, brain, or cerebral cortex function; it never has been and never will be. At the same time, talk about the connection between consciousness functions — including thinking — and their continuously increasing, increasingly intense carrier functions. In other words, thinking — as a function — increasingly relies on the multi-layered spiritual functions that carry it, becoming increasingly attached to them, and these, as carrier functions, become increasingly attached to the astral carrier functions carrier functions, the astral carrier functions to the aetheric carrier functions, and these in turn to the complex physical-nervous system-brain-cerebral cortex carrier functions.

The existence of carriers and their use is not negative in itself. However, forced attachment — almost to the point of fusion — is clearly negative. It is like a hussar who grows attached to his horse. This, of course, is the it also means that consciousness functions share in the fate of their carriers. In this regard, we cannot ignore what is perhaps most important: the level of conscious identification. If identification is deeply connected to the inner nature of physicality, then after biological death, the individual preservation of consciousness and awareness may gradually fade away, and will probably disappear.

The Self-Self cannot directly experience the Self-Self through experience — for this some kind of mirror, reflection, or mirror image is also necessary. Not so that it can look in the mirror and say, "That is me," but so that it can look in the mirror, see its reflection, and then point to itself and say, "Yes, that is me, and that is who I am."

Thinking has this mirror-like function, that I-Myself I-Myself I can grasp it as my thinking self. However, the thinker — generally cannot truly and directly think of itself, — but only through the thinking of something else. Reflective thinking thus becomes increasingly reflected thinking. In the life of consciousness-awareness, everything thus becomes increasingly indirect and increasingly reflected.

Thinking is by no means the strongest function of consciousness, but it is undoubtedly — despite all its indirectness — relatively the least indirect, or — we could even say — the most direct (especially the comprehension function of thinking).

Less indirectness also means that, in general, Auton-activitas is most prevalent in thinking, although Heteron-presence is also significant here, the latter's activity in thinking is much weaker than in imagination and perception, which occur in an intertwined manner, or in the so-called external in perception, perhaps in feeling or even in desire. which only manifests itself indirectly.

Consciousness is always magical in nature. Thinking is also magical. The thinker — in a limited sense, of course — is actually a magician. Thinking — in its living form much more so than otherwise — is a magical act of creation. In the strict sense of the word, we cannot yet speak of true magic here, but magic is nevertheless present. obviously not talking about real magic here, yet magic appears in all essential forms of thinking, even in rational-discursive thinking. In thinking, I am also enchanted by magic, but I am also a limited co-magician (essentially, I am the Magician, but I do not yet experience this here).

Thinking bound to physical carriers — functional carriers — in the mind

It can be localised; it seems as if thinking takes place there, deep inside the head, around the centre of the head. (Another question is that the whole world, together with my body and head, is in my consciousness.) Thinking is completely "airy", thoughts are also volatile.

Voluntary imagination and perception can also be localised in the head, slightly further forward, still in the head, but closer to the forehead. Imagination — even voluntary — are much less subtle than thoughts.

Unintentional, spontaneous imagination and perception can be located in the forehead, almost in line with the longitudinal axis of the eyes.

Unfortunately, these images are generally much more vivid and real than those that are deliberately created or evoked.

External and sensory perception is related to what is in front of me, outside my head. The intensity of perception can be deliberately influenced, but the nature of perception cannot. Banal Solutions are possible — I can close my eyes, put cotton wool in my ears and nostrils, refrain from touching things, and limit the effects of heat — but I cannot change much about the nature of perception.

The external world of perception was created by a much higher and deeper form of thinking, imaging and willing than can be grasped on an individual, personal level. However, this does not justify views associated with the most vulgar naive realism.

Extreme vulgar naive realism is caused, on the one hand, by the weakness of the intensity of self-experience and, on the other hand — not independently of this — by the over-reflective and non-animated nature of thinking, the lifelessness of perception, and the

Perception — in itself — does not evoke any ontological or epistemological worldview, either on a philosophical or sub-philosophical level. However, perception is never functional exclusively on its own. Perception, which is intertwined with and mixed with thinking, yet still separate from it, already "interprets" the world through thinking. The deepest stupidity is not vulgarly naive realism, but a complete lack of worldview; it "interprets" and observes, but its "interpretation" is so low-level that it cannot really be considered interpretation. Naive realism requires a higher level of low level of "interpretation" is required, and here a worldview beneath the worldview is actually formed.

Thought — "ideologically" — can reach much higher than actual self-experience and the actual relationship between thought and perception. In other words, it is quite possible for someone to be He is a "subjective idealist", even a solipsist in terms of his declarations, while remaining a "practising" naive realist. Not in his views or outlook, but in his way of seeing and observing.

A perfect view of existence is essential, but it is never sufficient; it must be complemented by (at least relative) perfection in the contemplation of existence.

Every self-correcting and lengthy transmutation requiring careful preparation must begin with the transmutation of thinking — and within that, my thinking nature — must begin with the transmutation of thinking. This was not always the case, but it is so today, and in the future — if the possibilities are not exhausted

. It is obvious that after this beginning, the correction and transformation of the other functions of consciousness — at least in an adequate manner — cannot take place without without significant progress in thinking. For this, it is necessary that thinking be truly thinking, at least in accordance with discursive rationality. Cogitatio philosophica is the most appropriate "pre-schooling" for this. (In our opinion, thinking about simple, man-made objects in a concentrated manner can only be designated as a task after the general existence of real thinking has been ensured. It is completely ridiculous for followers of anthroposophy to conduct "Schulung" thinking exercises with people who are not really used to thinking at all.

Mathematical thinking is, from a spiritual point of view, completely ambiguous. It is possible for two mathematicians of the same age, say, in similar positions at a research institute, to achieve excellent results of similar value. It may be that one of them experiences his own mathematical thinking in such a way that it becomes a valid spiritual preparation for his spiritual path, while the other, while achieving outstanding results, deals with mathematics in such a way and with such inner experiences that this occupation does not help him in any way, and may even set them back spiritually in all essential respects.

These dangers and possibilities exist everywhere, but nowhere are they as pronounced as in the field of mathematical thinking.

Among thinking abilities, individual qualitative differences are significantly more important than, for example, differences in perception (the "sharpness" of the senses does not play a role in this regard). This is not unrelated to the fact that thinking — in both a positive and negative sense — is primarily a human ability.

We cannot say that animals do not think at all, but they are incapable of what is specifically human thinking. A gorilla, chimpanzee or orangutan that is ten times more intelligent gorilla, chimpanzee or orangutan would be and remain ten times more intelligent, but it would not become truly human, at most it would become human-like in some superficial particularities.

The consciousness of animals is inspired from above. The individual level of consciousness is low, but the source of inspiration is high.

However, there can be little doubt that animals feel. Human emotions — Obviously, animals do not merely perceive, they also have real emotional feelings. The so-called higher animals have much more of these than the so-called lower animals: gorillas much more so than individual nematodes.

The most powerful of the functions of consciousness is desire or will. It is present in everything, but never directly. In the sphere of initiation and even higher operations, will has the greatest significance; asceticism is always primarily a matter of will. Transmutation in desire and will can only begin with the transmutation of the will operating in thought . Will is directly — initially — and for a very long time — unmanageable. Will cannot be experienced directly. Its presence in everything — indirectly —

, but its directness is shrouded in complete darkness. There are no direct exercises of will; but exercises of action — indirectly, of course — are nevertheless directed towards this . The asceticism of willfulness in thinking must precede the exercises of action and will, and if this does not happen, it can have far-reaching and dangerous consequences of titanization.

Feelings — currently, they are captive to emotionality, almost without exception and almost always. However, true intuition has two aspects: intellectual-rational and emotional. Intuition is always understanding and feeling together. Otherwise, feeling is emotional. This is so true that emotion and feeling are mutually synonymous, which is — essentially — completely wrong and erroneous, and leads to the most complete misunderstandings.

Feelings cannot be directly involved in the exercises. They must first be deprived of their emotional nature, which in turn must be preceded by progress made in the line of thinking. Direct feeling operations will be partly unsuccessful and partly cause deviations. The "practice of love" is dangerous in this respect. Love — like hatred — is a completely emotional feeling, and usually turns into its opposite, since in this respect it is the emotional nature of the feeling that is essential, not whether it is love or hatred. The militant advocates of love — precisely in this context — are, without exception, militant haters, whom it is best to avoid, along with their "practices".

It is advisable to first correct, treat and transform thinking in terms of its content. Only when significant progress has been made in this regard can we move on to the gradual separation of speech and thinking.

The completely mixed and mixing consciousness functions and their accompanying functions must be separated from each other, each must be perfected and transmuted separately, and then, after reaching a certain degree, they must be reunited in the sense of an explosion. must be reunited. The process of separation and reunification can be repeated several times. This is similar to the process of gender separation. Men must eliminate all feminine traits from themselves, while women must eliminate all traits associated with masculinity. Here, too, a "blasting apart" must reunite man and woman: for the realisation of the Androgyne.

The transmutation of consciousness functions leads to complete transmutation, and the transmutation of consciousness functions leads to the transmutation of thinking.

The revitalising correction and transformation of thinking is closely related to the radical transformation of the relationship between thinking and its carrier functions. The elimination of "fusion" is is of particular importance in this regard.

The most fundamental stages of transformation are: *consideratio*, *concentratio*, *meditatio*, and *contemplatio*. How do these differ from the following *Yōga-Sādhanas*: *pratyāhāra*, *dhāraṇa*, *dhyāna*, and *samādhi*? Let us take concentration as an example. This is either thought, or image formation, or perception, or sensation, or volition, but *dhāraṇā*, even at its lowest level, starts from the reunification of all these. *Yoga Sādhanas* are based on the full participation of the Self. From this point of view, yoga is always spiritual, at least primarily. *Hatha Yoga* starts from a physical-mental-spiritual totality, where the suspension of breathing and heart function for an unlimited period of time, while maintaining the highest level of awareness, is not considered a high achievement, but a prerequisite.

unlimited duration — while maintaining the highest level of alertness — was not considered a high achievement, but a prerequisite. Byāyāma-Prayōga — that is, the pre-yoga of Hatha Yoga's pre-yoga, ensured this from the outset. Byāyāma-Prayōga also had much more serious prerequisites than those ever approached by the "Yoga Gurus" found in the West or even in the East. "Yoga Gurus" ever approached.

The Yōga Centres, which are represented in the West and also operate with considerable publicity in the East

— by their very nature — can be nothing other than counterfeit, or — even worse than counterfeit — centres of contrainitiatio and contra-realificatio.

Every path has its dangers, even the path of thought, although — undoubtedly — this path has the fewest potential dangers. It is certain, however, that even the slightest tendency toward psychopathy is sufficient for the development of a serious psychosis . In this respect, any "practice" can be a dangerous activator, even any of the practices related to thinking, although such practices are still relatively the most harmless.

All things considered, the initial primacy of the path of thought must always be emphasised: a guru, a master, or at least a guide is necessary, except in very exceptional cases.

DEATH AND IMMORTALITY

The problem of death and immortality is only irrelevant to those who, apart from the Arhats, do not even understand what it is all about due to their dullness. Otherwise, it is one of the most important issues, if not the most important among all existential and essential questions.

With regard to the *Mysterium Mortis et Immortalitatis*, the *Centrum Mysterii* cannot be discussed because there are no words to express it. The *Ratio Discursiva* can only touch upon , the *Intuitio Intellectualis* can penetrate this circle, but the *Centrum* can only be The Realiser can achieve it, but even the Realiser does not speak of that which — for lack of words — must remain hidden. The essence of this problem cannot be revealed or explained; in fact, there is nothing that can be said about it. For this reason, only relatively external—but still quite internal—issues can be addressed, primarily those derived from the *Traditionalitas Integra*.

Materialistic atheism and spiritualism explicitly deny the immortality of man and his spiritual soul, and even the existence of the latter. According to this view, the existence and life of the human individual coincide, beginning with biological conception and ending with biological death. This view has many more adherents than the declared materialist views.

Most religions, including Christian denominations, profess and teach the continuation of human life after death. Some speak of Heaven, Hell, Purgatory, *Limbus Infantium*, and the now "defunct" *Limbus Patrum*, as in Roman Catholics either reject Purgatory, as most Protestants do, or others, such as Eastern Orthodox Christians, do not accept Purgatory, but instead speak of places and stages of warning trials — the telonions. Protestants, incidentally, generally do not accept the *Limbus Infantium* either, and they also do not attribute any special theological significance to the *Limbus Patrum*, nor do they generally attribute any particular theological significance. Some of the neo-Protestant denominations, but also some — sometimes prominent — theologians of the historical Protestant denominations, adhere to a peculiar view.

This view has two — in principle different, but in practical terms almost identical — consequences. — There are different versions. One is hypno-psychism, whose proponents believe that when a person dies, they "fall asleep", meaning that their spirit-soul falls asleep along with their body. Then, when the body is resurrected, the whole person is resurrected, and at that moment the spiritual soul also awakens from a sleep deeper than any sleep. A more extreme position is taken by the proponents of thnētopsychnismus, who believe that death affects the affects the whole person completely, the soul and spirit (the spiritual soul) die completely together with the body, but at the resurrection the whole person is resurrected, and after the Last Judgement , however, eternal and complete death awaits the damned. There is also a line of thought that those who have received a blood transfusion will either not be resurrected at all, or they will be resurrected but will be damned and destroyed. What is certain, however, is that those who go to Heaven , at most they can be the saved of the New Earth, but even that is unlikely.

Spiritualism — it would be more accurate to say hypnoparapsychism — has developed into numerous schools of thought. They generally do not deny the existence of Heaven or Hell, and sometimes even Purgatory, but it is not these that are of real significance to them, but rather the Afterlife in general. They distinguish between many

levels of the afterlife, and it is possible to reach the higher ones after achieving sufficient "development". Every level can be surpassed. Some branches of spiritualism reject the possibility of reincarnation, others do not rule out this possibility, while still others explicitly profess themselves to be believers in reincarnation.

The vast majority of occultist or occultistic movements—although there are exceptions—are strongly reincarnationist. Those occultistic movements that have associated themselves with some form of Orientalism are militant reincarnationists.

Apparently, all of these movements accept one, two, three, or more fateful destinies. The followers of the view of existence based on the principles of *Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Universalis Metaphysica* do not reject any of these possibilities, going so far as to absolve them, but they do not accept any of them to the point of completeness.

Manifestations of rationalised single, double or multiple fatalism can be found in all of them; proponents of the traditional view dislike both rationalisation and extreme fatalism. Materialists completely rule out immortality, while adherents of spiritualism and various occult movements rule out complete death, including absolute annihilation. These are the two extremes, but those who represent the middle ground also believe in a dual or multiple destiny. Proponents of reincarnationism consider the law of reincarnation as absolute; this law allows some people, upon reaching a certain level of development — to step out of the cycle of successive reincarnations. (Sometimes this is referred to — in an oversimplified manner — as Nirvana.)

The traditional view is capable of taking into account a wide variety of possibilities, while at the same time

With regard to "post mortem" possibilities, it also highlights the alternatives for selection and implementation.

Post mortem possibilities can be divided into two broad categories. One is called *Pitṛ-Yāna*, which is the Way of the Father or Fathers, or in a broader sense, the Way of the Ancestors. There are those who are so attached to their physical functional carriers that after death their consciousness is extinguished almost immediately. Strictly speaking, they do not even reach *Pitṛ-Yāna*

with full effect. There are those who more or less survive their own death, but their conscious powers gradually diminish, they experience their own incorporation into a regenerative tribe, the Tribe of the Ancestors (or *Áhrahám Kebelé*), and experience the incorporation of their own powers into the process of regeneration, but their self-awareness eventually fades away, also gradually.

There are those who retain their self-awareness much longer, but even they slowly integrate into the Tribe of Ancestors and Regenerations, and their individual self-awareness gradually fades away.

Dēva-Yāna is the Divine Path or the Path of the Gods. The prerequisite for this is the realisation of the initiation of Consciousness, either in the general process of life, before death, or immediately around the moment of death. Self-Consciousness does not fall asleep, but enters into different *Lōkas*, Worlds, where it can attain — through realisation — relative-particular, that is, *aiōni* immortality (which we could also call *aiōn* mortality). These worlds have neither a temporal beginning nor a temporal end. They are not created and destroyed in time — in *tempore* — but — *cum tempore* — together with time. Nevertheless they do have a beginning and an end, even though they are eternal in time.

It is also possible that, after wandering through the Lōkās, Consciousness does not enter any of them, but reaches the Nara-Lōkā, the Human World, in its entirety, but first its otherworldly aspect and levels. It is possible to enter into this — not as an earthly human being — but it is also possible to give in to the need for earthly birth. At the moment of occult conception prior to conception, this The wandering consciousness dies out, but it passes on everything it can pass on to an incarnation.

Finally, there is a possibility that stands out even from the circle of Dēva-Yāna. This is the realisation of absolute, timeless, eternal Immortality in Metaphysical Awakening. This can be realised in life: this is called Jivan-Mukti; it can happen on the border between life and death: this is Jiva-Vidēha-Mukti; but it can also be realised post mortem: this is Vidēha-Mukti. Here there is no beginning, no end, neither in time nor with time.

It can be considered a mystery "how much" is destroyed in those whose consciousness disappears. In the context of Yōga doctrines, there is also talk of complete, one might say absolute annihilation, this is Nirguna-Mūla-Prakṛti-Laya, Dissolution in the Root Nature of the Non-Qualified. The Root Nature without Quality — as Potentia Passiva Pura — is, from the point of view of reality, Nothingness itself. Destruction in this sense is true destruction. The fading consciousness is not completely destroyed in this sense.

The doctrine of reincarnation is not, in fact, a traditional doctrine. Hindu, Buddhist, Jain, and other Eastern traditions are *not* based on the principle of reincarnation. In line with Western expectations, the export and import of Hinduism and Buddhism are, of course, militant and belligerent advocates of the most vulgar form of reincarnationism. The misunderstanding of certain doctrines—several different complex doctrines—the mixing of egalitarianism and evolutionism with these misunderstandings, compounded by the aforementioned export-import vulgarisations of Eastern teachings, formed the basis of the reincarnationism of the occultist movements that developed in the last century.

The radical rejection of vulgar reincarnationism is, so to speak, "mandatory" for adherents of a view of existence based on the principles of Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Universalis Metaphysica. At the same time, the acceptance of subtle and nuanced reincarnationism is also completely foreign to the traditional view.

Just as the thought products of unrevived thinking "die" upon their birth after their birth, so do human beings die. A thought is never reborn, but the living thought that generates the thought process does not die in thoughts, nor does the life residue in the dying thought die, but participates in the thought-generating processes. When individual "A" dies, another "A" is not reborn — "B". To assume such a thing is quite simply nonsense.

The Sanskrit terms that are usually translated as "rebirth" or "reincarnation" — such as "punarjanman" and "punarutpatti" — refer much more to regeneration and relapse than reincarnation.

Regeneration, relapse, and relapse are very much at stake. What is generated and what is reborn? First and foremost, the thirst for existence and the tendencies, inclinations and characteristics associated with it. The tendencies of one incarnation can pass into ten thousand other incarnations, although they are primarily transferred to the incarnation of one person. Similarly, even in the "inheritance" phase, the tendencies of up to ten thousand incarnations can be transferred to one incarnation

, but primarily the tendencies of one person are transferred. In this sense, everyone has interincarnative "occult" ancestors — in many different senses — but just as my ancestors are my ancestors and not myself, in this respect too, we should not regard this inheritance should be regarded as identity.

Interincarnative regenerations — in relation to the lower planes — follow the general temporal succession. In higher planes, this is not necessarily the case. It is possible that a person being born now may manifest tendencies that are the post-mortem tendencies of a person who will be born in 120 years and die in 210 years.

There is a special, quite exceptional possibility based on a magical ability in the strict sense of the word: "transmigration" after death into a new conception, a new birth, or into someone else who is about to die. However, this is a completely conscious, deliberate and truly magical act, which cannot be confused with "rebirth".

Everything we have written above is based on reality, in contrast to reincarnationism, which expresses and reinforces a purely cyclical view, which is false and, at the same time, dangerously harmful teaching. Dealing with generative ancestors — within the framework of genealogy — can be interesting and, in some respects, even important. Even more interesting and important

It could be dealing with interincarnative-regenerative ancestors. This cannot be rejected at all. However, it is seriously dangerous and extremely harmful to deal with this by searching for my own essential origin in the series of incarnations. I have a generative origin, I have an interincarnative-regenerative occult origin. I have generative ancestors, and I have interincarnative-regenerative occult (even future) ancestors, but the essential origin of My-Self is transcendental and absolute, prior to origin and beginning, and I am the absolute ancestor of Myself.

We cannot even say that the doctrine of nuanced reincarnation is absolutely reprehensible. However, we must say that there is much more that is reprehensible in this than what is — with great reservations — acceptable at all.

The corpse is not identical with the personal individual, that is certain. However, I cannot say that the corpse of "A" and "A" as an individual have nothing to do with each other.

obviously. The subtle corpses into which demonic entities move, nor are they unrelated to the "former" individual in many respects, or to the subtle corpses of the individual. This area does not deal with "material" realities, and the "natural" and "logical" laws that apply here are completely different from those that apply to earthly human life. The manifestations and materialisations that occur during spiritualist "séances" are not, in essence,

, but are related to demonically possessed subtle corpses, although it cannot be stated with complete certainty that these have no connection to the "former" and now "summoned" individual.

From an even higher perspective: if figures who are alive in the waking world and — then the question that seems completely reasonable at first glance, whether these are "actually" the persons in question or not, is in fact meaningless. From this point of view, there is no such thing as "really" yes, and there is no such thing as "In reality" no. "In reality" one could say at most that: neither they nor not-they, or even that. There is nothing that is not "realitas illusoria". (Mistakes

are clearly possible, but they always come to light in the light of a relatively higher position.)

When approaching the problem of death and immortality from a "circumessentialis" perspective, we must start from the basic Buddhist teaching that "that which has a beginning also has an end." Who or what is there in me that has no beginning and therefore no end? I myself — as my own self — have no beginning and can have no end.

I, as myself, am immortal. Let us state this clearly — in fact, as dogma. It cannot be proven, but its certainty is obvious, and this obviousness is even
It is not incomprehensible to discursive rationality, although it is not transparent to intuitive intellectuality — in the sense of ascertainable transparency.

I — as myself — am immortal. I am as immortal as I am myself. If I am absolutely and completely myself, then my
my immortality is complete and absolute. Immortality is always present in me — as a potentiality. My actual mortality-immortality is a direct function of my identification with myself
. If I identify myself only with myself — completely and absolutely — then I am completely and absolutely beginningless, infinite, and
immortal. If I identify myself with anything else (that is, with any unrecognised Self), be it the highest and closest, immortality can only be relative, only
particular. If I identify myself with the contingencies of existence corresponding to my spiritual and physical carriers, then I choose transience for myself.

The "centre of gravity" of identification becomes the actual determinant. I was, am, and will be mortal or immortal to the extent that the "centre of gravity" of my own identification is the mortality, relative immortality, or absolute immortality.

This is not a question of merit, but of power. But for those who can only approach this from the perspective of "merit," we can say that those who lack "power" can only achieve what they deserve, no more and no less.

Identification and realisation are essentially one and the same. Realisation — or realisation beyond realisation — is aimed at identifying myself absolutely with myself. Or, as we have already described: I must lead myself back to my absolute Self through myself and by myself. Transmutation is always auto-transmutation, or in other words, the transmutation of my own identifications.
transmutation of my own identifications.

Salvation, Healing, Recovery — Sōtēriā, Salus, Heil — as the culmination of heavenly conditions, as complete "Restoration" is a prerequisite for Metaphysical Awakening. The prerequisite for complete Unconditionedness.

Just as bliss is the culmination of heavenly states, the culmination and culmination of bliss is "Pre-awakening" — Prabōdhi — or "Pre-blossoming" — Pranirvāṇa — or "Pre-liberation" — Pramōksa, Prakmukti — or "Pre-separation" — Prakaivalya. Among the
Among the stages of sanctity, this corresponds to the stage of "Anagami(n)", the stage whose possessor no longer enters the cycle of conditioned existence. The

"Anāgāmī" stage actually corresponds to the "Prabuddha" stage, and this can be considered the first stage of fulfilment, "Selfhood" — Svasti, Svastitā — from below.

Just as Salvation is a prerequisite for Metaphysical Awakening, so too is Initiation, Initiation into Salvation. The first stage of Initiation, however, is Initiation itself in the narrower sense. In Christianity, "Baptismos" and "Baptisma" actually mean Initiation, immersion, initiation. This means the realisation of a certain — partial or complete — , perfect autarchification, which, however, cannot be achieved without the successful completion of a preliminary — pre-archification.

According to the Roman Catholic Christian Church's "Theologia Dogmatica", "dogma" is the doctrinal proposition that "Baptismos" or "Baptisma" is a prerequisite for salvation. We agree that this is perfectly true. However, we might add that Catholic theology Even the most distinguished experts generally do not understand the true — truly spiritual — depths and heights of the teachings.

"Baptism" commonly does not even take place "ex opere operato", even though it is performed on the surface, visibly, — neither in the baptism of children nor adults, — or even in the full immersion of adults. That is, the baptised, the immersed, the initiated — during this "immersion," the "initiation" does not become "Initiated." No one can be initiated without the one being initiated being aware of it in some way. Infants know nothing about this; adults who are immersed are aware of the , but not as true "Initiation": their consciousness does not change fundamentally, essentially, they do not become wise and brilliant, superhuman after "baptism", which is a concomitant of Initiation-Initiation.

Catholic, Orthodox Christian, Protestant and Neo-Protestant baptisms of children and adults are essentially little more than nothing. Certain initiatory impulses can, in exceptional cases, be conveyed to children, but without the awakening of initiatory consciousness, neither — let us add — not even as a virtual initiation. (With regard to Initiatio Virtualis, René Guénon's remarks on this subject are noteworthy remarks on Initiatio Virtualis do not completely dispel the aporias that arise; in fact, in some respects, they even exacerbate the unfortunate proliferation of confessional misunderstandings.)

OCCULTISM AND METAPHYSICS

Occultism — as a concept — can be traced back to the adjective "occultus, occulta, occultum", which means "hidden", and to the noun "occultum", which means "the hidden" and the adjective "occulte", which means "hidden" or "concealed". Occultism, which roughly means "hidden-ism", is said by some to originate from the great Christian Kabbalist Eliphas Lévy, or at least — spread through his followers. The word "occult" — as a root word — has a completely "legitimate" use from a spiritual-traditional point of view, and is even terminologically, it is the root of important words. In this respect, there can be no objectionable aspect, nor does any arise. "Occultum" does not correspond to what we call "Metaphysicum" in a higher and stricter sense, nor does it correspond to what we call "Metaphysicum" in a lower and broader sense, only partially corresponds to it in its lower aspects. All in all, "occultum" is not "Metaphysicum", although the Partial correlations can sometimes be established between the lower terrains of the lower meaning of Metaphysicum and correspondences.

Occultism attributes transcendent significance to the "occultum" and places emphasis on the continuous intensification of the affirmation of this "attribution of significance". to the continuous intensification of the affirmation of this "attribution of significance". Occultism is very often intertwined with "latentialism", which in itself would not be a problem, but in this , this intertwining gives rise to tendencies that work against the much more important potentialism.

Occultism — and the more "ism" it is, the more pronounced this tendency becomes — carries with it the possibility of developing into what can and must be called pseudo-occultism, the various forms of which belong to the realm of pseudo-spiritual aberrations and delusions (which we will discuss later).

Occultism, and pseudo-occultism even more so, whether intentionally or unintentionally, works against the awakening of the idea of metaphysicality. the awakening of the idea of metaphysicality. Some trends do not speak about Metaphysicum at all mention the Metaphysicum at all, some mention it only rarely, and some talk about it constantly, but with such a mental "accent" that it has no real significance. Their statements are characterised by a "lightness" that can only be understood in a negative sense. The amalgamation of super-concretism and abstractionism — in the most unfortunate way possible — amalgamation of super-concretism and abstractionism: characteristic of almost all trends. The latest trends are in fact nothing more than the occultism-imbued equivalent of "mechanical materialism".

A view of life based on the principles of Traditionalis Spiritualis et Universalis Metaphysica Integra implies everything from occultism and occultisms that is worth implying, and — in this sense — can itself be considered occultism in particular. Occultism in general, however, does not include — even implicitly — what metaphysics presupposes, at any level.

Eliphas Lévy's occultism still had, or could have had, a "passage" to metaphysics, but the vast majority of later trends — with a few isolated exceptions — were completely unsuitable for this.

Almost all branches of occultism are excessively, almost obsessively substantialist, or "substantialist." Some schools speak of living, personal, being-like substances, while other schools tend to speak of generally diffuse hidden forces.

The focus of occultism does not extend beyond the occult, nor can it do so. The occult, however, is related to spheres of existence that are extremely far-reaching and turbulent. Even the highest level of occultism cannot be more than a science of states of existence, and even that only in theory, because in practice it is not even capable of this.

That which can be oriented towards some kind of "spiritual science" occultism — may indeed be extremely interesting, and even very important, but it is not the Essence itself, nor is it anything that could be close to the Essence; in fact, in some respects, it allows influences to prevail that distract from the essence.

Everything that the highest forms of occultism have ever dealt with — were present in a much more powerful, extensive, detailed and profound manner within the circle of true traditions detailed, much deeper and higher, and for the most part are still accessible today — but no matter how great their weight was and is, no matter how prominent their importance: their emphasis pales in comparison to emphasis of what is truly essential, central, mainly the inner, supra-rational meaning of the doctrines and instructions of realisation.

The truly traditional lōka sciences are much more reliable than the explorations of occultist trends in this regard, especially those of recent times, because they are the result of true considerative-concentrative- meditative- contemplative paths, based on the results of research experiences realised in reversal-descent , while the information of modern occultist trends — even those that may not be called occultist — is based on experiences gained through inward progress, which, because they are not top-down considerations — cannot be controlled, and therefore are always — to a significant extent — erroneous. In the case of metaphysical paths, however, what can be known — in relation to centrality — is considered important, but always of secondary significance. This statement, however, has far-reaching and serious consequences, both for the future and in general.

The majority of contemporary occultists do not consider themselves occultists and even protest against any such "accusations". These protests carry little weight, as the trends in question demonstrably meet most of the criteria for occultism.

The majority of contemporary occultist movements are intertwined with the four main forms of anti-four main forms of anti-traditionalism: "abstraditionalism", anti-traditionalism in the narrower sense, pseudo-traditionalism and counter-traditionalism. This A book devoted to this subject would not be enough to cover all the issues involved, but — even after the revelatory works of René Guénon and Julius Evola — there is still room in the literature representing the traditional view of existence for a book that revisits the deviant trends of the last 150 years, dealing in detail with those trends that did not exist in the lifetime of René Guénon and even Julius Evola did not yet exist — or did exist, but were not yet significant. We will deal with these in one of the later chapters of our book, albeit only briefly at this point.

EVOLUTION AND INVOLUTION

In a modern world defined by anti-traditionalism, evolutionary ascensionist theories of descent, i.e. theories of descent, prevail in all, but above all in the field to which they were primarily applied, both in terms of time and subject matter: biology.

Given that evolutionism is not only biological, we might say It has not only biological consequences, but also philosophical and hyperphilosophical ones, as well as consequences for our general view of existence and worldview, with far-reaching determining force and significance: this problem deserves to be examined, even from the perspective of the adherents of hyperphilosophical from the perspective of its proponents — within the framework of a brief, cursory overview.

The evolutionary-ascensionist theories of descent are "Lamarckism-neo-Lamarckism", "Darwinism-Huxleyism-Haeckelism-neo-Darwinism", and the latter along the lines of "Weismannism" and "morganism", while the classical "Lamarckism-neo-Lamarckism" and "Darwinism-neo-Darwinism" are constantly being refined theories of evolution, without exception — albeit in a muted tone — profess that humans are the comes from the animal world and is ultimately an animal itself, even if its "development" places it far above other animals.

In this respect, it is almost irrelevant that opinions differ as to whether humans and apes, humans and monkeys, humans and all other primates had a common ancestor, i.e. whether the 'split' occurred before or after the 'evolutionary descent'. humans and apes, humans and all other primates, i.e. at which stage of "evolutionary descent" the "split" occurred. In this regard, it would not be relevant if the 'split' were generally associated with the emergence of mammals or even vertebrates.

The traditional position radically rejects the idea of humans originating from the animal world and the idea that humans are, in any broad sense, "ultimately" animals: on the one hand as an anti-spiritual aberration, and on the other as a total scientific mistake. At the same time, however, it firmly posits a close relationship between humans and the animal world, albeit one based on entirely different foundations.

This question cannot be decided on a purely biological basis and within a purely biological framework. The decision requires a "multi-faceted" view, taking into account biological, specifically biological-palaeontological-palaeozoological, palaeoanthropological, zoological and anthropological, as well as biological-logical, philosophical and hyper-philosophical — perspective that takes all aspects into account and based on solid theoretical foundations.

Biological species concepts are not entirely uniform, but in general they are fairly consistent with the largely uniform species concepts of philosophy, and together they form the "hyperphilosophia hyperlogica species-conceptualitas". On this basis, it can be said that the biological species — if it is indeed a species —, even if it is not unchanging and eternal, is in any case "durable", characterised by "diuturnitas", both biologically and logically, but also factually.

Within a species, the possibility of micro-transformations is very high. However, apart from the role of quite exceptional effects in this regard, the boundaries of a species cannot really be crossed. If the species is not merely a "taxonomic" species, but also an actual species, then it is not possible to cross the boundaries of the species.

This is not unrelated to the fact that "species hybrids" (species bastards) cannot reproduce indefinitely when mated exclusively with each other. A horse and donkey hybrid, i.e. a mule, can — in rare cases — produce offspring when mated with a horse or donkey; offspring are only born from the mating of mules in very exceptional cases. The mating of such offspring is even more exceptional. Even if it were possible to breed mules to some extent, the "pure" and intergenerational "large-scale mule breeding" programme, with the complete exclusion of horses and donkeys, would not be a very fruitful or profitable investment.

Species, therefore, are relatively permanent in the living world; they are much more likely to become extinct than to transform into other species. This is one argument (not evidence, but an argument) that the "taxa" of the animal world — apart from the possibility and reality of micro-transformations within a species — are not ancestors or descendants of each other.

Biological evolution — as the basic principle of various theories of descent — is linked to the affirmative assumption of the principle of ascent, so the evolution of evolutionism is not only development in the sense of unfolding, but also in the sense of becoming higher, of ascension. Some, mainly from the religious and ecclesiastical side, consider this to be necessary and lawful, something that is in the spirit of "providence". P. Pierre Teilhard de Chardin S. J.'s seemingly spiritual theory of evolution, which initially did not meet with unanimous approval among Roman Catholic theologians, is now becoming increasingly accepted, with various modifications. This is the Christological and In the light of a truly profound insight, the theory of the Christ-evolving Cosmos loses its mask of "superspirituality" and reveals its true nature, which is anti-spiritual to its very roots and betrays an "worldview" based on overt materialism.

Consistently materialistic evolutionism prefers to speak of the interaction of laws and chance, while others only speculate about chance in relation to the motivations of evolution. the motivations of evolution. These views , but they do acknowledge it as a fact and as a consequence of development.

According to the proponents of the hyperphilosophical view of existence based on the basic principles of Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Universalis Metaphysica Integra, the origin of the "Universality of Universals" must first be clarified.

According to them, it is a fundamental error to assume that the "Universality of Universities" is eternal. It is a fundamental error to assume that the "Universality of Universities" is not eternal. It is a fundamental error to assume that the "Universality of Universities" is both eternal and not eternal at the same time is a fundamental error. To assume that the Universality of Universalities is neither eternal nor non-eternal is a fundamental error, and so on.

To assume that the world was created: a fundamental error. To assume that the world was not created: a fundamental error. To assume that the world was created and not created — simultaneously and jointly —

. Species enter into manifestation as independent, separate "reeds" from top to bottom
, gradually materialising and then appearing in condensed form in the earthly world.

The so-called lower species materialised completely earlier, while the higher species materialised later. The series of fossils reflects this final materialisation, which may give the impression that the later forms are derived from the earlier ones. This is a scientific "optical illusion" that the luminaries of biological palaeontology and palaeoanthropology should have noticed. It should be noted that in the 20th
, many outstanding biologists spoke out against Lamarckism, Darwinism and their derivatives, listing scientific counterarguments to refute them
refute them. Together, these arguments are truly effective. In recent times, the work of Roberto Fondi has been particularly noteworthy, but earlier evolutionism
The work of opponents cannot be ignored either. Nothing has been finalised yet in terms of details
finalised, which is obvious, but it is becoming increasingly clear that Lamarckism and Darwinism, as well as the theories that arise from them, are completely untenable.

Transitional forms are generally absent, which in itself fundamentally undermines the whole of evolutionary transformism, even if its blind followers do not realise it. If transitional forms were never absent, even that would not undermine the basic principles of "anti-transformationism". An obvious example is the mole, an underground form of life
, had to evolve from other insectivores living on the surface of the earth.
— according to the proponents of Lamarckism and Darwinism — but the transitional forms are missing. It is difficult to imagine, especially in the long stage when they had already largely given up their above-ground lifestyle but had not yet
. Nothing can be explained from the point of view of "necessity"; why would there have been a need to move underground when all the conditions for life were still
all the conditions necessary for life were already provided. Many insectivorous species live near the surface of the soil, but not below it, in the same climatic conditions as moles, and consequently they have no disadvantages, nor of course any advantages, just as moles do not —
explainable advantages or disadvantages resulting from their lifestyle. They say that giraffes have long necks so that they can reach the foliage of trees. There is no doubt that giraffes mainly feed on trees. It feeds on the leaves of its foliage. That is why it often grazes, with its front legs spread apart. Where there are leafy trees, there is usually grass, and other hoofed animals — occasionally — stand on their hind legs, leaning on the tree trunk with their front legs, jumping up
to reach the leaves of leafy trees and consume them. But they would survive even without the leaves of leafy trees, just as giraffes would survive without the leaves of foliage, albeit in slightly less comfortable conditions. Where there are leafy forests, however, they could survive without grazing on grass. The real reason for the elongation of the neck is unknown. There are no transitional forms. The okapi, which also has a long neck, albeit shorter than that of a giraffe, cannot possibly be an ancestor of the giraffe that got stuck in the process of neck growth and thus survived; no one would dare to seriously claim this.

Similarly, one could go through the multitude of animal species. None of them has any real, unconditional and clear immanent advantage in being what they are, but of course they have no disadvantage either. Extinct animals did not have any fundamental disadvantage that would have necessarily led to their extinction. Considering that they lived for millions of years the way they did. It is often suggested that, for example, the sabre-toothed tiger's increasingly large
, and that this contributed to its extinction. Saber-toothed tigers lived for a very long time

tigers lived for a very long time even with their maxillary canines at their maximum size; they did not begin to regress

their canine teeth, as would be expected from evolutionary transformism. Then they became extinct. It is possible that their enormous teeth played a role in this process, but tooth growth could not have been the main cause. Animal species and

There are clearly interactions within their environment which can have significant consequences, particularly in terms of intraspecific modifications, but these do not generate the emergence of new species. Animal species are created by a power and dominion that is both impersonal and personal, transcending the individual.

impersonal and personal character. On the one hand, this is the "Dēmiourgos" and, on the other, the "Makranthrōpos" (macro-anthrōpos), who creates and at the same time separates man's misguided, dead-end possibilities — as cosmic forms of thought, will and imagination — and then projects them. These forms are realised as animal species.

The species actually form a "triad". This is the animal god — "Thēriotheos" — and the animal demon — "Thēriodaimōn" (the latter with two additional images) — together form the group or species spirit of the animal species. The third is the materialised species — as the totality of individuals.

In this sense, animals "descend" from humans, or are derived from humans. Obviously, this does not refer to modern biological humans or biological descent.

Humans, in their lack of specialisation, which in some respects is multi-specialisation, can be considered much more "ancient" than descendant. Even today's human skeleton is much more of an "ancient" skeleton — in its brain, facial bones, and lower jaw, but in its limbs as well, rather than a descendant "offspring". A significant proportion of so-called primitive humans are not true primitive humans and are not human-like, although there were also "primitive humans" who played a role in the generative community of modern humans. Of the so-called primitive humans who played a part in the creation of modern humans, the majority were by no means as mentally "backward" as is assumed, although there were indeed some low-grade types.

Ape-like primitive humans, pre-humans and ape-humans were never the ancestors of humans, but rather representatives of barely human forms of life that had mineralised prematurely.

The animal-like subhumans of ancient times may have had races that played a role in the further evolution of the human-animal-phantom beings of the "substratum lemurianum" discussed later.

Animals are, on the one hand, creatures, on the other hand, the products of the elimination of wrong turns and dead ends, and on yet another hand, the results and projections of cosmic acts of will and thought. The "ontogenesis embryonalis et fetalis," which, according to the proponents of Haeckelianism and post-Haeckelianism — the rapid and repetition of "phylogenesis": on the one hand, it is by no means such a faithful repetition of certain animal formations as is commonly believed, but insofar as these similarities exist — as they do to some extent — then this is by no means an accelerated and analogical repetition of "phylogenesis", which does not exist anyway, but rather an imprint of how macrocosmic Man, of metacosmic origin, "rejects" the possibilities of becoming fixed in animal forms of existence, eliminates them from himself, and transcends them.

on them. (Julius Evola mentions this almost in passing, but nevertheless very vividly, at the beginning of his seminal work *Metafisica del Sesso*.)

According to one of Heinrich Steffell's pertinent observations on nature, "every animal is an obsession." This expresses both the eliminability of animal forms of existence and their origin in will, thought and imagination. The created nature of animals and their origin in will, thought and imagination, on the other hand, express something that implies the existence of playfulness, in close connection with Līlā. The multitude of animals is, among other things, a multitude and is what it is because the sacral playfulness of a Power-Dominion "whim" wants it that way, while at the same time eliminating it from the inner circle of human existence. Animals are, according to this — in a certain limited sense — are actually human beings. It is by no means uninteresting to sometimes look at the most diverse animal species that come before our eyes and can be studied, recalling the idea and concept that this animal — in a certain sense and — is in fact a modified human being.

This is obviously easier to do when observing a gorilla than when observing an earthworm, but the basic principle is essentially the same in all cases. (Incidentally, all this also applies to plants and flora, and even to so-called "lifeless" nature, which is of course not as lifeless as the materialist practitioners of materialist science would like to believe, provided that the things that need to be changed are changed.)

so-called "lifeless" nature, which is of course not as lifeless as the materialistic practitioners of materialistic science would like to believe.

It should be noted that the "human" origin of the entire "Universe" corresponds most clearly with the teachings of numerous traditions. (This in no way contradicts the traditional basic teaching that man — as an earthly being — has no unconditional privilege in existence.) According to this, it is not only "lifeless" nature, including the quadrillions of stars and billions of galaxies, the plant world, the animal world, and the human world in the strict sense, but also the Heavenly Hierarchies, the Angelos, Arkhangelos, Arkhē, Ekhsousiā, Dynamis, Kyriotēs, Thronos, Kheroub, Serāph, and those above them, are also created by the human-God, representing the Metakosmanthrōpos. This does not exclude the possibility that the same is true of the Seraphim in their form of existence. They do not regard him as Ādām Qadmōn, the Man of the Beginning, but as S'rāf Qadmōn, the Seraph of the Beginning.

It is clear that every human being is an incarnation, or if you will, a reincarnation, of Manu (Mahā-Manu) or Prajāpati (Prajāpati-Pati). These incarnations are manifestations of manifestations of "possibilitas versionalis", creations and eliminations at the same time. More broadly, every animal, every living creature, every being, every entity (entitas) is such a manifestation, materially such an incarnation or even reincarnation.

The "Makrotheokosmanthrōpos" — and even higher on the ladder of existence — the "Metatheokosmanthrōpos" in the sense of the highest and ultimate essence, I am Myself; this is not yet Myself reduced to the degree corresponding to the "Metaphysicum Absolutum" reduced to Selfhood, but one of the highest "circumcentral" states of being and consciousness. Obviously, it is not bound to my Own Personality, I- It is a question of selfhood, since this is also linked to a strictly defined and incarnated unique and individual form of human existence. Thus, I am neither the ancestor, creator, nor eliminator of the multitude of forms of existence, but in this state, quasi-consciously, I can still grasp my personal self in relation to Myself as the centre of Being beyond Being, and prior to that, Myself as the origin of forms of existence.

In this sense, every human incarnation is an incarnation of My Self, my incarnation or even my reincarnation, and indeed, every animal species and animal, every living creature, being and entity is a manifestation of me and, materially, my embodiment.

In each individual human being — if I were to observe them sharply and deeply from above — I could see Man and Myself. In animal species and individuals of these species, I could and should see not only the uniquely modified human being, but also the modal myself.

Béla Hamvas often and willingly quotes Saint-Martin's idea that it is not from the World that we should look at, observe, see and understand Man, but from Man that we should look at, observe, see and understand the World.

The world. This is indeed true, but it is even more true when supplemented by the fact that we should not look at Man from the world and at myself from Man, but rather at Man from myself and at the world from Man. It is obvious that this cannot refer to my personal state of being or to the merely earthly aspect of Man.

After this brief, sketchy, but—we believe—enlightening touch on the relationship between humans and the animal world (and indeed, the living world, and even the natural world), we can return to the idea of evolutionism. Apart from the relative permanence of species, which in itself would rule out evolution and the ascensionist "descendentia macrotransformistica", we must mention an even more important argument.

For the Deity, Manu, Mahā-Manu, Prajāpati, Prajāpati-Pati — in the Realm — there is neither descensio nor ascensio, neither evolution nor involution. The traditional view of existence is not involutionist and descentist because it would correct involution or descent approves of involution or descent, not at all.

He does not approve of these in the slightest, nor does he endorse them, but he does note that in terms of manifestations, and in relation to those manifestations that do not dominate them, one can speak only and exclusively of involution and descent. This is not only factually true, but it cannot be otherwise.

Everything that is subject to necessity or lawfulness, everything that is subject to chance, everything that is subject to a mixture of necessity or lawfulness and contingencies: for those within it, there can only be involution and descent, nothing else. For the Ruler and the Ruled, there is neither ascent nor descent — in the absence of rule, only descent is possible. There is also ascent; ascension — traditional view of existence — is more important than anything else. However, we can only speak of ascension if it is based on autonomy, if it is clearly controlled from above, if it is maximally conscious and deliberate and — even if only relatively — highly free. Heteronomy, reduced autonomy, non-top-down control, limited or absent consciousness and deliberation, reduced intensity or extent of freedom, necessity or inevitability, chance or a mixture of these all rule out the possibility of ascension, and even

Ascension and descent can not only be created or surpassed above, i.e. in a position of dominance or rule, but can also be counter-surpassed below — and the fulfilment of this counter-surpassment is Nothingness.

fulfilment of this counter-transcendence is Nothingness. Descent always takes place in this direction and intensifies in this direction.

To this we must add — for the sake of emphasis — that the lower can never — essentially — become the higher. Thus, for example, neither squirrels, nor prosimians, nor monkeys, nor nose monkeys, nor from apes or their ancestors — human beings.

We must repeatedly draw the reader's attention to the fact that initiation and "suprarealificatio" The upward movement that takes place during metaphysica is not a counterargument to the above; this upward movement is in fact not an upward movement from below, but rather a self-elevation from above, which can also be called a top-down ascension, as we mentioned a few lines earlier. but rather a self-elevation reaching down from above, which can also be called a top-down ascension, as we mentioned a few lines earlier.

The permanence of species and the comparison of the above with this principle of permanence, we believe — in view of what has been said so far — that in the case of serious contemplation of this, every thinking should raise doubts about the "truth" of evolutionism, ascensionism, and the macro-transformist theories of descent based on them. Anyone who wishes to address this issue from a biological point of view is recommended to read the works of H. Marconi, Edgar Dacqué, G. E. Mattei, L. Lafont, Max Westenhöfer, and more recently Hermann Poppelbaum, Dewart, Schwabe, but above all G. Sermonti and Roberto Fondi, as well as the authors they refer to. The views of these authors are not entirely consistent, and their spiritual commitments also vary greatly. As already noted, none of the authors has fully clarified the details, let alone reached a conclusion that would facilitate the necessary orientation for further progress. Nevertheless, those who compare the works of traditional authors with those of the above-mentioned biologists will not remain completely uninformed or in a state of mere doubt—they will not have to rejoin evolutionism, nor will they have to take refuge under the umbrella of creationism for the sake of ultimate simplification.

It is strange, though not at all surprising, that after a brief period of resistance, accompanied by a few critical remarks, the Roman Catholic Church accepted Lamarckian-Darwinian evolutionism without further ado, and only recently has it linked this to the dangerous anti-spiritual heresies of the aforementioned P. Pierre Teilhard de Chardin S. J.'s dangerous anti-spiritual heresies, while at the same time paying little or no attention to true evolutionism. criticism, ignoring not only the works of traditional authors, but also those of 20th-century biologists who rejected evolutionism. It would be in the fundamental interest of the Roman Catholic Church to support research in this direction — including the establishment of institutes — but no such initiative has been seen even in the increasingly rare circles of ecclesiastical conservatism, not to mention the growing and expanding circles of ecclesiastical modernism. The historical Protestant denominations also show no interest in criticising evolutionism. Some of the neo-Protestant sectarian denominations have recognised and continue to recognise the fundamentally heretical nature of evolutionism, but — since they do not recognise this in terms of its essence — they do not counter it with an adequate critique of evolutionism, but rather with the creationism of biblical fundamentalism, arguing as best they can. Evolutionism is generally completely untenable, but it is absolutely unacceptable to those who adhere to a worldview based on the principles of Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Universalis Metaphysica Integra. Anyone who shows even the slightest inclination towards evolutionism willing to compromise, and even those who are not "ruthless" opponents of even the most moderate evolutionism cannot rightly claim for themselves that they are followers of the traditional

view of life, even if they are otherwise unwavering and creative in every respect — a believer in traditional principles.

There are occult and spiritualist movements, such as anthroposophy, which are in the most pronounced sense of involutionism and descentism, in the most decisive sense of anti-Lamarckism and anti-Darwinism. In this respect, all his discoveries and ideas are almost flawless, — even when the strictest traditional standards are taken into account. On the essence of the matter, the followers of anthroposophy, who are committed to the extreme — followers of "Steinerolatry" — take a diametrically opposite position: on the one hand — with regard to the essential Self — take the position of pluralism. On the other hand, the most radical evolutionism — in a spiritual sense, so to speak. In this context, they also speak of involution, which is now followed by evolution and ascension, and indeed, involution and descent were also — implicitly — evolution and ascension. Among the ideas put forward by anthroposophy, there are some very valuable insights, but taken as a whole, it is a distinctly anti-traditionalist movement, as clearly expressed by their aforementioned "spiritual evolutionism". . It is pointless that they have a great involutionist theory concerning bodies, or "shells".

We have pointed out that the doctrinal propositions of "Makrotheokosmanthrōpos" and "Metatheokosmanthrōpos" are only complete when supplemented by the unreserved and at least intuitively verified acceptance of "theourgo-magico-solipsismus hyperphilosophicus", which has been fully and at least intuitively verified and accepted in practice — without this, like all other doctrinal assumptions, if deprived of it, it is irrelevant chatter that may be superficially interesting, but has no real illuminating or enlightening power or validity.

One must always start from theourgo-magico-solipsismus; this must always be the background and support, and we must always return to it. Otherwise, there would be no real point in dealing with anything. This has been our guiding principle so far, sometimes more strongly, sometimes less strongly, and it will continue to be so in the future.

MAN AND HIS WORLD

Above the animal species — higher than the earthly human level of existence — there are consciously ruling and determining group spirits. Above the higher animal categories are spirits even more powerful than these. Of course, these categories do not follow the classifications of zoological taxonomy, but certain overlaps are possible, and indeed exist.

On the one hand, the group spirits are animal gods, "Thēriotheos", and on the other hand, they are animal demons.

Thēriodaimōn, namely "good" animal demons — Thēriagathodaimōn — and "evil" animal demons — Thēriokakodaimōn. Every animal species has a divine and demonic aspect, and every demonic aspect has a "good" and an "evil" variant.

The animal god, the animal demon and the individuals of the animal species together form the species triads, and such triads represent what the species itself *actually* is. Either the divine aspect dominates, or the demonic, depending on the level at which someone or something comes into contact with this spirit something. Furthermore, either the "good" dominates and the "evil" remains in the background, or the "evil" dominates and the "good" must be content with a secondary position.

Something else may also contribute to this. The God-man of the Beginning, when the animal species produces and projects its entirety, generating human generations in a single act. This is the basis of "totemism", and it is by no means irrelevant whether the totem connection is divine or demonic, nor whether it is associated with good or evil demons. (The royal house of the conquering Hungarians, the Árpád dynasty, actually corresponded to the Turul "gens dynastica". The Turul is a bird of prey, probably a hawk, but this is not certain.†)

It can rightly be assumed that the Turul here represented the dominance of the "gens dynastica" in the Thēriotheos context.

Not from a biological point of view, but from a higher, spiritual point of view — each individual human being individual is in fact an independent species. The closest human group spirit is the "Subiectum in Actu" manifested in the Self-Personality as "Spiritus Individualis". There are also more powerful human group spirits, although these are always indirectly connected to the super-personal consciousness through the Spiritus Individualis.

Families and clans also had (and to a very small extent still have) spirits, Genii. Families and clans also had (and to a very small extent still have) spirits, Genii. Ethnoses had powerful Genii, but there were also Genii of languages and landscapes, as well as castes. There were "gens" — gens dynasticas — over which a Genius or Dynastia Spirit ruled, at least as great as an entire ethnos, or even as a Spirit ruling over a "megethnos polyethnikos". Those who belonged to the Turul dynasty were not Hungarians, but Turuls above nations and peoples. The Babenbergs, the Hohenstaufens, the Habsburgs, the Habsburg-Lothringens, and the Hohenzollerns were not Germans in a national and in a supranational sense. The Capet-Anjou were Capet Anjou, the Capet-Valois were Capet-Valois, and the Capet-Bourbon were Capet-Bourbon, not French.

The arrogance of the "national king" — that is, the "ethno-national king" — is an idea and aspiration that emerged at the turn of the historical Middle Ages and modern times, which, although it never fully took hold

, it remained a haunting distortion until the middle of this century (the 20th century). No one had or could have had a deeper or higher connection with the ethnos and ethnoses they ruled than the true "hyperethnic-supranational" king had and could have had a deeper and higher connection with the ethnos and ethnoses, the "natio" and "natio"s he ruled over.

The indisputable fact that — in a spiritual sense — every personal human individual corresponds to an independent species does not in the least contradict the equally indisputable fact that the ethnoses are above the "megethnos polyethnikos", the basic races, the great races, the races and sub-races, the castes, the "topos" and even the languages — the "glossa": powerful "spiritus generalis" and "genius" stood above them and — to a certain extent, in a certain sense — still stand today.

The relationship that exists between an individual belonging to an animal species and the group spirit of that species has never existed, nor could it ever exist, between an individual human being and the superhuman group spirits. The inspirations of the superhuman spirit, in relation to the individual human being, are validated by the individual individual human being through further self-inspiration. If the individual human being detaches himself from the spirit above him — he falls below his own level, but the connection to the higher must not only be natural, but also recognised and consciously intuitively desired. This again does not exclude the possibility and validity of an even higher, much stronger, much more conscious and much more deliberate connection.

Human beings — as beings that exist and manifest themselves in a biological sense — are essentially of superhuman origin, and more specifically, of dual origin.

The "Hyperborean" man, representing the superhuman, as the name suggests, is of extraterrestrial origin. Hyperborean means "beyond the north". This also means beyond the 60th parallel, but even more so, it means beyond the Arctic Circle, or even from the Pole region, and even more so that it originates from above the Pole, from the North Star, meaning that it descended to Earth from that direction direction. This should obviously be understood in a symbolic-spiritual sense, and only in this way. (To avoid misunderstandings, we would like to reiterate that this origin has nothing to do with an invasion-like arrival in interplanetary invasion-like arrival of beings from distant , nor to theories about life being planted on Earth. We do not rule out the possibility that some of the unidentified flying objects may indeed be celestial vehicles, — but this has nothing to do with what has been said above.)

The Hyperboreans had "soft bones," as taught by the doctrines of Far Eastern anthropogenesis. These flexible bones were much less mineralised than the bones of later humans or cave dwellers and semi-human creatures. They did not undergo fossilisation either. For this reason, their and never will be found by researchers of "palæanthrōpologia" and "palaeoarchaeology".

Cro-Magnon man and his contemporaries could still see the Hyperboreans, albeit rarely. late representatives of superhuman beings — and there are cave drawings that depict, without any "stylisation", a type of human being that was completely different from the typical types of the age and from modern humans.

In contrast to the Hyperborean superhuman, there were already human-like beings living on Earth who had survived from an earlier era, perhaps as remnants of an earlier Mahā-Yuga, and who had materialised much earlier. On the one hand, these beings were subhuman, on the other hand animal-like, and on the other hand "phantom-like, demon-like"; who lived in the tropical zone, formed the "substratum" of a later mixture. Considering that the phantom-like nature of this being is characterised by the influential presence of the "lemurs" (lemures), we can and must speak of a "Lemurian substratum".

Those who are mainly descendants of the former Hyperboreans, and in whom the residues of Hyperborean origin dominate, constitute a category of biological anthropology. "borealis" basic race, root race or major race, which in taxonomic terms corresponds to *Homo sapiens borealis*^{††}, where "borealis" could be understood as a "macrospecies".

Homo sapiens borealis split into two, i.e. first one branch separated from it, a major race or racial circle — as a subspecies: *Homo sapiens borealis mongolides-mongoloides*, while the other — as the original — main branch also formed a subspecies: *Homo sapiens borealis europides-europoides* corresponds to this large race or racial circle.

The mixing elevated the barely human beings of the Lemurian substratum to the human species, but the dominance of "lemuricity" remained permanently valid despite the mixing.

The basic human race or race circle that carried and continues to carry this dominance can be appropriately designated *Homo sapiens tropicalis*, which includes two major races or race circles: *Homo sapiens tropicalis nigritudes-nigritoides* and *Homo sapiens tropicalis australides-australoides*.

American Indians represent a mixto-based race. The higher types are of Europid-Europoid and Mongoloid-Mongoloid descent, but the South American jungle-dwelling Indians also show traces of tropical admixture in addition to the above.

Homo sapiens borealis europides-europoides nordicus has perhaps preserved the most of all races — microspecies — the original boreal — and through this — the hyperborean origin.

Homo sapiens borealis europides-europoides nordicus can be classified as those whose language was originally Indo-European or Indo-European (Indo-European), or Indo-Aryan language family. (Those who at some point — adopted one of the Indo-European languages, even if this happened a very long time ago. The tropical mixed-blood Dravidians, who adopted the Indo-European language, the modern equivalent of which is the numerous dialects of the Romani language, obviously did not and could not belong here.)

The problem of human basic races or major races, major races or race circles, races or sub-races, and sub-races — "nanospecies" — or type circles can be raised at the "somatic-somatological" level: this would be the domain of biological anthropology field of biological anthropology, especially if it were to address this issue in a more adequate manner than it usually does. At the same time, this issue can also be raised at a higher level — the psychic-psychological level. Furthermore — to top it all off — this issue can also be discussed at the pneumatic-pneumatological level, and indeed, above all and above all else, it should be discussed here and from this perspective.

From this point of view, it can be concluded that the spirit is always the regulator, this is true for all races — the soul is the mediator or mediatrix, while the body is the regulatum. At the same time, a process that can be considered a "counter-regulation" also takes place from the direction of the lower forces.

Due to the interaction of the force components, one can speak of spirit-dominated, soul-dominated, etc. dominant and physically dominant basic races. In this respect — and strictly speaking — only the spiritually dominant basic race can be classified as "ārya", the other two cannot.

The basic races, major races, races and sub-races defined according to spiritual classification are capable of "carrying" the physical, spiritual and intellectual dominance of their classification in different ways and to different degrees. classification.

The basic races, major races, races and sub-races of the physical classification of races — mediated by spiritual race relationships — can also be carriers, indirectly carriers, of the basic races with physical, spiritual and intellectual dominance resulting from the spiritual classification.

In this context, it can be concluded that those belonging to *Homo sapiens borealis* can carry, or could carry, but mostly do not carry, the spiritually dominant basic race, i.e. the "ārya" basic race. Those belonging to "*Homo sapiens tropicalis*" are generally incapable of carrying the spiritually dominant basic race.

There are well-known suggestions that races represent "horizontal colours", while castes, or "varṇas", represent "vertically distinguishable colours".

These suggestions are largely acceptable, with certain reservations, but there are aspects which, all things considered, require us to speak out against such views. our voices against such views. Races are undoubtedly more related to "horizontal colours", especially at the "biologico-somaticum" level. If I did not relate this to other factors were not involved, this might be true. However, there are other factors involved, namely many higher factors, in a very complex way. Among these, most important is the previously mentioned ability or inability to carry. Only the boreal basic race is capable of the spiritually dominant basic race — the spiritual race components through mediation — whereas the tropical basic race is incapable of doing so. This greatly modifies the theory of the "colours" of races, which can only be symbolised horizontally, and which in itself could even be considered true.

Those "ārya" races that are capable of carrying the "ārya" castes. This statement is another way of expressing the above statements. "Āryanism" is more related to castes than to races, but it is also indirectly related to them. According to physical classification, there is no "ārya" race, but in an indirect sense, we can still refer to — with some flexibility — those basic races that are capable of carrying the spiritually dominant basic race: the "ārya basic race".

Caste is more important than race, but the connection—albeit complex—is clear.

In the metaphysical context of supra-realisation, "āryaship" and "anāryaship" are still becomes more acute. The person who does not participate in realisation is called "paśu". "Paśu" is the name of a sacrificial domestic animal, and it is also used to refer to a person who lives a life analogous to that of the animal.

One part of "paśuk" is completely incapable of realisation from the outset, while another part— although also incapable of this—is such that its abilities in this direction can still be awakened, and although "paśuk" are all "anāryák", "āryaság" can still awaken in some of them.

In this respect, only the hērōsi-semi-divine "vīras" and the "dīvyas" who follow the divine path. Only they can be classified as āryas according to their degree of realization. This classification precedes and surpasses all others.

Today, considering their current position, almost everyone is anārya. However, there are very few — in whom āryaship can awaken, and there are those in whom it can never awaken in practice and in reality. And those in whom it has already awakened or can definitely awaken are even fewer than the few.

Can a primitive forest dweller attain initiation? This is a question that is raised with stereotypical frequency in connection with the above. To this we can say that, for example, according to the doctrines of the Buddhist traditions, all beings possess the potential for Metaphysical Awakening, but this potential is not yet actual potential, that is, it is not a possibility. However, most possibilities are not immediate — they are possibilities that have almost been actualised, i.e. virtualities. Initiation-initiation is much lower level than awakening beyond levels, but the former falls within the latter's line. It cannot be ruled out that the black savage of the primeval forests may achieve true initiation, but looking at it more concretely, practically and strictly — taking into account the relationships between potentiality, possibility and virtuality — this can almost be ruled out. The situation is not the same in the case of "counter-initiation" and "counter-realisation". Everyone, including the savage man of the primeval forests, has

Of the castes, the three upper ones — that is, the "ārya caste" — are suited to spiritual dominance. Not only did the majority of those who originally spoke Indo-European languages belong to the three upper castes, but these were also present among the originally "Europo-Mongoloid" or "Mongoloid-Europid" Dravidians, but they became diluted and pushed into the background when the Dravidians mixed with members of the Nigritid-Nigritoid and Australid-Australoid races.

The "śūdras" belonging to the anārya castes, the "pančakas" — within this group the "čāṇḍālas", the "paulkas" and others — as well as the casteless below the caste, the "avarṇas", were almost never pure Indo-European descendants.

The validity of the castes, the varṇas, remains — in principle — permanent. From a lower perspective, the internal stability of the varṇas has been shaken for more than two thousand five hundred years. The castes no longer stand where and how they should, but even today they have not completely disintegrated
. Belonging to the three upper castes no longer means what it once meant, but it still has significance.

On the other hand, however, the anārya origin has not completely lost its validity. The attachment to these castes
— or even to the caste below them is still quite strong today. The upper classes have fallen, but the lower classes have not risen; instead, they too have fallen, even lower than they ever were before.

Another name for those belonging to the ārya castes was "dvija", which means twice-born, twice-generated. Those born into one of the three upper castes only anticipated their caste

only anticipated their membership of the caste by their birth; they only became full members of their caste

only when they underwent caste initiation, the "varṇa-dīkṣa". If they did not undergo this, they died as "anārya". The only ones exempt from this were those who chose an even higher path and embarked on one of the yōga paths.

In India, among the Indo-Hindus, the highest caste was the "brāhmaṇá" "varṇá".

priests of the highest cults and the highest officials belonged to this caste. The second caste was the ksatriya varṇa, whose members were mainly warrior nobles or officials, but there was also a third caste, the "vaiśyá"

, the civil caste of distributors of goods. Male members of all three castes could perform, and indeed they had to perform certain priestly duties. Let us repeat: all three castes were spiritual castes, and only members of the spiritually dominant basic race could belong to them.

No one ever seriously disputed that the brāhmanas were generally the highest of these.

The symbolic origin of the ancient "ativarṇa-brāhmanas" — above the castes — was "polaris and solaris". The ativarṇa-brāhmanas or "hamsas", the caste above the "swans", separated. The "brāhmanas" in the strict sense of the word were created — in terms of their symbolic origin, polaris and lunaris — and the solaris caste of the "ksatriyas", and later the lunaris caste of the "vaiśyas", the "śūdras" caste, which — in terms of its symbolic origin — was "telluric", while the symbolic origin of those below it can be defined as "subterrestrial". In any case, the

The brāhmanas stood at the first and highest level, relating to the ksatriyas as fathers relate to their children, but — on the other hand — in many respects as mothers relate to their sons.

to their sons. The brāhmaṇa caste was, in some respects, the "mother" of the ksatriya caste. (There were rituals in which the

"purōhita-brāhmaṇa" was the symbolic wife of the ruler, the "rāja". This is similar to how the high priest of the Aztecs bore the name "Snake Woman" and, although he was a man, was considered the king's wife within the framework of the liturgy.

Nevertheless, the brāhmaṇa was higher than the ksatriya. However, there were also dynastic ksatriyas, the "rājanyas". The brāhmaṇas were higher than the rājanyas, but the rājanyas had more intense virtualities that could be awakened in the ativarṇa rebirth.

in terms of its implementation. In other words, although the rājanya was initially lower in status than the brāhmaṇa, he had greater opportunities to transform himself into an ativarṇa, an ativarṇa-brāhmaṇa,

or hamsā. According to Buddhist teachings, those who later realise themselves as Buddhas is either already an ativarṇa, a brāhmaṇa, or a ksatriya, but cannot be a vaiśya, even though this is a high spiritual level.

The grave mistake of the extreme Guénonians is that they refuse to accept and understand this.

No one doubts the inherent superiority of the brāhmaṇas, but completeness is represented by the ativarṇa, who is both brāhmaṇa and rājanya-ksatriya at the same time, and this is easier to achieve from the position of rājanya-ksatriya.

The outstanding intellectual Béla Hamvas also accepted this extreme Guénonian position, but he "developed" it significantly. Where are those who belong to the ksatriya caste?

"patronisingly", where he makes explicitly disparaging remarks, especially in his later writings. The self-appointed circles of "Hamvasianism" like to portray "Evolutionism" as one-sided "ksatriyanism", but they do not shy away from making statements that were foreign to Béla Hamvas and are far removed from the truth.

There were ethnic groups and empires where the two highest castes did not split into two: those who belonged to the "gens" of the patricians who founded Rome were in fact both ksatriyas and brāhmaṇas, without having been ativarṇas from the outset. There were also high-ranking ativarṇas among them, such as Tullus Hostilius, the third king of Rome, not to mention Rome's first god-man king, Rōmulus, who, as Quirinus, became one of Rome's three god-kings of Rome, alongside Jupiter and Mars.

The destabilisation of the castes occurred earlier everywhere than among the Indo-Hindus because they gave up the indispensability of the second (confirming) "birth" sooner.

In the West, the clergy, monastic clergy and monasticism were only a pale imitation of the brāhmaṇas, the representatives of the noble warrior aristocracy were the ksatriyas, and the . In ancient times and the historical Middle Ages, everything was more or less in its place, everything went as it should, or almost as it should . At the turn of the Middle Ages and the modern era, everything had finally faded away. Among the orders of knights, those that represented a truly "action-heroic" path represented the spirit of tradition the most, as did the secret societies, which were also based on the principles of the orders of knights and supplemented this with Gnostic and even "theourgo-magicus" practices. In this regard, the Order of the Grail, the We are referring to the true Rosicrucians and the Knights Templar, as well as those who may have had closer ties to them.

From the 14th century onwards, but even more so from the 16th century onwards, the decline became increasingly unstoppable , but today we can rightly say that what existed until 1945 is worlds apart from the situation that arose afterwards. The Japanese Empire in 1945 — even after the atomic bombs — was a traditional country, perhaps the most traditional in the world, but in 1946 all that came to an end. The internal destructive processes had obviously been latent for much longer, probably for centuries, but the cause of the collapse was Hirohito 's inability to "renounce" his divine origin, as if one could renounce one's origin or ancestry. (Frithjof Schuon made some very apt observations on this subject in his book on Buddhism made some very apt observations, with which one can only agree.) The new emperor, Akihito, was asked in 1989 and then again in 1990, during his ceremonial accession to the throne, to remain in Japan. traditional circles to declare Hirohito's renunciation of his divine origin null and void and to restore the dignity of the Tenno, ensuring that their guardian could always . Akihito did not comply with this request, and it is unlikely that his more modern-minded son or his descendants from his far more morganatic marriage.

1945 was indeed a year that can be characterised as the beginning of Satan's reign, as it came to pass. But the end of the 20th century was an even darker period. The majority of these generations had either died by the end of the 20th century or, if still alive, had grown so old that they could hardly do anything. By the end of the 20th century, most of these generations had either died or, if still alive, had grown so old that they could hardly do anything.

In this advanced phase of the Kali Yuga's closing era, all remaining values are collapsing. The castes, and even the faint echoes of the castes, have collapsed in the West, and the caste structure in India is also on the verge of collapse.

Ethnic groups are mixing chaotically and will thus slowly — or not so slowly — disappear in the process of disintegration following this mixing. If the Earth's population continues to grow at the current rate, by around 2010* there will be ten billion people living on Earth; doubling will occur at increasingly shorter intervals. If humans no other "global" problems to contend with except overpopulation, this alone would be considered fatal. However, there are countless problems, and they are all interrelated.

Under no circumstances should the number of people living on Earth exceed one hundred million, according to traditional principles. Around the 6th century BC, the number of people living on Earth reached one hundred million and immediately exceeded this limit. This period was a time of a final great spiritual upsurge, which was followed almost immediately by a great spiritual collapse and decline. A materialistic outlook could not have existed in the world until then could not exist in the world, but from then on, even if only to a very limited extent, it could.

This period was followed by another thousand years, which, although largely a time of decline, saw tradition resist the rather superficial effects of anti-tradition. The historical Middle Ages, which meant a deeper descent than in ancient times due to the darkening, was in some respects superior to ancient times. This was when anti-traditional influences began to surface, and with them a more decisive resistance. It is by no means what was needed, but even in retrospect, what has been achieved cannot be considered insignificant.

The Middle Ages and the spirit of the Middle Ages would require a completely different approach to historical science than the one it currently receives. The historical Middle Ages were anything but "dark" when compared to later modern and contemporary history. Of course, compared to prehistory, this period was also a dark age, but so was antiquity.

To sum up what has been said: every single human individual — from a spiritual, not biological point of view — can be considered an independent species, and indeed should be considered an independent species. The family, the clan, the tribe, the ethnos, the subrace, the race, the macro-race, the basic race — again from a spiritual point of view — would correspond to much more comprehensive "taxa" than this purely biological overview would allow. Certain "gens dynastica" — as we have noted represented at least the same "order of magnitude" as individual ethnic groups, and there were even some that represented a significantly higher level of existence.

There are those who came "from above" in every respect — we might say superhuman and superhuman-origin humans — and there are those who came "from below," whose ancient origins were also superhuman, but who fell so far and so long ago that their awareness of their former superiority was completely lost. (There have been discoveries from which it seems possible to conclude that even the most lowly peoples — those in contact with the supernatural — also have legends that point to a higher origin.) In this regard, it is not unlikely that these . This would be supported by another — by no means implausible — hypothesis, according to which the "substratum lemurianum" is the language and

They may have been on the verge of losing their language, and their actual languages — which were often far from inferior — were partly acquired and partly plundered from the Hyperborean-origin Boreal ethnic groups, also through contact.

According to the almost unanimous opinion of traditional thinkers, humanity — as a category — is one of the borderline categories, and referring to it would only make sense if armies of subhuman beings were to attack all humans without exception.

humanity is a category that, on the one hand, represents a boundary "downwards", separating humans from animals and demons, and on the other hand, represents a boundary "upwards", separating humans

from all beings above humans. In a complete world state, there would be no sense or dignity in refer to "humanity", apart from what we have already referred to, a fictitious possibility that, say, the collective totality of the world's rats ("ratness") would attack the collective totality of humans ("humanity"). The adequate traditional

For adherents of the existentialist view, "humanity" is not a point of reference or a normal category. In a spiritual sense, it is not "humanity" that unites people, but Man. Manu or Mahā-Manu, Prajāpati or Prajāpati-Pati, or, according to the Qabbālā(h), 'Adām Qadmōn(i).

Man, as we have said, defined according to the traditional view of existence, does not belong biologically — even in the broadest sense — to the animal world. It is much more true to say — to put it bluntly — that, in a broad sense, animals belong to the human world, and in an even broader sense, this is also true of the plant world, the mineral world, and indeed, all "entities".

Humans do not originate from the animal world, neither directly nor indirectly — from living beings — but from the lifeless nature. Man — according to his essential origin — is not a natural being. The Subject does not derive from the human form of existence, does not originate from anything, is not an "entitas", nor even a "supra-entitas" — it is beginningless, infinite and timelessly eternal.

Individual human beings, ethnic groups, races in the physical, spiritual and intellectual sense, and castes also differ from one another. This difference can be symbolised on the one hand by 'horizontality' and on the other by 'verticality'. This is something that everyone knows, even those who would be willing to sacrifice their lives for the cause of denying the fundamental differences between human beings.

everyone knows this, even those who would be willing to sacrifice their lives for the cause of denying the fundamental differences between people. The differences established along the lines of 'verticality'

implicate the existence of differences in social status. To deny this and its validity is to express a lack of common sense, especially considering that, as we have noted — everyone is aware of this to some extent, even those who vehemently deny it.

It is evident that the assumption of hierarchical differences between people in no way implies, even indirectly, that those who are higher in the social hierarchy can oppress, exploit, or persecute those who are lower in the social hierarchy those who are lower in the social hierarchy and who live within the framework of their fundamental human rights; nor can they do so even if those who are lower in the social hierarchy do not live within the framework of their fundamental rights; but they can take action to that could threaten the internal harmony of an organic society (now more desired and assumed than actually existing) and the organic state above it.

The forces that collaborate with those generating Kali Yuga strive to put organic society and the state, which are already almost completely impossible, into a state of constant offensive readiness, and they are largely successful in this.

, and they are largely succeeding in this endeavour.

Adherents of the traditional worldview do not want to prevent the Kali Yuga from running its course; in fact, in some respects, they want to accelerate its pace. However, they want to achieve this in a completely different way than the human agents of the forces collaborating to generate the Kali Yuga. The intention of the adherents of the traditional view of existence is to raise, revitalise and preserve the values that have descended from the heights into the depths. This is the only way can the Mahā-Yuga — in the spirit of building the Golden Age — in the spirit of building the Golden Age. Those who collaborate with the forces generating the Kali Yuga are not aware of the principles of spirituality, even if they are not completely inexperienced in this field. They do not realise that while they are destructively controlling almost the entire economic, political and cultural life of the world, they themselves are being controlled to the greatest extent, nor do they realise that the destructive forces that are destroying almost all values will ultimately crush them too, and in this respect
No thinking person can have any doubt about this.

†If Turul means hawk, and it probably does, it is interesting that the dynasty that ruled over the first Hungarians is also associated with the hawk, as is the last one, — the Habsburg and Habsburg-Lothringen dynasties, since the word Habsburg comes from the word Habichtsburg, which means Falcon Castle, also expresses the connection with the falcon.

††We know for certain that the classification presented here differs greatly from the "officially" accepted biological-anthropological schools and trends. Nevertheless, we accept this seemingly "heterodox" classification as standard.

*This is currently estimated to be between 2030 and 2050 (editor's note).

A CRITIQUE OF THE ILLUSION OF PROGRESS

Progressivism — as the forced affirmation of the superstition of "progress" — is the sister theory of evolutionism — as the forced affirmation of the superstition of "evolutio".

Progression has descended into history (according to progressivists, into history). The alleged "evolution" of human social, civilisational, cultural, religious, philosophical, scientific, economic, political and state life.

Progressionism is more dangerous than ordinary evolutionism, from which it is otherwise inseparable from it. For here it is not merely a question of the alleged progress does not exist, but also that this alleged and desired progress — which, of course, is not real progress — were to be realised, it would pose an extremely destructive threat, as it always has when progressivists talked about the realisation of progress, or — looking back — still talk about it today.

Progress in history has never been anything other than "digressio" in terms of quality. descensionalis et dissolutionalis, that is, the actual, or "qualitativ progressio," is nothing more than the most deceitful deception, without the slightest basis. Those manifestations which are usually referred to as the glories of "human progress" by the committed followers of progressivism are nothing more than dark stains on human history, at least for those who do not completely reject all possible forms of spirituality and tradition.

Superiority cannot be associated with anything other than closeness to the spirit, closeness to God, closeness to the self, and everything that is closely related to these in the sense of affinity. It cannot in any way be validly associated with the degree of technicisation or — with a positive sign — with materialistic atheism and increased irreligiousness.

The superiority recognised by progressivism is diametrically opposed not only to what the traditional view of existence considers superior, but also to what any intelligent and sensible, unpretentious people regard it as such.

In the eyes of "retrospective" progressives, early Christianity was extremely "progressive"; it was in stark contrast to Romanism, the traditional Roman religion, or the cults of the Mithraic mysteries. . Later, when Christianity came to dominate, it was still "progressive," but only in contrast to "Gnostic currents," including Gnostic Christianity. According to progressivists, Catholic Christianity, which had become entrenched in power, represented a "retrograde" spiritual reality, even though, from a traditional point of view, it was actually beginning to become "positive".

Every anti-church and anti-empire manifestation is considered and presented as "progressive" positivity according to the progressivist view.

In this respect, liberal progressivism does not differ much from Bolshevik-Communist progressivism; both consider exactly the same manifestations to be

"progressive" positives and the same as "reactionary" negatives, and vice versa.

Humanism is highly valued by both forms of progressivism. From a traditional perspective, humanism, which limits the human world exclusively to the earthly-human world and which could and wanted to carry out the tasks to be solved in the earthly-human world exclusively within the scope of earthly-human paths, goals, frameworks, means and methods, which (turned towards man in such a way that it turned away from man's superhuman and god-like possibilities: which can be considered decisive and, so to speak, entirely negative.

The Renaissance — judged from a traditional point of view — was a rebirth and a deadly decline. There were manifestations associated with this era — which — viewed purely in themselves — could even appear to be positive.

Such were the connection to "antiquity," the "reclassification" of the Latin language, and the revival of interest in the Greek language. These superficial positives were indeed only . Behind them, the main driving force was Catholicism and the goal of undermining the Church. The antiquity to which the anti-spiritual spirit of the Renaissance turned was not the traditional reality of Roman Latin and Greek culture. If, just like To a lesser extent, the spiritual and traditional assessment of the Renaissance would have been quite different. The Renaissance was not the antithesis of Christianity, but rather its opposite, and at that time, it could not have been otherwise.

There were prominent figures of the Renaissance who cannot be associated with the dark forces operating in the background of the Renaissance: such were, for example, Cardinal Nicolaus Cusanus, Marsilius Ficinus [Marsiglio Ficino], Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, Count of Mirandola and Prince of Concordia. Their work is not entirely free from ideas whose traditional validity and spiritual unconditionality are debatable, but they essentially represented a theoretical approach in line with tradition.

The retrospective view of progressivism is strongly pro-Renaissance, and — as is obvious — they consider the most negative features of the Renaissance to be the most positive, the most "progressive".

In retrospect, the Reformation and Protestantism are also considered "progressive" by The Reformation and Protestantism had both positive and negative aspects and characteristics.

The Reformation and Protestantism had both positive and negative aspects and characteristics. From a traditional point of view, the negative features were and remain predominant. The positive aspects of the Reformation were almost completely unable to develop, and there were no truly clear and strong efforts to develop them. The Prussian kingdom, in some respects, used Protestantism for its own to support its expansion, but without Protestantism becoming unconditionally significant in this regard.

There is no doubt that Protestantism was closer to and stood closer to the exotericism of early Christianity than Roman Catholicism, Eastern Orthodoxy, Monophysite Christianity, or Nestorianism, but this — from a traditional , this was more of a disadvantage than an advantage, because, in contrast to the above-mentioned trends in Christianity, they became extra-Christianised in many respects and, at the same time, traditionalised, in an attempt to revive early Christian exoterism and

attempting to revive it — in many respects, they became extra-Christianised and, along with this, traditionalised.

It is hardly debatable that the highest manifestations of Protestantism were the Protestant orders of knights. The Protestant branch of the Teutonic (German) Order and the Prussian Order of St. John. Knightly Protestantism lasted until approximately the middle of the 20th century — the last quarter — it managed to maintain a certain "actitudinal" level, but today it is in sharp decline. The Taizé Brothers — a largely ecumenical Protestant monastic order following the Rule of St. Benedict — presented a positive image between approximately 1945 and 1990 image, especially because of its rapprochement with Catholicism. Recently, however, it seems that modernism has begun to have a strong influence on them, and their strongly expansionist "publicity" is beginning to undermine the standards of this order and community.

The progressives' support for Protestantism — understandably — did not extend to any of the positive aspects of Protestantism. The activities of the Taizé Brothers also provoked strong resentment in all "progressive" personalities, but since this community has begun to show signs of decline, the "progressives" have begun to look more favourably upon the existence of the Taizé community.

In relation to Protestantism — but also independently of it — every rebellion and uprising fills progressives with an interest in history with extraordinary enthusiasm, and they are clearly regarded as "progressive", i.e. worthy of re-evaluation.

The English Revolution of 1648/1649, which remained in power until 1659, and its antecedents between 1642 and 1646 — especially its least stable and most turbulent periods and features — were and are regarded as one of the triumphs of "progress" by the obsessives of progressivism and the multitude of semi- and quarter-educated people under their influence in the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries.

After the Renaissance and the Protestant Reformation, partly in parallel with and partly extending beyond the rebellious-revolutionary and Protectorate periods in England, a period began which bears the name "Age of Enlightenment" and was considered a particularly "progressive" era in the eyes of progressives.

The darkening referred to as the "Enlightenment" was an exceptionally intense manifestation of the closing phase of Kali Yuga and the advance of the forces operating within it. By "Enlightenment," doubt in the spirit and the Divine, and indeed this was the case, but not in the sense of enlightenment, but rather in the sense of a descent into darkness. The process called "enlightenment" began with "deism". They began to talk about the Supreme Being or the Highest Being, whose fundamental nature is "Reason". This was also professed by the leaders of the French Revolution, with the exception of the most extreme ones, such as Jacques Hébert and his followers. The home of the "Enlightenment" was mainly France, and a very important chapter in this process was the Encyclopaedism. The creation of an encyclopaedia — viewed in isolation — would be an unambiguous positive, even according to the most radical traditional view. Unfortunately, this was not the case in the 18th century: encyclopaedism, the collective of encyclopaedists, was oriented towards atheism, with a "deist" and "pro-atheist" line of thought. : encyclopaedism and the encyclopaedists represented a "deist" and "pro-atheist" orientation and, one might say, movement towards atheism.

Encyclopaedism prepared and promoted the advance of Freemasonry in accordance with the Masonic plans formulated in 1717, which, seventy-two years later, culminated in a "world day"

seventy-two years later, the "great" French Revolution. It prepared and promoted the infiltration of the Order of the Illuminati into Freemasonry, thus paving the way for the emergence of the emergence of "Jacobinism".

The particularly dark nature of the "Enlightenment" is also expressed by the fact that doubt in God, or even outright atheism, was associated with enlightenment by progressives in that era, just as it is today.

Needless to say, the greatest enthusiasm was and continues to be generated by the brutal French Revolution of 1789 among the former and current champions of progressivism. In their view, this was the

"most progressive" act of "humanity" to date, and in their view — and in ours, in some respects in our opinion — the subsequent great and "progressive" movements of "humanity". They are somewhat more restrained in their praise of the Reign of Terror, but they do not object to it either fundamental objection to it. Progressives tend to regard 18th- and 19th-century nationalism as as "progressive", but they consider 20th-century nationalism to be extremely retrograde and "reactionary".

The French Revolution of 1830, Charles X, who was still a great French figure in the late modern era The expulsion of the king was seen by progressives as a series of positive, glorious and very "progressive" acts even then, and their position on this has not changed today.

Even Louis Philippe's weak rule was too much for the revolutionary progressives, who branded it as retrograde and "reactionary". The revolutionary uprisings in France, revolutionary uprisings in France, Austria and Hungary in 1848, which provoked rejection and contempt in all sensible and right-minded people, both then and now, were and are considered by former and current progressives as a series of "glorious" and "progressive" celebrations.

The European revolutions of 1848 and the events of the 1848/49 Hungarian revolutionary uprising, which escalated into a treasonous civil war, cannot be accepted from a traditional point of view, and can only be viewed with the most extreme retrospective rejection. can be dealt with. No nation can wage a "war of independence" against its king — in this case Ferdinand V and Franz Joseph I. Not to mention that Hungary and the Hungarian nation did not live under oppression during the reign of the Habsburg and Habsburg-Lothringen kings under oppression or in any circumstances that could be considered slavery.

The revolutionary uprisings in France in 1870/71 — closely linked to the Franco-Prussian War — and, within that, the revolutionary "commune" of 1871, were also a glorious period of glorious deeds in the eyes of liberal and socialist-communist progressives, and even today they look back on these shameful events and times with the same assessment.

The two-stage Russian Revolution of 1917 was the darkest, most demonic, most satanic series of events in world history. From a traditional point of view, there is no other way to assess it. The European revolutions of 1918/19, which can be traced back to the Russian Revolution, largely followed the model of the Russian Revolution. The 1918 "Aster Revolution" in Hungary followed the first phase of the Russian Revolution under Kerensky, and the "proclamation" of the "Council Republic" in 1919 followed the second phase of the Russian Revolution, Lenin-style phase of the Russian Revolution. The Bavarian "Council Republic" was also established in the footsteps of the latter.

Socialist-communist progressives became, and still are, albeit somewhat more cautiously, staunch admirers of the two-stage Soviet Russian revolution, especially the second phase led by Lenin, although they show more interest in the first phase led by Kerensky.

Liberal progressives did not dare to call themselves unreserved supporters of the Bolshevik-Communist revolution. They considered as "progressive" or even "very progressive," although they criticise certain "excesses" and "overreactions." They also consider the revolution within Lenin's revolution to be "progressive" in its intentions, but flawed and "distorted" in its "execution", and they condemn only the much later Stalinist revolution almost without exception.

The "Aster Revolution" that broke out in Hungary at the end of October 1918 was considered by both socialists and liberal progressives to be a "very progressive" and "glorious" historical event, with its flaws but essentially entirely acceptable and, in retrospect, "celebratory" in nature. Incidentally, this view is not only held by socialist-communist and liberal "retrospectors", but also by "moderate right-wingers" (in fact, moderately or not so moderately left-wing pseudo-right-wingers) prominent historians and politicians, who declared themselves admirers of the 1918 Hungarian revolution and thus also admirers of Mihály Károlyi.

The only mistake or sin they attributed to Mihály Károlyi was that he allowed Béla Kun and his followers. Today, only the most extreme left-wing communists dare to openly praise the "council republic" conditions in Hungary under Béla Kun and Tibor Szamuely as "progressive".

As a side note, we would like to mention that in Hungary, for example, the 1848 revolution and the 1849 civil war, referred to as the "war of independence" — which even involved external forces — are likened by liberal progressives, communist progressives, but the most extreme among them also closely associate the events of 1848–49 with the revolution that proclaimed the "Council Republic" closely related to the events of 1848–49. At first glance, all this seems like "sacrilege". Upon closer examination, however, this is not the case. All left-wing rebellions, revolutionary civil wars, and left-wing civil wars that escalate into civil wars can be compared to each other, and what is more, they should be compared to each other.

Unfortunately, 1848/49 is not only likened to the 1918 "Aster Revolution" — which would not be a problem — but both are also likened to the Hungarian anti-communist uprising and war of independence that broke out in Hungary on 23 October 1956. This is a serious and culpable mistake. The 1956 Hungarian uprising and war of independence was the only uprising and war of independence in the entire history of Hungary, the Hungarian nation and the Hungarian people. The fight against the Turks was a war against the invading and then occupying against external enemies — defensive and reconquest wars. The "freedom fights" of Bocskai, Bethlen, Thököly, Rákóczi and Kossuth were nothing more than widespread revolutionary uprisings and civil wars. It was only in the autumn of 1956 that a true freedom uprising and freedom struggle against the most vicious enemy occupiers and their most despicable mercenary puppets. There was no other freedom fight or freedom uprising, nor was it even conceivable or comprehensible, either in the course of Hungarian history to date, in the eyes of those who once saw and thought clearly, nor in the understanding of those who look back on historical processes from today's perspective. What happened in Hungary in the autumn of 1956

— was not a "progressive" event at all, nor was it the work of "progressive-minded" people. "progressive" act. The liberal progressives must also be aware of this — secretly — and probably are aware of it — secretly — but it would not be beneficial to their endeavours if they , since the memory of 23 October 1956 – when properly manipulated – is perfectly suited to the agents of certain intentions collaborating with the forces generating Kali Yuga now, at the end of the 20th century.

It is clear that there is no real "progress" at all, and what the advocates of progressivism call progress is in fact *digressio descensionalis*, *dissolutionalis*, *destructionalis*, *degenerative* and *deviant* in the sense and spirit of a serious and acute catastrophe.

Societies and states, which are inherently higher than societies, are not only failing to progress in the so-called advancement of history, but are gradually and then increasingly rapidly declining, descending and deteriorating towards destruction.

Societies and states — starting from the society above society and the state above the state — in the course of history originating above history — truly transform into societies below society societies and states below the state, in accordance with a process of degeneration, and history originating above history and historicity is increasingly approaching subordination to history and historicity, and in some respects is already in the process of transitioning to it.

The last traditional social system (and economic system) was feudalism — or, as we would say today, feudalism. Bourgeois liberal democracy and the capitalism associated with it, as well as plebeian social democracy and the economic socialism associated with it — profoundly anti-traditional formations, not to mention communism — as a utopia and as the practice of its "construction" through socialism. These shapeless forms of "progress" are all products of decline. Economic capitalism differs from economic socialism — socialist state capitalism — in that, in terms of its relatively coherent forms, it is more or less functional, while the socialism is as inefficient as possible, even in the short term, and in the long term proves to be unworkable.

Whether economic capitalism takes the form of private capitalism, corporate or joint-stock capitalism, group capitalism, community capitalism, state capitalism or national capitalism, it is essentially negative, namely left-wing and anti-traditional.

Economic "capitale activum" — in itself — is obviously not negative, but it immediately becomes so if it loses its active nature, and if the private or corporate or any other form of ownership of "capitale" becomes capitalist ownership.

Feudal estates were originally embodied in land holdings. The basic principle was that all land — Essentially, it belongs to God. The king receives it from God as a "fief", so in concrete terms, all land belongs to the king. The largest feudal lords receive it from the king, and from them, either directly or through intermediate noble owners, the serfs. The land was the private property of the serfs — "non capitalisticus" — but in a higher sense — even more so — and also non-capitalisticus — it was the private property of the feudal lords, and even more so, it was entirely the private property of the king, and in an absolute sense, it belonged to God. However, in this "hierarchico-gradualitas" of property rights, there is no trace of capitalist "ownership". At one time, land holdings could not be sold, bought, exchanged or gambled away. Even the richest

could not buy land. Land could only be received: primarily and ultimately from the ruler, or — indirectly — from the feudal lords authorised to do so. Intertwined with the industrial economy society has already seriously deteriorated and become decadent. Increasing decadence and increasing technicisation go hand in hand. The proliferation of machines separates man as a worker from his work and the results of his work. This

all-encompassing alienation is clearly evident in connection with the advent of machines. In the world of industrial technicisation, feudalism has completely disappeared, while manufacturing (craft) industry — albeit in a completely different form than in land ownership and agriculture — persisted for a long time. The professional orders, corporations, and guilds — could be considered, in a certain sense, as feudal remnants in the positive sense of the word.

Although, from a traditional point of view, it would perhaps be it would be more appropriate to gradually transform it back, as long as it exists — however strange it may seem — it would not be impossible to "feudalise" it to some extent, of course, after the previous "refeudalisation" of landowning agriculture. Control over joint-stock companies could be given and received as a "quasi-feudum". And shares could only be held by those

could receive and purchase those who have a "connection" to the industrial activities of the joint-stock company ; there could also be separate employee shares, which could be obtained — after a certain period of time — by employees working in the relevant industry and employed by the joint-stock company and then — on the basis of authorisation — could buy them.

All this would be far from "progressive" in the eyes of liberal and socialist progressives . However, since they are in power, there is very little prospect of "refeudalisation" and "feudalificatio nova" will take place, since in the countries of the former "socialist camp" the reprivatisation of stolen assets is not taking place, and the new state systems are taking over the assets stolen by the older state systems and — sells them off as a middleman, while offering the former owners of the property or their descendants pitiful and laughable "compensation" that is equivalent to a refusal to provide actual compensation equivalent to denying them actual compensation.

The most widespread form of government in the world today is the "res publica", or republic. Modern republics have little in common with the "paradigm" the "Res Publica Romana", which is at an unimaginable height — in every era — compared to any of today's republics, even though the Roman Republic was also far below both the earlier Roman Kingdom and the later Roman Empire, which can be dated from Julius Caesar's rise to power — the Roman There were states that were, in fact, republics de jure.

There were states that were "de jure" republics , but in essence they were "monarchy equivalents". One such example was Venice, which was ruled by the "doges". According to the traditional worldview, Venice was until the 13th century — and even to this day — effective — exemplary, but not from then on. Thus, only monarchies — empires, kingdoms, grand duchies/grand principalities, principalities/duchies, sovereign counties or quasi-res-publica equivalent to monarchies — correspond to the traditional view.

These are precisely the ones that are least "progressive" in the eyes of progressives and which — unfortunately, not entirely independently of this — are disappearing.

At the time of writing — in 1995 — there is only one empire left in the world, existing both de jure and de facto: the Japanese Empire, which today is, in many respects, only a memory of what it once was and what it should still be today.

After the First World War, four empires ceased to exist: the German Empire, the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy — as an empire in relation to Austria and as an empire in relation to Russia The Empire, i.e. the Russian Tsarist Empire, the Turkish Empire, i.e. the Turkish Sultanate. Although the Russian Tsarist Empire fought on the side of the Entente Cordiale in the war — unlike the other three empires — it still ceased to exist, it had to cease to exist, because one of the main goals of World War I was to eliminate these empires, which — albeit in a faded form — still preserved and maintained some kind of tradition. This goal was the political goal of Freemasonry, just as the peace treaties signed in the Paris area at the end of the World War and their nature were also entirely inspired by Freemasonry.

The shakiness of theories of human evolution and progress is nowhere as spectacularly as in the case of languages. We can rightly say that all human languages are in a state of "digressio descensionalis" compared to their archaic states . This fact is completely indisputable, and anyone who believes that simply does not understand what we are talking about.

Root words or word roots — radices — have not been created in any language in the last five thousand years (and possibly even longer). Every new word is created either through affixes, compounds, or derivations — or as an abbreviation acronyms, or in other similar ways. The dignity and power of naming has been lost. There are dreams in which some kind of — often high-ranking — reality appears, along with its name. After waking up, the name does not fade from memory, but its meaning does; one may still know that it had real weight and significance, but its original, very precise meaning is lost.

The standard of languages may indeed "rise" — there can be no doubt about that — but this rise is not a rise in the language itself, nor is it the result of an inner rise in the people who live with the language. This so-called rise is in fact the result of "language innovations" from other language paradigms , which is based in part on the adoption of foreign words, the translation of foreign words, and the creation of words through combination, compounding or derivation.

The Hungarian language is almost unique in terms of its natural, atmospheric, onomatopoeic — original — words and the beauty of these words. At the same time, there were almost no original words with which valid philosophical literature could have been created. The word translations and word creations of the language reform era and the significant Its expansion now makes Hungarian suitable for creating philosophical or even supra-philosophical literature of any standard, but only if it continues to make ample use of Latin, Greco-Latin and Greek words, as well as words borrowed from other languages. (Let us look at an example: the Hungarian translation of the Latin word "tolerantia" is "türelem" or "tűrés" (patience or tolerance). — in most cases, these translations are perfectly usable, but not always: gyógyszer-tolerantia or kábítószer-tolerantia cannot be translated as gyógyszer-türelem or kábítószer-türelem, because that would be nonsense; they can be translated as gyógyszer-tűrés or kábítószer-tűrés

, but even these forms do not fully and accurately express what the original language means and expresses.

Analogical-paradigmatic linguistic interactions, borrowings in the original and in translation, including changes in meaning, contribute to the enrichment of individual languages and, on the other hand, to their relative impoverishment. The vocabulary of languages is constantly It expands and contracts, but on the whole it tends to expand. However, this is not linguistic "evolution", linguistic progression, and certainly not linguistic ascension, but merely linguistic "amplification", which may have implications for "enrichment" or even "elevation" — without any real, substantial elevation. From the point of view of the "morphogrammatology" of languages, they mostly become impoverished and decline.

According to the most common "language evolutionist" view, languages that were previously synthetic later became analytical, which is more or less true, but it is not true that this corresponds to a process of becoming superior.

The Chinese language, which has long been extremely analytical and root-isolating, is one of the most advanced languages, but certain American Indian languages, which are polysynthetic and incorporating, are certain American Indian languages, which are polysynthetic and incorporative. Analyticality and syntheticity alone do not determine the superiority of a language. Several languages may have undergone analytical-synthetic-analytical-synthetic phases, and there can undoubtedly be "pseudo-synthetic" stages in the life of a language. It is probable that languages originally existed in some kind of unity between extreme "analyticity" and extreme polysynthesis.

Linguistic trees and shrubs — turning from the sky towards the earth — are not as implausible as biological trees and shrubs. However, we must also take into account the possibility of completely parallel developments must also be taken into account, and not all similar languages necessarily had — necessarily a common linguistic ancestor.

The single most ancient and original proto-language — did not and could not be an earthly language; the "separation" of the true proto-languages may have taken place in the higher celestial spheres, and separate proto-languages already existed in the lower celestial planes.

Of course, there were also terrestrial base languages, as there can be no doubt that Latin was the ancestor of the Neo-Latin (Romanian) languages, even if the various "substrates", "superstrata", "adstrata" and "instrata" were taken into account more than usual.

If we were to take all aspects into account, then among the commonly known languages, we would have to place Sanskrit (i.e. the combination of Vedic, Epic, Classical, and Middle Indian Buddhist and Jain Sanskrit) at the highest level, but obviously — not in all respects, and it cannot be ruled out that there were — and perhaps still are — secret sacred languages known only to a small circle of people, which never became widely known and probably never will. Certain sources mention such languages languages, but unfortunately, these are mostly sources whose reliability is highly questionable. The spiritual languages of Latin and Greek Its superiority is indisputable, but Italian, French, Spanish and the Neo-Latin languages in general, as well as the Germanic languages, are also superior. German occupies a special place in this regard

: in some respects it approaches the status of Latin, and in some cases even surpasses it, but in other respects it exceeds it.

The word composition and word formation possibilities of German are not inferior to those of Greek; only Sanskrit surpasses it among the Indo-Germanic or Indo-European languages. (The Hungarian language's rather rich word composition and possibilities in this regard — in addition to its inherent potential — were developed on the German model as a result of conscious language reform.

The complexity and very existence of compound words is not necessarily a sign, let alone a guarantee, of a language's intellectual status (think of Chinese, for example), but it is undoubtedly a serious contributor — on all levels, one might say — to the expressive possibilities of linguistic nuances

In purely agglutinative languages, agglutinatives, and in agglutinative and inflected languages, the "agglutinium" cause and the "apophonia flexinum" disappear and cease to exist: this is always a sign of the decline of the language, but it is also independent of this if "periphrasticus" expressions are needed where independent verb forms once played a role. The "modernised" linguistic forms are, almost without exception, signs of decay and decline.

The progress proclaimed by progressivists is not progress, but a decline turning into a fall and a destructive, decaying disintegration. All this lies deep beneath not only the pre-historical era of archaism, but also of antiquity, the Middle Ages and the early modern era, which are secondary in comparison. Each decade brings a new and more pronounced decline "gradus", and we are getting closer and closer to the stage when these gradus will be annual and even more frequent.

The descent into decline is not uniform and does not accelerate at a constant rate. There are processes that counteract the decline. Furthermore, the law of alternating peaks and troughs applies, but the peaks are lower today than the troughs were in the past, and the troughs are deeper than the peaks were in the past. troughs, but the peaks of the waves are lower today than the troughs were in the past, and this will increasingly be the case in the future.

Societies, states, religions and cultures — far from evenly, but ultimately — are sinking deeper and deeper into obscurity, darkness, confusion and disintegration. There can be no question of real progress; wherever these processes are heading, if you like — progressing: it is towards Nothingness. Everything that is considered particularly "progressive" is particularly destructive and disruptive.

Disruptive processes must be resisted. Not because of the reversal of processes. This would require a power greater than that of the Lord of the Age — but the goal is not reversal is the goal. The Dark Age must run its course; it should be accelerated rather than slowed down. However, the hidden values of the depths and heights must be brought to the fore again and preserved with careful attention. These "extractum essentialé" can be transferred to the forces generating the coming Golden Age.

If someone lacks the ability to think critically, they may give in to the temptation suggested by progressives: how can we judge the sciences, especially the natural sciences, the results appearing in medicine, not to mention the technical sciences.

There is undoubtedly an apparent "quasi-progress" in the sciences, the apparent nature of which must be strictly and repeatedly emphasised, and which can be understood as more of an "optical illusion".

At one time — when the sciences were still supra-scientific sciences — their practitioners still had direct experience, and their knowledge was of a supra-rational origin and nature.

When this transcendental experience and knowledge descended, the occult-level experience and knowledge still remained. There was no need to process and record data, no need for telescopes and microscopes, no need for instruments (although these may have existed), and indeed, no need for certain types of calculations.

registering data, there was no need for telescopes and microscopes, instruments (although such things may have existed), and there was no need for certain types of calculations either.

When occult vision and knowledge also generally disappeared, everything had to be found multiple intermediaries, external and lower approaches. For example, the had to be rediscovered, and initially the process of rediscovery began with the most banal solutions.

It is obvious that early modern astronomical and other scientific tables were much less accurate than today's. It goes without saying that medicine was much

learned more about the human body over time than at the dawn of medical knowledge as we understand it today. Traditional medical approaches have survived, and still exist today, but they are not perfect in every respect compared to today's "official"

medicine, especially when it comes to treating serious illnesses in people whose bodies have become "coarsened" over time

, although they can sometimes achieve remarkable results

, the sciences have not really and essentially developed, since people themselves have declined since then and are still declining, but the inferior and superficial processes of "reinvention" may nevertheless give this impression to the unsuspecting and uninformed.

We must turn both towards the Past and towards the Future, of course, in a completely different way, with a different meaning, with a different purpose. Above all, however, the Present, and even more so the

"point-like" present than to the equally important Present Age. The "point-like" Present is the gate that opens the shortest path to Timeless Eternity. This is where we must turn first and foremost; this is where I must turn, to put it more intensely. The traditional

and essentially traditional person is a person of the Past, Present and Future, and by no means exclusively of the Past, as is mistakenly believed, simply because the patterns to be followed models to follow are drawn from the Past. Rather, they are people of the "point-like" Present who want to transmute themselves into people of Timeless Eternity.

THE END OF KALI-YUGA

From an astro-symbolological point of view, Kali Yuga, or the Dark Age, the Iron Age or Lead Age, began precisely in 427,542 BC, or -427,541 in astronomical terms, and in fact around that time. The Kali Yuga lasts for 432,000 years

"hypo-cyclis" within the Mahā-Yuga, which lasts 4,320,000 years. There are ten Alpa-Yugas within the Kali-Yuga, four of which form the Alpa-Satya-Kṛta-Yuga within the Kali-Yuga, three form the Alpa-Trētā-Yuga, two form the Alpa-Dvāpara-Yuga, and one period lasting 43,200 years forms the Alpa-Kali-Yuga within the Kali-Yuga.

The Mahā-Yuga is divided into 4,320,000 years within an extended Mahā-Yuga period of 6,480,000 years period, the Kali-Yuga 432,000 years into an extended Kali-Yuga of 648,000 years, and the 43,200-year Alpa-Kali-Yuga into an extended Alpa-Kali-Yuga of 64,800 years.

With these "amplifications", Kali-Yuga began earlier than the astro-symbolic date given above, precisely in 638,142 BC, astronomically in 638,141 BC, and factually around that time. The Alpa-Kali-Yuga within this period — as mentioned above

— It lasts for 64,800 years, and the earthly-human world is currently in its final phase.

Alpālpa-Kali-Yuga lasts 4,320 years, "extended" 6,480 years, the Alpālpa-Kali-Yuga lasts 432 years, "extended" to 648 years, but these two latter unextended and extended eras and era calculations — although by no means insignificant — play almost no role in our subsequent investigations.

The Kali Yuga, lasting 432,000 years, and the Alpa Kali Yuga within the Kali Yuga, lasting 43,200 years, are concluded by a "separate" phase lasting $1,080 + 6,480 + 1,080 = 8,640$ years. The extended 648,000-year Kali Yuga and the also extended Alpa Kali Yuga within it, which lasts 64,800 years, are closed by a $3,240 + 12,960 + 3,240 = 19,440$ -year phase, which is also separate.

In both senses, the current earthly-human world is in these closing phases. The end of the closing phase of the Kali Yuga also marks the end of the Mahā Yuga's pre-manifestation period, the *ṣṛṣṭi*.

The unexpanded and expanded forms of the various Mahā-Yuga, Yuga, Alpa-Yuga, Alpālpa-Yuga and Alpālpa-Yuga periods do not contradict each other in the least, but function organically within each other, along with many other types of cycles that are larger and longer or smaller and shorter than these.

We should focus our attention primarily on the 432,000-year Kali-Yuga and its 43,000-year Alpa-Kali-Yuga, the structure of which is as follows: $1,080+6,480+1,080+25,920+1,080+6,480+1,080 = 43,200$ years, i.e. the innermost "core" is a symbolic period of a precessional cycle (each symbolic era lasts for a period of time such that the number of years can be divided by nine or twelve — thus, of course, thirty-three — without remainder; nine and twelve are the two defining numbers for humans in terms of time; the number seven is also such a number, but in other respects).

Both the initial phase and the final phase last 8,640 years, but the inner core of this is a quarter of a precessional cycle, i.e. 6,480 years. The current final era, in which

we are now — began in 4,182 BC — in a broader sense — this beginning 3102 BC, or 3101 BC in astronomical terms. In that year, कृष्णा, the eighth Viṣṇu-avatāra, left the earthly human world. This is the most notable beginning of the closing phase. The closest beginning of the conclusion was in 2022 AD, astronomically in 2021. If we add a quarter of a precessional cycle to these dates, i.e. — symbolically — 6,480 years, we first get 2,299 AD = +2,299. This is the beginning of the astrological era dominated by Aquarius, Taurus, Leo and Scorpio — symbolically. In fact, this era will begin around +2,332 with an accuracy of ± 6 years, if we think in terms of 30° - 30° astrological sectors. The second such closing date is 3,379 AD = +3,379. At this time, on the one hand, precisely, and on the other hand, approximately, the solaritropic points will be at 15° of the stable astro-sectums. The third closing date is 4,459 AD = +4,459. At this time, the vernal equinox of the northern hemisphere will reach 0° of the constellation Aquarius, which is considered to be 30° , or 30° of Capricorn.

In relation to the extended Mahā-Yuga, Kali-Yuga and Alpa-Kali-Yuga, the structure of the latter is as follows: $3,240+12,960+3,240+25,920+3,240+12,960+3,240=64,800$ years.

Here, both the initial phase and the final phase last 19,440 years, which is $2 \times 9,720 = 19,440$ years longer than in the case of the unexpanded Alpa-Kali-Yuga.

From the starting point of the closing phase in the broader sense, determined as -4,181, we must subtract 5,400 years to arrive at the starting point of closure in an even broader sense. This date is 9,582 BC = -9,581. The end of the closing phase in a broader sense is also extended to an even later end point in a broader sense, which will occur precisely on the one hand and approximately on the other hand in 9,859 AD = +9,859.

At the beginning of the closing phase, the vernal equinox of the northern hemisphere was located at or around 15° of the constellation Leo, which is considered to be 30° . At the very end of the closure, the vernal equinox of the northern hemisphere will also be at or around 15° of the constellation Scorpio, which is considered to be 30° . There is no contradiction between the two approaches.

Returning to the earlier "inner" dates of +2,299, +3,379 and +4,459, each of these will mean something different, even though they all mark the end of an era.

P. Chr. 2,299 = +2,299 will be mainly a spiritual collapse: a religious-confessional-cultural-civilisational "collapsus". After that, there will be no more "ponderable" spiritual crisis. A collective psychopathy and psychosis affecting almost everyone will gradually develop, because pneumatopathy and pneumatosis will already have developed before 2299. In 3379 AD, a general — one might say spiritual — collapse will take place. The serious crisis of "spiritual" life will effectively come to an end.

Spiritually, a state of crisis will begin. This will necessarily be accompanied by a high degree of general mental decline, as well as somatopathy and somatosis, which will ultimately result in everyone — from the moment of conception — becoming seriously ill in all their organs and organ functions. At the end of this period, almost everyone will be at least feeble-minded, there will be many imbeciles and a great many idiots. Nevertheless, even in this age there will be royal geniuses. At the end of the closing phase, around 4459 AD = +4459, a general collapse will occur, including on a physical level, with death and the extinction of human races.

According to the expanded interpretation of Yuga, there will still be a period until complete withdrawal, which can be interpreted as a relatively long period of 5,400 years for the final elimination of the remnants of the crisis. This phase can be so long, relatively speaking, because the remnants of the crisis will no longer have any real impact.

The post-pralaya following the Alpa-Yuga, the Yuga and the Mahā-Yuga will be 32,400 years after the Alpa-Yuga, 324,000 years after the Yuga, and 3,240,000 years after the Mahā-Yuga, which will be followed by the next Mahā-Yuga, also lasting 3,240,000 years. This will be a completely crisis-free, subhuman, almost animal-like, phantom-like, demonic form of existence. The superhuman people of this New Golden Age will enter it through a new generation.

The coming Mahā-Yuga Satya-Kṛta-Yuga, the coming Golden Age, will follow "immediately" on the plane of "duratio stans" after the final closure of Kali-Yuga. This is a traditional basic tenet. At the same time, we must be fully aware that in the earthly world, on the plane of duratio fluens, there is no question of the new Golden Age immediately following the Dark Age.

There are Ind-Hindu movements that cannot be considered heterodox, but are explicitly "deviational". One such trend is that of Jnanavatar Swami Sri Yuktesvar Giri — Paramahansa Yogananda, according to which the Mahā-Yuga lasts for 12,000 earthly-human years in the modern sense, followed by another 12,000 earthly-human years. This is a complete cycle: a total of 24,000 years. The "descending" Satya-Kṛta-Yuga — according to them — lasted 4,800 years, the "descending" Trētā-Yuga lasted 3,600 years, the "descending" Dvāpara-Yuga lasted 2,400 years, and the "descending" Kali-Yuga lasted 1,200 years, after which the complete Mahā-Yuga consists of two Mahā-Yugas, — after which the "ascending" Kali-Yuga period also lasting 1200 years begins, followed by the ascending Dvāpara-Yuga, which will last 2400 years, the "ascending" Trētā-Yuga, which will last for 3,600 years, and the "ascending" Satya-Kṛta-Yuga, which will last for 4,800 years.

According to this school of thought, in 499 AD = +499, the earthly human world reached the end of the "descending" phase of Kali Yuga: From 499/500, Kali Yuga entered its "ascending" phase, but this also came to an end in 1699 AD = +1699, and from 1699/1700, everything and everyone on earth is in the "ascending" Dvāpara Yuga.

According to most followers of Rudolf Steiner's "anthroposophy" — as Rudolf Steiner himself put it — a Mahā-Yuga lasts 50,000 years: the Satya-Kṛta-Yuga lasts 20,000 years, the Trētā-Yuga 15,000 years, the Dvāpara-Yuga 10,000 years, and the Kali-Yuga 5,000 years. According to Rudolf Steiner and most of his followers, the Kali-Yuga began in 3102 BC = - 3101 AD and ended in 1899 AD = +1899 AD. Whether a Pralaya or a New Golden Age would begin at that time, or a new Dvāpara-Yuga, or a new, but "ascending" Kali-Yuga, remains completely unclear.

It is certain that there is no Mahā-Yuga lasting 12,000 or 2 x 12,000 years, just as there is no a Mahā-Yuga lasting 50,000 years, nor is there a Yuga lasting 1,200, 2 x 1,200, or 5,000 years, nor is there an Alpa-uga, Alpāpa-Yuga, or Alpāpāpa-Yuga of such duration.

The idea that the Kali-Yuga is already over, or that we are in some kind of "ascending" branch, is not only completely contrary to traditional doctrines, but also contradicts the most basic experience of oneself and the world. We have presented these absurd ideas only to highlight the anti-traditional, anti-spiritual, evolutionist-progressivist modernism of 20th-century "intellectual" trends.

Kali Yuga—specifically, its closing phase—still exists and continues today, manifesting the dark and obscuring forces of darkness with increasing intensity. According to certain Tibetan teachings, Kali Yuga is the age of the release of previously restrained poisons. In the Mahā-Yuga, there is darkness and there is light, there are poisons and there are elixirs. In the golden age of the Mahā-Yuga, darkness and poison are hardly released, while in the Dark Age and at its end, almost only darkness and almost only poison manifest themselves.

At the end of the Kali-Yuga, enchantment and vulnerability to enchantment are increasingly prevalent, as are "Avidyā", metaphysical ignorance, blindness and stupidity. It is here and now that man distances himself most from himself. Here and now, I am most distant from myself, almost reaching the final limit, where there is a danger that man will fall out of the circle of human existence and consciousness, to be completely submerged in the circle of animal and phantom forms.

At the end of Kali-Yuga, enchantment and vulnerability to enchantment are increasingly intense, as are "Avidyā", metaphysical ignorance, blindness and stupidity. It is here and now that man distances himself most from himself. It is here and now that I am most distant from myself, almost reaching the final frontier, where there is a danger that man will fall out of the circle of human existence and consciousness, to be completely immersed in the circle of animal and phantom forms. The Kali Yuga, the Dark Age, the Iron Age, the Lead Age, has only one "advantage" over previous eras, especially compared to the Golden Age: the intensity of the striving towards Metaphysical Liberation — Mōksa, Mukti, Metaphysical separation — Kaivalya, Metaphysical awakening — Bōdhi — is greater. The Golden Age is a world completely illuminated by spiritual Light, where humans live in divine superhumanity, even for thousands of years, and their consciousness does not fall asleep in death, so there is no real death, no illness, no suffering, and triumphant happiness reigns. Superhuman beings could more easily attain the state of awakening than at any other time, but their striving in this direction is minimal, almost non-existent. In Kali Yuga, these efforts are maximally intensified, but not towards the end of Kali Yuga. Today, dullness is so widespread that we can speak of a lack of intensity in our efforts, but in a completely different sense. Of course, Awakening was achieved in the Golden Age, and it can be achieved at the very end of Kali Yuga, and indeed, it will certainly be achieved, even if the probability of this is close to zero in the final stage.

CREATION AS TRANSMUTATION AND THE AGES

In the highest sense, there is neither creation nor non-creation, neither creation nor non-creation. We must adhere to these principles above all else. However, we have already mentioned that we are willing to accept a "quasi-creationist" position only as a "working hypothesis" — with certain and definite "reservatio mentalis" insofar as it is organic, proportionalistic, and hierarchical-gradual, leaving room for involution and descent.

The view of existence based on the principles of *Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Universalis Metaphysica Integra* favours the principles of Auto- over all other principles that can be related to it

This is true of creation, the withdrawal of creation, and the realisation of levels of existence: In fact, "Auto-transmutation" and "Absolutio Metaphysica" itself are the paths that lead to this.

The transformation of my superpersonal self, my own transformation, takes place—in fact—always and in everything.

This "Auto-transmutation" can also be understood as creation, as the realisation of stages of creation. There are stages of creation. The highest stage is "Creatio Emanativa or Emanata". This is radiant or radiated, effusive or effused creation. This is, in fact, the creation of the Creators.

The next stage is "Creatio Creativa or Creata", which corresponds to the next level: this is creative creation or created creation. This is the creation of the Lords of Forms — the creators —

.

The next stage is "Creatio Creativa or Creata", which corresponds to the next level: this is creative creation or created creation. This is the creation of the Lords of Forms — the creators — the creation. The next level of creation is "Creatio Formativa or Formata". This is creation carried out by the Form Spirits, the creation of the *Forma Internas*. The lowest level of creation is "Creatio Factiva or Facta", the creation of the objective world of facts. This is stored downwards and outwards only by the "Shell, the Bark, or the Shells and Barks".

The current earthly-human world is at the bottom of the "Factionalitas", between the factionalities and Shells, the Boundaries.

The Golden Age is the reduced "recapitulatio" of "Creatio Emanativa or Emanata" at the level of the Factum world; the Silver Age is the renewed and faded reappearance of "Creatio Creativa or Creata" in the Factum world; the Iron Age is the earthly and faint repetition of "Creatio Formativa or Formata"; and the Iron Age is "Creatio Creativa or Creata" in the Factum world, but initially still "remembering" the previous states and previous ages, and indeed, this memory was also present in the earlier stages of the closure phase.

In the Upanishads belonging to the Vedas, there is also a creation that surpasses all other creations infinitely. In this, God, as the highest Deity: Brahman/Brahma, creates Himself. Self-creation precedes and surpasses the creation of the Creators: all Creation follows from this. This supreme all-encompassing Creation must also be understood in terms of Auto-transmutation — as its Beginning rooted in the Beginningless.

SPACE, TIME AND "SUBSTANTIALITY"

Space, time and "substantia" or "substantiality" are closely related, and everything with which they are connected — however loose the connection may be, however indirect it may be — are dependent on the states of being that correspond to the lower meaning of "metaphysica", this circle of meaning.

It is clear that this "coharentia entitatum" can be examined from many different perspectives, primarily the natural sciences, in some respects mathematics and psychology, as well as philosophy. We wish to address this issue from a general perspective — only tangentially and in outline, but without forgetting the "background" of our "hyper-philosophical" approach. philosophical" approach as a "background".

Nowadays, the question arises from several sides — and the demand implied in this question — whether the numbers of spatial dimensions that can be treated mathematically or even raised exist physically, because there are physical theories according to which it would be helpful for interpretation if there were indeed more than three spatial dimensions.

Space and spatial dimensions, as well as their number, are part of objective reality — this Certainly. However, objective reality is not independent of consciousness — my personal and supra-personal consciousness — or an objective reality that exists independently of it. In this sense, any number of spatial dimensions are possible: four, five, six, ten, one hundred, one thousand, fifty-seven thousand eight hundred and twenty-three, and even n dimensions, and indeed, this " n " could be any infinite number. This is the consequence of *Lilā* projected onto the strictly physical plane, and depends on the autonomous freedom of the supra-personal myself—as the autonomous freedom of *Lilēśvara*. It may also be true that only ten spatial dimensions are possible, not one more, and at the same time—let's say twenty-three-dimensional space also exists, each with its own unique exclusivity, but ultimately forming a complete unity.

The suggestion of space-dimension numbers higher than three or continuums with dimension numbers higher than the four-dimensional space-time continuum: "abstraction". The existence of "abstractio rationalis" is not an unambiguous intellectual positive. They cannot be completely rejected or avoided, but a view of nature based on "transcendental suprarationality" would be a much greater, incomparably greater and completely unambiguous positive would be a view of nature based on "transscensio suprarationalis".

It is never possible to operate completely "legitimately" with spatial dimension numbers that are inaccessible to inaccessible to general human experience, dealing with n -dimensional bodies that are never experienced, that cannot be imagined, and that cannot even be thought of correctly, even if they can be can "handle" them without any problems. (Lenin's view that humans cannot imagine infinity, but can think about it, is completely wrong. People cannot imagine infinity at all — that is certain — and they cannot really think about it. Rational thinking about infinity is actually a form of pseudo-thinking. This may be spectacularly successful, but it is actually the result of incorrect thinking that produces completely incorrect ideas.)

The experience of multiple dimensions, the ability to imagine them at any time and think about them in a completely correct manner thinking would entitle mathematicians and physicists to deal with these questions in a truly adequate manner.

Of course, until this becomes a realised result, such thinking is not entirely unjustified, but it must always be done cautiously, critically, constantly examining the extent to which what we believe to be knowable can actually be known.

Nothing is as serious a mistake as trying to interpret man, consciousness, the secrets of the Universe, or even the World itself from the perspective of the World. No fundamental knowledge can ever be gained from the World — not even about the World itself.

We must constantly be aware that I am in the World, but also, and even more so, that the World is in me: not in my body, not in my head, but in my consciousness. The whole World is in my consciousness, together with my body in the World.

The number of dimensions can also be raised in relation to time, although dealing with this is much more problematic. A physical worldview that is capable of functioning in an infinite space-time continuum with infinite spatial dimensions and infinite temporal dimensions may also be adequate, provided that one possesses the appropriate mental faculties, without forgetting the inseparable substantiality.

Time manifests itself as "passing" or "duration" and appears as such, not directly as "time", just as "space" does not appear directly as "space", but as extension or extensiveness.

Time — as a flowing, streaming duration: "duratio fluens" — extends, on the one hand, from the "past" through the "present" towards the "future", and on the other hand from the "future" through the "present" towards the "past". The former is the direction of actual "spread", the latter the direction of actual "occurrence". The hidden reversal of this can also be revealed: in the sense of the future in the past and the past in the future. Time — as a flowing, flowing duration: "duratio fluens" — is "cyclical" on the one hand and "linear" on the other. The linearity of passing duration can symbolically be of two kinds: "duratio fluens" linear horizontal and linear vertical duration. Together with cyclical duration, these belong exclusively to the realm of consciousness, through consciousness and in consciousness, to the realm of "objective" realities that I am aware of in my consciousness. — belong to the circle of "objective" realities.

The "horizontal-linear" passing duration — symbolically represented — touches the boundary of the circle of circular passing duration at one point, — while the "vertical-linear" passing duration — from the point where the "horizontal-linear" passing duration touches the circle of the cyclical passing duration — towards the centre of the circle. All of these are clearly symbols, but — precisely because of their analogical symbolic nature, they express and refer to "realiveritas".

Eastern traditions emphasise the cyclical nature of time as a passing duration, although linearity also occupies a prominent place in East Asian traditions. The Western view emphasises linearity almost exclusively, and this is also the basis of Christianity's view of time. In fact, the combination of cyclical and two types of linear approaches together correspond to the understanding based on the principles of Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Universalis Integra. This also includes the statement that the "vertical-linear" passing duration does not only differ from the "horizontal-linear" passing duration and the cyclical passing duration, but also — in fact — from the

combination of transient durations. It moves from "duratio fluens" — the created standing duration: "duratio stans creatá" — towards the uncreated standing duration: "duratio stans increata".

A lower level of duratio stans creata is constantly present in the background of duratio fluens — just as the "time of times" or the "duration of durations" is present in the background of expanding spaces, so too is the "space of spaces".

Every point-like moment of passing time must be understood as a point of radiation from which countless events emanate, that is, as the countless continuation of any kind of event. This can and must be interpreted from an actualised state — which can be understood as part of one continuation — as "potentiality", which, however, as a result of a power directed towards this, can be actualised.

This should be understood as if, for example, the Western Roman Empire had continued uninterrupted after Romulus Augustulus, under the rule of new emperors, or if Árpád had not died when he died according to our "trail", but were still alive today.

The cause in principle precedes the effect (although, at the same time, causality is not an absolute and unshakeable fundamental principle), and this seems to manifest itself in time as well.

This is certainly true, but — in a certain sense, every temporal cause is also an effect, and every temporal effect is also a cause; thus, the cause is the effect — as a cause — of the effect: this "causal" correlation may also be true — on the plane of temporality. Essentially, "causalitas" does not operate on the plane of temporality, but in a timeless sense. And the temporal projection — as we can see — can be (at least) dual.

With regard to the openness and closedness of the past and the future, the traditional view of existence takes a complex but unambiguous position. In this respect, there are four possibilities:

- a) — closed past — closed future
- b) — closed past — open future
- c) — open past — closed future
- d) — open past — open future.

The general approach can only comprehend and accept the connection between a closed past and an open future as defined in point "b". The traditional approach, on the other hand, always accepts all four approaches in "simultaneitas", possibly emphasising one or the other from a certain point of view, but never forgetting the combined validity of these four

Those who wish to define themselves as adherents of a view of life based on the principles of Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Universalis Metaphysica Integra must also take a position on "eternities" and their opposites.

wishes to define themselves as adherents of this view of existence.

The opposite of "permanence", or "diuturnity", is "indiuturnity", which means long-term survival: a significant and valid concept in relation to "species", while — and indeed with good reason

Perpetualitas (perpetuitas) — as continuity — essentially means eternity existing in tempore. There are forms of existence that have no beginning or end in time — in tempore — ; with certain restrictions, we can assume their perpetualitas, while other forms of existence have both a beginning and an end that can be grasped in time, meaning that in their case, imperpetualitas (imperpetuitas) is true.

Those forms of existence that are "in tempore" without beginning and without end, that is, in continuity, are in "eternity": — "cum tempore" — that is, together with time — they begin and end. That which is "in tempore" "perpetualis" — "cum tempore" "æviternitas" (ævum) "aiōn" relative "eternity" (and immortality). Forms of existence — in general — are "in tempore" "imperpetual", not "cum tempore" and pass away, so — in this respect — they are in "inæviternitas".

The Indo-Hindu cosmological tradition also speaks of quadrillion-year cycles, but Mahākāla — as a cycle — is, on the one hand, perpetual, and on the other hand, cyclicity coincides with horizontal linearity and vertical linearity, and furthermore, in essence, it is not temporal.

Mahākāla (meaning "Great Time" in the sense of universality, which is also a Time-Deity) 'æviternitas' differs from other 'æviternitas' in that it is continuously created 'cum tempore' and continuously ceases to exist 'cum tempore', then is recreated and ceases to exist again. This is indeed 'perpetualitas infinita' from the perspective of reality existing 'in tempore', but from the perspective of 'cum tempore' , "sempiternitas" corresponds to the completeness of "Mahākāla", while everything that differs from this is in "insempiternitas".

Absolute timeless-timeless eternity, which cannot be associated with any beginning or end: "æternitas" (æternum). "Immortalitas Absoluta" can only be realised in "Aeternitas Absoluta". Everything belongs to the sphere of "inæternitas" "samsāra" states.

Perennitas appears in temporality, but as a reflection, projection, or representation of æternitas representation of æternitas: it must be understood as "eternally valid". "Philosophia Perennis", "Confessio Perennis", "Religio Perennis", "Traditio Perennis", "Metaphysica Perennis" and "Sophia Perennis" mean approximately the same thing: the message about the Essence that precedes and transcends everything. Anything that does not express this, even indirectly, is "imperennitas".

Permanence, or "permanentitas" (permanence), as "unchangingness," can appear on different levels of interpretation. That which can be called "Permanentia Absoluta" actually corresponds to "Aeternitas Absoluta", and thus everything that is "samsāra" falls within the scope of falls within the scope of "impermanentitas" (impermanence).

There are states of existence — rightly called "occult" and potentially existing — that do not belong to the lower sense of "metaphysicality," even though this makes some kind of connection possible. These still have a certain connection — in a stricter or looser sense — to space and spatiality, as well as to

time and temporality, and they definitely have some kind of connection to them, whether in a narrower or broader sense.

What we call æthericity — strictly speaking — is no longer in space, but it still has a very strong connection to spatiality and anti-spatiality — and not only in terms of three spatial dimensions; and in temporality — as a passing duration — if not quite in the same way as physicality in the strictest sense.

What we call astrality—strictly speaking—exists neither in time nor space, but it is closely related to spatiality and, in particular, to temporality.

The soul — as such — is neither in space nor in time, and — in fact — is not "substantial," but it is indirectly related to both temporality and spatiality, as well as to the astral, the ætheric, and, most closely, to physical substantiality.

The "spirit" is obviously not in space, not in time, and not at all "substantial"; its relation to these is multiple and indirect; essentially, it has no relation to them at all. These are generally all potentialities, not "latentities". In occult and supra-occult experiences, these are—in fact—actualised: this is how they become realities.

That which is occult lies between physicality in the strict sense and metaphysicality in the lowest sense; it belongs to physicality in the broadest or broadest sense and is related to metaphysicality in the broadest and lowest sense. The concept of the occult is an extremely important traditional concept, with an indifferent-neutral "value judgement" in itself. Dealing with the "occultum" or referring to it does not yet mean occultism, which in turn can only be accepted in its broadest sense and at its highest levels — with significant "reservatio mentalis" — and even then only in a very limited way; in general, as we have already noted, we tend to reject the various branches of occultism.

Neither more than three spatial dimensions nor more than one temporal dimension can approach what is commonly referred to as transcendence and transcendental, or what is commonly referred to as "transscendentale" and transcendental. (The transcendental dimension has nothing to do with to any dimension of space-time continuum.) These — as possibilities — belong to the broader sense, and do not reach the levels of the higher occult realms. Parapsychological phenomena are explicitly occult in origin, but their manifestations pass through the zones of higher space, time and substantial structures, i.e. the perfecting manifestation is realised by passing through them. Through these, the occult is connected to the actual physical. Spirituality can be linked to higher and more space or time dimensions or to associate it with more subtle substances: the most extreme misunderstanding and the unmistakable sign and expression of a high degree of "stupiditas" in this direction.

The infinite number of infinite mutually perpendicular number coordinates and their extension into the field of physics as a science, stating that this space-dimension numbers and the infinity of time dimension numbers: fundamentally justified and evaluable; however, the way they do it — only acceptable in the most exceptional cases, it mostly deserves outright rejection.

The validity of the infinite number of mutually perpendicular number coordinates of the infinite union is not affected by the other, no less important, and indeed rather more important fact that any number of mutually perpendicular (or any other) number coordinates are not necessarily or absolutely valid, and that completely different interpretations of numbers may be at least as valid.

Related to this is the fact that, for example, a line can also be understood as a collection of points without extension (!) rather than as an independent form of reality. Or a plane figure, say a square, can be interpreted not only as a set of points and lines, but also as an independent form of reality. Or a three-dimensional spatial figure, such as a cube, can be understood not only as points, lines, planes as a whole, but — similar to the former — also as an independent, autonomous form of reality. Such an approach would not invalidate the validity of known and different approaches, but would enrich them with a different and superior perspective ways of looking at things.

We have already mentioned the extremely negative nature of interpretations of man, consciousness and subjectivity derived from world reality. The various mathematically based models of the physical world may be indisputably interesting, but the sleight of hand performed by amateurs or professional experts with them is of little value in terms of real interpretations, since — as we know from Saint-Martin's idea and our own addition to it, which that one should not look at and see man from the world, nor the Subject from man, but rather the opposite: one should look at and see (interpret) man from the Subject, and the world from man.

And the Subject is myself. The world comes from me, not from my personal self, but from my supra-personal, essential self, which, however, can only be reached from my own person during the absolute realisation of reductive fulfilment.

Also interesting are those ideas which essentially claim that the physical universe itself is actually a being: a conscious and intelligent living creature. This could even be acceptable for us, and in some respects we even accept it. But such ideas also have the negative feature of setting a limit on our perspective: this is an objective reality that exists (also) independently of consciousness, our consciousness, my consciousness; this is how it is, this is a given. The Universe — indeed, the Universe of all Universes — follows from me, even if conscious... a sentient being, regardless of its power. Its power may be immeasurable compared to my earthly, human, but it has no real power, in fact, it has no power at all over Me-Myself as Alan, because its existence, its nature, and its power are derived from me.

Concepts of space and time, theories related to causality, theoretical hypotheses about the nature of nature — these are important, but not really essential. It is possible, worthwhile, even necessary to deal with them — but they have no central-axial or suprarational metaphysicality. However, this topic must also be addressed from the perspective of a broader, lower interpretation of metaphysicality, this topic must also be addressed because, although spatiality and temporality do not belong to the lower sphere of metaphysicality, and this is a criterion, this issue can still be discussed metaphysically through the occult.

DEVIATIONES PSEUDO-SPIRITUALES

Deviationology, which can only be expressed with the neologism "neologicum" — that is, the doctrine of deviation, the theory of deviation, or the science of deviation — is an important chapter in traditional studies: every "paradoseologus" must also be a "deviationologus".

Considering the fact that almost all spiritual movements of the second half of the 19th century and the 20th century, without exception, were in fact "deviatio pseudo-spiritualis", "deviationology" and "deviationologist" will not be without work to do. Of the four variants of "antitraditionalitas", two — "abstraditionalitas" (subtraditionalitas, "extratraditionalitas") and "antitraditionalitas" — only appear latently in modern intellectual and pseudo-intellectual mazes and misleading labyrinths. "Pseudotraditionalitas" and "contratraditionalitas" are the two variants that truly appear in deviations, as well as their mixture, whose presence, we might say, is truly primary.

We have already made most of our comments on occultism; primarily on its in relation to the fact that occultism is not metaphysics, and that the lowest levels of metaphysics in the lower sense may be indirectly connected to the highest levels of existence considered by occultism, at least in theory. If occultism and materialism were the two alternative choices, it would not be and could not be that occultism's explanation of man and the world would be incomparably richer than the other. Nor is there any doubt that, based on these considerations, we should choose occultism

A crucial error and deficiency affecting the foundations of occultism is that occult does not see and does not show, but also does not want to see or show more and higher things: for the occult is still deeply involved in what we call the vortex of existence, "samsāra".

The occultist movements that emerged after the advent of Darwinism were, without exception, radically evolutionist and progressivist, while none of the earlier movements, even though their leaders, with their "occult experience," should have seen the existence of "progress" much earlier, at least as early as Darwin's precursors. This proves that the idea of "progress" does not follow from "occult experience," but appeared as a modern and smuggled idea among occultist movements, regardless of whether the founders and leaders of these movements had abilities that enabled "occult experience" or not, and regardless of the extent and quality of any such abilities they may have had, or what their extent and quality are today. From all this, it is quite clear that occultist movements are also "modernist" movements. Incidentally, this Some contemporary trends categorically reject this, but there are also trends that proudly proclaim themselves to be "modern", and since modernity — in the general sense of the word — represents a strongly and negatively qualified form of "anti-traditionalism" in the broader sense, we can rightly consider all variants of modern occultism to be anti-traditional in a broader sense and pseudo-traditional in a narrower sense. , we can rightly consider all variants of modern occultism to be, in a broader sense, anti-traditional, and in a narrower sense, pseudo-traditional-counter-traditional trends.

Spiritualism—which would be much more accurately and aptly called "hypoparapsychism"—is the most vulgar form of occultism. Even the "lofty and noble intentions" are quite low-grade, and its commonly spread variants are vulgar in a way that is beneath any critical measure.

What actually takes place here is the manifestation of subtle — ætheric and astral — corpses, which cannot be as dead as physical bodies in the strictest sense, but which are moved by the "demonic forces" that have moved into them. These demonic forces are, on the one hand, personal beings and, on the other hand, impersonal forces.

"spirit summoning" is, in fact, both a subtle corpse summoning and a demon summoning.

"séances" may be of some interest, and it is not inappropriate for a "deviationologist" to participate in such gatherings a few times for the purpose of gaining experience, but there is a danger, especially if the person gaining experience is truly a man of high order, possessing powerful personal and superhuman forces, that the demon-possessed corpses retreat rapidly due to the "terror" of the demons, with such intensity that the "medium" acting as a channel is subtly injured — possibly to such an extent that these injuries, as a result of physical transference, may even cause the death of the "medium".

Adherents of "hypoparapsychism," also known as spiritualism, often feel superior to mainly "theoretical" occultists, saying that the latter only talk, while true "spiritualists" demonstrate and even prove their claims through materialisations.

Adherents of "hypoparapsychism", also known as spiritualism, often feel superior to mainly "theoretical" occultists, saying that the latter only talk, while true "spiritualists" demonstrate and even prove their claims through materialisations. The danger of "hypoparapsychism" should not be underestimated. On the one hand

it represents a seriously dangerous attitude because it links any degree of "immortality" to the existence and manifesting abilities of subtle and demonised corpses.

We have already pointed out that even the most rigid, "crude" physical corpse is related to the person who once had a living body; this is obviously true even in the case of skeletons and decayed remains. At the same time, we must also note that we cannot speak of identity in any sense. This is almost the case even with subtle corpses. There is no doubt that these corpses are much less dead to begin with, they carry lifelike

, carrying traces of tendencies and memories, and are even under the indirect influence of a separate — and also not eternal — "mentality", while at the same time being kept alive by a demonic obsession keeps them alive more than they would be without it. These vitalised

Corpses have much more to do with the deceased than physical corpses in the strict sense, but there can be no question of actual identity here either, apart from the fact that the relative nature of identity and non-identity allows for different — by no means unconditional and unambiguous — definitions in this regard.

In the case of spiritualist believers who are particularly sensitive and have an affinity for occult influences, it is not at all impossible that demonised human residues will attach themselves to them as constant companions, exerting a frightening and dangerous influence on the person concerned.

Theosophy and anthroposophy, as well as numerous pseudo-Rosicrucian movements and other more or less similar trends, represent the "qualitative"

forms of occultism. Hundreds of books are written and published by their adherents, covering virtually every topic — except for the essence, about which there is not a single complex sentence.

Their common characteristics are egalitarianism, evolutionism, progressivism, and — not unrelated to these — vulgar reincarnation, as well as the verbosely presented "cosmogenesis" and "anthrōpogenesis," the careful neglect. *Simplicitas complicata* is also characteristic of all of them.

These movements display such an aversion to discussing metaphysics—even on a philosophical level—that it borders on prejudice, and we can speak of a veritable "metaphysics phobia" in relation to them, without exaggeration.

The highest thing that most of these trends express is the Cosmos. The occult "cosmicity" that they show the greatest interest in: the "lōkā" of "samsāra", that is, the "worlds" belonging to the cycle of existence and their nature. Those that, according to the view of existence based on the principles of *Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Universalis Metaphysica Integra* — as well as according to the great "Traditio Metaphysica" — may be interesting, and indeed important, but are still secondary to what is truly essential. The "Metaphysica Centralis" and the "Suprarealificatio Metaphysica Absolutionis" are what truly and above all else essential and fundamental, everything else may be interesting, even important, but it can only take its rightful place—which is not to be underestimated—after, alongside, and beneath the essential doctrines.

A tradition or spiritual movement that has only a "cosmology" and "anthropological doctrine" but no metaphysical doctrine cannot be a true tradition or a true spiritual movement, but only a fragmentary vulgarisation. The occultist movements of the present day do not really represent anything more than this.

From the turn of the last century to the present day, there have been various centres of Sri Swami Vivekananda's partly Vedantic, partly "all-religions-unifying" movement. René Guénon wrote a sharp, condemnatory critique of this trend, quite rightly and with good reason, as one that attempts to "modernise" and "vulgarise" original Indo-Hindu tradition, unfortunately with considerable success.

Since then, countless "pseudo-orthodox" and openly "heterodox" Indo-Hindu, and even non-Hindu religious, semi-religious, religious-characteristic and independence from all religions. These can be broadly classified as "Orientalism", Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, Taoism, Sufism, and many other movements — specific export-import versions, but at the same time

religious traditions, the truly "serious" ones — but in reality only in name — lines of religious traditions also appear. The masses of Indians, more recently Tibetans, Chinese, Japanese, Arabs and Iranians (Persians) appear among the associated European and American "masters", among whom — let's say it openly and clearly — there is not a single authentic master, nor can there be. It is not possible! — this is the emphasis. It is inconceivable and unthinkable that there could be not only an authentic master, but even a single disciple of an authentic master who, in the well-known manner, among the extremely discredited forms, would carry out his activities and give any kind of "guidance". Theoretical lectures are the ultimate limit, and theoretical or practical purpose but expressed in a theoretical manner. If someone remains strictly within these boundaries, their authenticity cannot be doubted, provided

they are not connected to any modern occult or orientalist line of thought, because if they are — even remotely and loosely connected to such lines of thought, their credibility not only become questionable, but can be denied and should be denied from the outset. And anyone who "in concreto"

It provides "practical guidance" — in principle accessible to almost everyone — in the form of "Path of Darkness"; it is indeed a "guide", but one that points the way to Infernality. In this respect, there can be no exceptions.

There is no doubt that there is no "pseudo-guru" whose "teachings" do not contain strikingly apt and truly remarkable statements, or generally valid, fundamentally negative — among his "practical guidance" — actually valuable and worth retaining. However, it would be a grave mistake to overestimate these; any intelligent person with knowledge of human nature and experience as a lecturer.

The Krishna Consciousness Movement and the Transcendental Meditation Movement represent the most dangerous and mentally damaging trend of our time, the easiest way to among the available trends. Most of their followers are fanatically attached to their religiously followed trend, displaying hateful intolerance towards all other spiritual attitudes. The Krishna Consciousness Movement, through the recitation of the "Mahā-Mantra" — preferably without interruption — develops a kind of "pneumatopathia collectiva" after a certain period of time, which will be followed by "pneumatosis collectiva", but the risk of developing "psychopathia collectiva et individualis" and "psychosis collectiva et individualis". The Transcendental Meditation Movement is characterised by the fact that — although "collectivity" plays an important role here too — the emphasis is placed on the individual recitation of the inner mantra and the mental concentration required for this. What they can achieve in this way can be described as "counter-meditation counter-transcendental". The "pneumatopathia", "pneumatosis", "psychopathia" and "psychosis" — successive — cannot be ruled out here either, and is in fact probable — in the case of those who perform the prescribed exercises for several years with truly "unflagging diligence" and "without interruption". It is this sluggishness that usually saves the followers of these trends from serious mental and spiritual damage — that is, a human error. The fact that it is a mental and character flaw that can save someone highlights the dark and dangerous nature of the entire trend — and other related trends.

Darnel-style "training" is also a dangerous and harmful movement. Its goal is to turn shy and inhibited people into arrogant and aggressive personalities who border on criminality. During the "transformation", forces that are essentially completely uncontrolled are released and retreat into the background of conscious mental life, the existence and influence of which are anything but not really "liberating" or related to liberation. Serious personality deformations can be caused by the "training" of Krisztián Darnel, which, incidentally, was not invented by the person hiding behind this pseudonym, but by others, and not in a completely original way. José Silva's "mind control" and Hubbard's "dianetics" (actually: "dia-noética") are all dangerous trends, not forgetting "hypnosis regressiva", which can sometimes reach back to "previous incarnations" or even a multitude of "ancient incarnations", supplemented by "progressive hypnosis", which leads the hypnotised person to "future incarnations". the hypnotised person. The hypnotist, meanwhile, is either a "reincarnationist" himself, or — and this is also interesting — not at all, but rather a committed materialist, yet considers the migration of the unfortunate souls who turn to him into past and future "incarnations" — through hypnosis — to be an excellent method.

Shri Satya Sai Baba is at the forefront of one of the largest recent pseudo-spiritual movements. There is talk of his many "verified" and "proven" miracles — he is said to be able to do everything that Jesus Christ did. We do not doubt any of this. It is likely that almost everything about him is as his more sober followers and relatively unbiased observers claim. In their opinion, Sai Baba is definitely greater and more powerful than any other "medium" in the world, but this does not mean that he is not truly and completely autonomous, a "miracle worker", but rather a mediator. His own

"own" powers cannot be insignificant, but he is not the "creator" of the powerful forces that manifest themselves in connection with him, but rather their "mediator", that is, their intermediary. It is certain that he can control the "activation" and "specification" of the forces manifested through him with his own powers, but it is unlikely that he possesses much more than that.

Sai Baba's "teachings" are by no means more "sapiential" or sacral than what a strong personality with excellent intellectual abilities is capable of in his more prominent moments; there is not even a hint of true "greatness" cannot even be suspected in connection with him; it is likely that his practical "guidance" — some of which, for some reason, is still "holds back" — they point in exactly the same direction as all other "modern" Indian, Eastern or any other kind of "master's" "guidance".

Probably the most dangerous trend of the present day is "New Age". This is an all-encompassing trend. It "incorporates" "traditions and traditionalism", but only after ruthlessly "detraditionalising" them and then pseudo- and counter-traditionalising them. It professes theosophy, to a limited extent anthroposophy, the ideas of Freemasonry, Illuminism, and in general all forms of occultism, spiritualism, demonic magic, witchcraft, modern scientism, psychology, and emphasised "ufologism". He professes to be apolitical, but he appears "open" to embracing the most vulgar extreme left-wing ideas to the most vulgar extreme right-wing ideas: secretly, he would be most likely to support extreme left-wing and extreme right-wing anarchism, but outwardly — while emphasising apoliticism — he most explicitly favours liberal democracy. There are and have been followers whose interesting insights we even appreciate, but basically we have the worst opinion of New Age.

New Age has, of course, cast its net over Christianity, but the various Christian denominations have strongly resisted this and continue to do so. Therefore, Christianity is embraced in a completely "non-denominational" state by New Age adherents and followers who are otherwise Christian in their outlook.

The level of Christian — Catholic, Protestant, Neo-Protestant — attacks against New Age is generally below criticism. Their foolish narrow-mindedness is such that they constitute counter-propaganda for themselves and propaganda for New Age.

Incidentally, some of the neo-Protestant denominations, which are sectarian in character, can also be considered to be seriously misguided, even misleading. The most extreme of these are not far removed from the various Satanist denominations, whose emergence and proliferation are very characteristic of this closing period of Kali Yuga. The religious and ecclesiastical criticisms levelled against these movements are, without exception, as worthless as their targets. The mutual criticisms are a dialogue between the deaf and the insane.

We must add a few comments to say that, in our opinion, the current earthly human world is living in an age in which many people suffer from what the "Pneumatopathia" best expresses this, meaning the spirit's pathological hypersensitivity to receiving negativity, and the pathological hypersensitivity that becomes even more intense as a result. In this context, "pneumatopathia", which can become a truly serious illness, can be called "pneumatosis" — a spiritual illness. We are convinced that all "neuropathia" and neurosis, all neuropsychopathy and neuropsychosis, all strictly speaking functional psychopathy and psychosis, are directly or indirectly, and it is even likely that "pneumatosis" is also present, and this latter probability is so strong that it can be considered a certainty.

The Spirit — as Spirit — obviously cannot be pathologically hypersensitive, nor — even less so — sick. This is a fundamental, indisputable reality, and we are not willing to compromise on this.

"Pneumatopathia" and "pneumatosis" are not pathological hypersensitivity and illness of the Spirit — as Spirit — but rather the Spirit's relationship to man — It is therefore an illness that has developed in an "interrelation", which above all means the pathological hypersensitivity of the human being in relation to the spirit and the illness of the human being in relation to the experience — or non-experience — of the spirit.

It is not the Spirit itself — as Spirit — that becomes ill, but man — precisely as a spiritual and non-spiritual human being. Behind "pneumatopathia" and "pneumatōsis" there is always a disturbance in self-experience, and it can always be found if the search is carried out by a professional who considers working with people to be their deep calling.

The number of misleading aberrations will certainly continue to grow, and trends that are even more dangerous than those that exist today. Today, materialism is still growing stronger, but it will not continue to do so for long; it will reach its maximum potential, and then "hypoparapsychistic" currents will take over. Those that are already very strong, and those that will appear later, or immediately after the takeover. Today, there is still a faint — and increasingly weakening, fading — hope that even different types of "hypoparapsychicism" can — in very rare cases — spark real intellectual interest, which can encourage genuine exploration. . If materialism — intensifying even further — creates a complete vertical closure, such possibilities will disappear entirely.

From the 24th century onwards, almost everyone will be in the grip of "pneumatōsis"; materialism will reach its peak around this time, the closure will be complete, "hypoparapsychicism" will be all-pervasive, and pneumatōsis will intensify in both its prevalence and its extent. From this point on, the spread of general "psychōsis" must also be taken into account. 34—35. In the 21st century, even "hypoparapsychicism" will be exhausted, and psychosis, which affects almost everyone, will be accompanied by dementia, followed by "somatosis", which, as we have already mentioned, refers to a serious complex of diseases that exist from birth, or even from conception, in which every organ system and organ will be seriously diseased.

The pseudo-spiritual-counter-spiritual and pseudo-traditional-counter-traditional — deviational and deviationary — trends cause immeasurable damage through their pseudo-initiatic and counter-initiatic practices. These influences, which are capable of affecting even the very end of Kali Yuga effects, which — among other things — aim to make this end as

"unworthy" as possible, as well as to thwart the preparations for the timeless "transitions".

The paths of darkness are not only imperfect, but they also lead in a counter-transcendental direction. Ultimately, these are also insignificant, but man is not in an "ultimate" state, and therefore the dangers that result from aberrations and misguidance are still significant, even of enormous consequence. The widely professed and practised "tolerantia traditionalis et spiritualis" cannot be unlimited, no matter how broad its boundaries may be.

There is no longer any possibility of making concessions to the forces of darkness, because they are ultimately prepared to use offensive means to exert their immeasurably harmful and damaging influence.

The trends representing deviational pseudo-spiritual forces are increasingly merging their endeavours with political currents. Those that also serve, operate and influence the Darkness.

NOTES ON POLITICAL SCIENCE POLITICA ET METAPOLITICA

Based on the principles of Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Universalis Metaphysica Integra and is based on the Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Universalis Metaphysica Integra, takes the position of "metapoliticitas" above all else. The meaning of metapoliticitas — as the word itself suggests — is twofold: "meta-politicitas and meta-a-politicitas". The meaning of metapoliticitas must always be considered in light of this duality, and only in this sense can we accept it as taking precedence over all other positions.

Metapoliticitas has every opportunity to "open up" in the direction of politicitas on the one hand, and in the direction of apoliticitas on the other. But whichever direction it opens up, the other half of the pair of opposites must be present as a "background", and the primary position, metapoliticitas, must be present as a "higher background" that transcends both. The last quarter of the 20th century tended to place apoliticitas in the foreground.

would make it more justified, given its nature, especially considering that, starting around 1980, the possibilities for adequate "political action" rapidly diminished. Nevertheless — on a theoretical basis — we must assume that the possibilities for adequate politicisation will not disappear or be completely destroyed in the 21st century, even though we cannot forget for a moment the almost hegemonic dominance of hopelessness in politics.

In the following, we will address certain questions in the sense that metapolitics comes first, followed by politics, while apolitics occupies only third place (knowing that apolitics could be ranked second—albeit on different grounds—and be at least as justified).

We must say at the outset that the political and social aspects of the worldview based on the principles of Traditionalis Spiritualis et Universalis Metaphysica Integra is right-wing. This is an "axiomatic-dogmatic" obvious and exclusive truth, which renders any further debate on this subject completely superfluous.

The dilettantish clichés, in the worst sense of the word, according to which those who represent true intellectualism can only be completely apolitical on the one hand, and on the other hand — if they do have to deal with politics indirectly — can only follow the "aurea mediocritas", in this case the political middle ground, the political "centre", and cannot be associated with either the "right" or the "left", as these are "sides" that are in any case alien to the centrally oriented intellectual.

Left-wing and right-wing — as descriptive terms — became widespread at the end of the 18th century and originally referred to the seating arrangement in the French parliament, but soon spread throughout spread throughout the Western world in a much broader sense. In fact, they are not very fortunate terms, but — and this is also beyond doubt — there are no more appropriate ones. In fact, they are not even close.

Just as correctly understood right-wing politics corresponds to the socio-political dimension of traditionalism, true left-wing politics corresponds to the political and social projection of anti-traditionalism.

Only the far right can be considered truly right-wing. The ultra-right wing is a radicalised 20th-century adaptation of the classic right wing of Maistre and Metternich-Winneburg radicalised 20th-century adaptation of classical right-wing politics. In fact, ultra-right-wing politics is also extreme right-wing politics, but it is by no means identical with vulgar extreme right-wing politics. Vulgar extreme right-wing is a form of right-wing and extreme right-wing politics that is influenced — sometimes even saturated — by anti-leftist tendencies.

Counter-leftism (kontra-sinistritas, kontra-sinitrismus) is a term we have introduced, which we believe to be indispensable: it refers to extreme anti-leftism that nevertheless retains or adopts left-wing ideas, goals, paths, styles and methods.

Ordinary far-rightism and counter-leftism are not the same, but ordinary The far right has mostly given way in the past and is giving way in the present, and will presumably continue to give way in the future to the counter-left, namely the extreme counter-left or counter-far left. infiltrations. (In the Third Reich — in 1934 — Ernst Röhm and his even more extreme followers were the most characteristic representatives of the anti-leftist extreme right-wing ideology.)

Although the concepts of left-wing and right-wing politics spread after the end of the 18th century, they can be applied without restriction not only to the political landscapes of the 19th and 20th centuries, but also from prehistory through antiquity, the Middle Ages, modern times and the present day, and from the present day into the future, for as long as there is history at all (i.e. until the end of Kali Yuga, although the end of history has already begun to manifest itself since the end of the 20th century).

One can also hear voices — equally amateurish — claiming that “leftism” and “right-wing” no longer exist, that they have disappeared as realities and that they are concepts. We must classify such opinions as ignorant and misleading nonsense.

One can also hear — equally amateurish — voices claiming that “left-wing” and “right-wing” no longer exist, having disappeared as realities and become concepts are outdated. We must classify such opinions as ignorant and misleading nonsense. We must recognise that “left-wing” and — above all — They have created considerable conceptual confusion regarding “right-wing politics” — primarily from the “left”, and not without intention. Anti-communism is obviously associated with right-wing politics, but it is also associated with the increased affirmation of capitalism, anti-capitalism and all forms of conservatism — including liberal conservatism, anti-liberalism, anti-democracy, nationalism and, strange as it may seem, communism itself. Thus, apart from those who are particularly well informed, no one will know what true right-wing politics, and — consequently — what is meant by the concept of actual left-wing politics.

However chaotic the conceptual meanings of our terms may have become, there can be no question. On the contrary, we strongly recommend their continued use, while at the same time

We will attempt what some may consider impossible: to clarify directly what right-wing politics is and indirectly what left-wing politics is.

We know that the greatest and most tense contradiction possible in the earthly human world is the antagonism between traditionalism and anti-traditionalism. Anyone who claims otherwise is either stupid, ignorant, foolish, or consciously deceitful and misleading (and ultimately, of course, also stupid, ignorant, and foolish).

If the most tense opposition in the earthly human world is the antagonism between traditionalism and anti-traditionalism, then the most tense political and social conflict is the conflict between their projections: the truly irreconcilable conflict between the right and the left.

Today, the political far left — all over the world — already calls the centre-left and far-right as moderate left-wing, while at the same time the moderate left-wing — sometimes — defines itself as explicitly right-wing, the centre-left as centre-right, and the explicit left-wing as moderate right-wing. Only those who are even further to the left than these willing to define themselves as moderate left-wing, centre-left or decidedly left-wing (most of them are already on the far left of the extreme left).

True right-wing politics — that is, the far right — always represents conservatism, or rather ultra-conservatism, which is sharply distinguished from liberal democratic pseudo-conservatism in all its possible forms. (Nowadays, there are voices claiming that the supporters of Bolshevik communism are the true "conservatives". This is also one of the typical products of deliberate chaos.) The conservatism of the right wing — conservatory conservatism. The true right wing is a radically "anti-revolutionary" movement, but only in relation to the "Revolutio Anti-Conservatrix Sinistra". In fact, in this respect, it is also radically counter-revolutionary.

However, a completely different kind of revolution is also possible, in relation to which the "revolutionaries" are the true advocates of the right wing. This is the *Revolutio Conservatrix Dextra*, which — symbolically represents a 180-degree turn from left-wing positions, and now implements a multitude of 360-degree turns: with the help of an axis paddle reaching from the sky to the depths of the ocean. These are such powerful turns, reaching from the heights to the depths — , always in the right direction, actualising the hidden values of the depths and heights as possibilities. The revolutionary and radical preservation and conservation of these actualised values, which were thought to be lost or had not yet manifested themselves, is the next task. If all this has to be carried out in opposition to a left-wing revolution or revolutionism, the name of the series of action-reactionary operations to be implemented will be "*Contra-Revolutio Conservatrix Anti-Sinistra et Dextra*", which, however, by changing what needs to be changed, will not differ substantially from the *Revolutio Conservatrix Dextra*.

True right-wing politics is extremely hostile to all egalitarian ideas or even view. In existence, everything differs from everything else. People also differ from each other: both in a horizontal sense and in a vertical sense. We have already mentioned that more or less everyone is aware of this, even the most enthusiastic and militant advocates of egalitarianism. A collective and all-encompassing mutual deception while (almost) everyone knows that

egalitarianism has no basis whatsoever, (almost) everyone still acts as if the assumptions of egalitarianism were obvious and self-evident truths that they are prepared to defend tooth and nail.

There are significant differences between people. Some have argued that the differences between people are insignificant, since (generally) all humans can speak, and this is such a significant difference compared to all other beings that cannot speak that, in comparison, the differences between humans are negligible, almost unworthy of mention.

One could respond to this by saying that there is an even greater difference between living and non-living beings, but even that difference pales in comparison to the difference between beings and non-beings. However, there may be significant differences between beings and beings, living beings and living beings, people and people, even if the spectacular difference is minimal, since only barbarians can deny the significance of subtle differences.

If the differences between the sexes were insignificant, then — obviously — there would be no female and male sexes. The same is true for different ethnic groups.

In terms of differences symbolised by verticality, there are lower-order and higher-order personalities, families, clans, castes and ethnic groups, imperial “megethnos polyethnikos” with different tasks, obligations and rights — at least in normal states and societies, in a world that is at least close to normal. This does not imply that any ethnos or stratum can be oppressed, persecuted or even hunted down by other ethnoses or strata.

Everyone knows that forms of nationalism — in the strict sense of the word — began to emerge in the 14th century, not without precedent. During the Protestant Reformation, nationalist tendencies grew stronger.

The growing importance of national languages—in itself—is not at all anti-traditional development, provided that it does not occur in conjunction with the marginalisation of a language of traditional and supranational significance. The fact that many national languages in Europe could have been viewed as a positive development, and in retrospect could still be viewed as such, had it not been accompanied by the deliberate marginalisation and its actual relegation to the background.

The Enlightenment and the English Revolution both contributed to the development of nationalism. Its explosive development is linked to the French Revolution of 1789. The revolution, the most popular words were "peuple" and "citoyen" as well as "république", but it was around this time that "nationalisme", "patriotisme", "patriotique" and "patriote" also began to be used, although they lagged behind the previous three concepts in terms of time and significance. "Natio" and "patria" are old words. In Europe, natio referred to the nobility. It referred to the collective of its ethnic groups, rather than the entire population of the country. Patria referred to the land of the ancestors, primarily the land of the noble ancestors.

Nationalism began to develop with truly explosive force when the coincidence of "nation" and "peuple" was declared, and this was applied to all citizens of the country — "citoyen", as belonging to the "nation" and the "peuple", to all of them as a whole

. Nationalism — nominally and verbally — only spread later, but after the French Revolution it was already completely "ready".

Nationalism had essentially been "left-wing" since the 14th century, but from the end of the 18th century onwards, it was almost declared as such, and this was more or less the case until the First World War.

almost to the end, although those with keen insight began to notice around the turn of the century that changes were beginning to take place in this regard.

The more left-wing internationalism stemmed from nationalism and can thus also be regarded as an indirect product of the French Revolution. According to nationalism, belonging to a people or nation renders all other differences insignificant, and that belonging to a people or nation is the highest and most sacred dignity. According to internationalism, belonging to a people or nation is surpassed by belonging to any people or nation, and through this, belonging to the whole of humanity.

The forces that generated the left-wing revolutions first favoured nationalism, then a combination of nationalism and internationalism, with an emphasis on nationalism at first and then on internationalism later.

At the end of the 19th century, the forces that generated revolutions decided that nationalism would only be used in special circumstances in the future, and that they would devote all their energy to internationalism, even against nationalism.

This became apparent to everyone in connection with the left-wing and internationalist revolutions of 1917, 1918 and 1919

obvious to everyone. The right-wing anti-revolutionary forces, partly out of their fundamental convictions and partly in revolt against revolutionism, later linked their counter-revolutionary right-wing stance not only to nationalism, but also to revolutionary socialism, which had been transformed into a counter-leftist movement. Thus, nationalism was originally left-wing, regardless of its background possibilities.

Nationalism was therefore originally left-wing, apart from the background possibilities. In the 20th century, it became partly right-wing and partly far-right, but mainly contaminated by the left wing, it became right wing, and contaminated by the far left, it became far right.

However, there is another possibility open to nationalism, one that has been on the fringes of relevance for a very long time, occasionally becoming relevant, but only to a very limited extent and almost only for a few moments. This positive nationalism is nothing other than

true and genuine right-wing nationalism (dextro-nationalismus), into which no left-wing or anti-left-wing ideology could or could have infiltrated.

within the nationalism of the 20th century, which was strongly influenced by the extreme right and extreme left, a kind of background noise — truly and purely right-wing — and in this sense: traditional — nationalism also appeared — this cannot be disputed, but eminently

He was unable to play a decisive role, although this possibility could not be ruled out.

The traditional view of life is only positive, i.e. it can accept a purely right-wing, populism-averse, radically anti-egalitarian, anti-plebeian nationalism that places hierarchical division and gradualism at the forefront.

Even in the 19th century, but even more so in the 20th century, internationalism appeared almost exclusively as extreme left-wing ideology: in the form of socialist and communist manifestations. It is true

there has been and still is a Christian social – "white" – internationalism and internationalism, but so far, although by no means insignificant, it has not had a world-shaping significance. Christian social internationalism is, incidentally, caught between the left and the right.

All actual forms of right-wing politics today are decidedly anti-internationalist.

Just as nationalism is more or less associated with patriotism, which can also be left-wing, right-wing as defined by anti-leftism, or far right, as well as genuinely and unambiguously ultra-right — internationalism is associated with the opposite of patriotism, so to speak: inter-patriotism, the most extreme form of which is cosmopolitanism.

Strange as it may seem, internationalism can also be positive, that is, it can be clearly and unambiguously right-wing, even ultra-right-wing, if it opposes all forms of egalitarianism, if it rejects all forms of egalitarianism, if it accepts the horizontal and vertical symbolism of ethno-national differences and the consequences thereof.

In addition to right-wing patriotism, purely right-wing inter-patriotism is also acceptable. from a traditional point of view, but always both together, never just one or the other.

Even cosmopolitanism, which can rightly be called the greatest enemy, can be positive, that is, it can be ultra-dextro-cosmopolitanism. The traditional view has never accepted and does not accept cosmopolitanism in the general sense cosmopolitanism in the general sense, and indeed — we repeat — considers it to be the greatest and most dangerous enemy, or one of the most dangerous enemies, in every sense sense, it considers it to be the greatest and most dangerous enemy or one of the most dangerous enemies.

Positive nationalism and positive internationalism have — and, above all, can have — a supreme synthesis in which both are combined, but — since they are not merely separate surpasses both, but also exceeds their combination — in fact, neither of them. This positive peak synthesis can and should be called cognationalism.

Cognationalism (cognationalismus) or cognationality is, on the one hand, the name given to the principle of international community, which differs from the principles of nationality and internationalism, and on the other hand, it also expresses collective, shared nationalism(s).

The traditional view of existence, which rejects ordinary nationalism and ordinary internationalism, but also accepts positive and purely ultra-right nationalism, as well as positive and purely ultra-right internationalism, and does so with great conviction: it accepts and embraces positive and purely ultra-right-wing co-nationality-co-nationalism, as well as the associated principle of co-socialism and the ultra-right-wing form of compatriotism that also belongs to it.

The traditional view of existence — in the fullest sense — is based on positive and ultra-right-wing transnationality and transnationalism, or, in other words, positive and ultra-right supranationality and supranationalism, or, in other words, positive and ultra-right supranationality and supranationalism.

Beyond the acceptance of positive and ultra-right patriotism and the same interpatriotism — as we have noted — we can accept even more readily positive and ultra-right-wing compatriotism, and even more so the equally positive and equally ultra-right-wing transpatriotism or suprapatriotism.

We must oppose any form of patriotism that is hostile to the possibility of an "Imperium Monarchicum Dextrum" — possibilities that cannot be called minimal, but do exist in principle, and whose preservation — for adherents of the traditional worldview — is both obligatory and is also an obvious desire.

Adherents of traditional ultra-right-wing and ultra-conservative views are, of course, willing to show solidarity with anti-left-wing populist nationalism and anti-left-wing vulgar patriotism if confrontations with openly left-wing liberal or socialist-communist internationalism and cosmopolitanism intensify. Obviously, this cannot be allowed to happen. At the same time, traditional ultra-right-wing and ultra-conservative tendencies must be made clear that it does not identify itself with right-wing and far-right influences that yield to the anti-left and extreme anti-left, with plebeian-populist nationalism and vulgar patriotism, or with the equally vulgar Christianity, as well as the equally vulgar — neo-paganistic — "new paganism".

We have already mentioned that the traditional — and consequently ultra-right-wing ultra-conservative — approach is only willing to accept monarchical and monarchia-equivalent forms of government among the possible forms of government.

The exclusively absolutist monarchy — the Monarchia Absolutistica and the exclusively feudal monarchy — Monarchia Ordinaria Feudalis — is or would be rejected by proponents of the traditional view, and even when looking back at history, they cannot really and clearly enthuse about such formations. The original unity of Monarchia Absolutistica and the Monarchia Ordinaria Feudalis is what is truly appropriate for the traditional view. The constitutional monarchy — the Monarchia Constitutionalis — is only marginally acceptable to those who hold traditional views: even an exclusively absolutist or exclusively class-based monarchy is much more appropriate. Constitutional monarchy is particularly unacceptable when the monarch — the Monarch — is effectively and in almost every respect limited in his powers.

(The Austro-Hungarian Monarchy — after 1867 — was on the verge of acceptability in this regard. In terms of authority, the Emperor and King still wielded considerable power, but compared to the royal prerogatives prior to 1867, and — especially — the powers of the monarchs before 1847 and prior to that, it was already a concession, and a serious one at that, which Franz Joseph I, despite his better judgement, made in the interests of consolidation, and to which he then adhered strictly and correctly, again contrary to his inner convictions and principles.

Traditional ultra-right-wing, ultra-conservative imperial-monarchism is, on the one hand, radically "Europism" and, on the other hand, equally radically "ante-Europism", and in connection with these — committed "paneuropism" and, at the same time, committed "anti-pan-

supports the principles and goals of Europism. There is, of course, no contradiction here, nor could there be. It matters what kind of Europe or Pan-Europe we are talking about we are talking about.

No traditional and genuinely right-wing personality living in Europe would want to be "European" in the way that the liberal-democratic, social-democratic, conservative-democratic and Christian-democratic "defining Europeanists" would like to prescribe, with their shallow glances at the open or veiled intentions and ideas of the advocates of socialist-communist restoration — in the former Soviet Union and elsewhere. We are opposed to such Europeanism.

The idea of a "United States of Europe" is a distorted hybrid if it is conceived on the model of the "United States of America". There is no such thing as a European nation, any more than there is a North American nation, while at the same time there are mostly plurinational historical countries in Europe that cannot be united without further consequences.

The Pan-Europe we envision cannot, in our opinion, be a Union, a Federation, or a Confederation: it cannot be any of these, nor should it be permitted to attempts be made to realise any of them. Only — relatively and limited — a possible Pan-Europe can be conceived and imagined — in a positive and organic sense — as a close imperial alliance of sovereign countries, rather than a loose one.

If possible, monarchies should form a Pan-Europe, which would also be a monarchy Europe. The imperial alliance could and should be formed according to conational and transnational principles: based on the conationalist-copatriotic and transnational-interpatriotic harmonisation of various right-wing national-patriotic and international-interpatriotic aspirations. transnational-transpatriotic aspirations.

The Imperium Monarchicum Pan-Europeum Dextrum is a goal with which the supporters of traditional ultra-right-wing, ultra-conservative imperial monarchism obviously cannot agree, but which they can work towards while fully accepting it. agree on, but one that they can fully accept and work towards. Res Publica Pan-Europæa Sinistra, on the other hand, is a goal that — based on a traditional view of life — can only be rejected. Pan-Europe — regardless of everything else "in se" — does not exist and is not possible. For this very reason, positions claiming that the creation of a loose or tight Pan-Europe is the only main goal, compared to which the form of government and the question of right-wing or left-wing orientation are insignificant, are unacceptable. In our opinion — precisely in line with our traditional approach — these are fundamental issues that must be clarified before anything else can be done.

Today, many people are trying to make Pan-Europe a reality, but unfortunately, most of them are doing so from a left-wing or moderately right-wing position, which is essentially left-wing.

Even in a realised Pan-Europe, it is not entirely impossible to work and fight for the actual realisation of a positive and true Pan-Europe, but it would certainly be more appropriate to clarify the fundamental issues, to make right-wing decisions, but also to take the necessary measures. The goal could be to restore all European monarchies, possibly even to create new ones, to bring them to the level of absolutist and feudal monarchies, including those those that are formally monarchies today, but whose "constitutionality" has reached such a degree that

they cannot really be considered true monarchies. Subsequently, a Ligamen-Imperialé — an Imperial League — could or should be established, which could then be transformed into an Imperium Monarchicum Dextrum, also in the sense of an absolutist and class-based monarchy in the sense of unity.

In opposition to the rule of darkness, "scotasmocracy", only "photismocracy" can be accepted. The rule of light, and light means spiritual light. This can manifest itself in the following closely related and interrelated variants

— closely related, interrelated variants: theocracy, autocracy, monarchocracy, — ariocracy, aristocracy, androcracy, noocracy, pneumatocracy, meritocracy. and many other similar forms of rule.

It is obvious that only a ruler belonging to a "gens dynastica" above the ethnos can rule over an ethnos. The national kingdom — as we have already discussed — is a conceptual hybrid and chimera, a projection of anti-traditional aberrations manifested on a statal level, which only fools can be enthusiastic about.

If there is no personality belonging to a gens dynastica who could be a legitimate ruler according to his suitability and intention, then a ruling governor must be elevated above countries, or even a European Empire, or — ultimately — a World Empire, the Endowed with almost all the rights of a king or emperor, they had virtually unlimited rule and power.

The leaders of individual countries must come from the country's leading ethnic group, but if for some reason they cannot be drawn from the single ethnic group of a given country, then it is not possible to lower the standard; it is not possible to produce a leader or leaders who belong to that ethnic group but are not of the highest intellectual calibre "for the sake" of the ethnic group. In such cases, the leader or leaders may belong to a completely foreign ethnic group, but they must belong to the spiritual "elite" that is capable and entitled to lead.

In the case of countries, the National Assembly, and in the case of empires, the Imperial Assembly, has an absolute and indispensable right. The most appropriate is the three-chamber National Assembly or Imperial Assembly: House of Representatives, House of Professions, and House of Lords. However, under normal circumstances, the National Assembly or Imperial Assembly cannot have legislative powers. Only the Sovereign can have legislative and judicial powers. The only power of the "conventus" can be to give its opinion on proposed legislation. It must be like a General Council in the Roman Catholic Church: the council's resolutions are very important, but they are not binding on the Pope. The final decision is always made by the Pope.

We have already stated in other contexts that feudalism is a social system based on state foundations — and with far-reaching effects on economic life — which is compatible with tradition. Later formations are all anti-traditional: they have neither sanctity nor legitimacy, nor can they have either.

Empires are always superior — provided, of course, that they are truly empires — than countries. In the case of empires, "polyethnicity" and "plurinationality" are commonplace: there would be no exceptional and unconditional advantage if the empire were inhabited entirely by a single race, ethnos and nation (nor, of course, any disadvantage), but this was not actually the case. Ethnically homogeneous Nippon/Japan is far from homogeneous if we take a closer look at its population. The Huns and the did not belong to a single race, a single ethnos or nation, but consisted of two major races, several races and sub-races, numerous ethnoses and ethnos mixtures.

Modern republics have nothing to do with the former Res Publica Romana, which, incidentally, was clearly superior to both the earlier Regnum Romanum and the later Imperium Romanum were definitely superior, nor do they have anything to do with republics such as the old Venetian state. Modern kingdoms — today — can be considered bad, but their transformation into republics would still be unacceptable, because in the case of a formal monarchy, the possibility of retransformation is still greater than in the case of a de jure and de facto republic.

In the case of a true monarchy, the modernist and left-wing, or possibly anti-left-wing, argument that a monarch may be incompetent at any time, and in some cases even His disability or insanity cannot be ruled out. From a traditional point of view, this cannot be a starting point or assumption. One can only start from normality, from what is normal, and only in a secondary sense, but then one must also deal with what to do when normality is barely enforced or cannot be enforced at all. These contingencies, so the question can only be asked on a case-by-case basis, and the answer can only be given on a case-by-case basis.

The truly great rulers, who were no longer god-kings or sacred kings or emperors in the strictest sense, but their indirect involvement in sacred matters — such as Franz Joseph I, Emperor of Austria and Apostolic King of Hungary — they were already disappearing in the 20th century, and by the end of the 20th century, we can say that they had disappeared. It can be assumed that the genius, god or archangel of the gens dynastica has more or less abandoned them. Probably not not completely, but to a considerable extent.

Each country could still be ruled by a king, and the Imperium Monarchicum Pan-Europium Dextrum could also be headed by a king and emperor. However, the Imperium Monarchicum Pan-Gæum Dextrum could not be headed by a king or emperor enthroned, because the World King is a living reality, and although he has withdrawn into invisibility, his kingship is unquestionable.

change. At the head of the world — in the case of a monarchical world state — there could be a ruler, a Regnator: the viceroy of the World King. The dignity of the Regnator would be an absolute requirement in this case, and otherwise it would only be a requirement if suitable dynastic rulers were no longer available. However, the Principium Monarchicum can never be abandoned. (As we have already noted, the national kingdom is unacceptable from a traditional : the monarch must be above the nation and nations, and it is also obvious that he cannot belong to any ethno-national religion.

The prerequisite for an organic society is an organic state, bearing in mind that the state precedes society and stands above it. The essence of an organic society and state is that it functions like a healthy living organism — therefore, their rule and leadership

is primarily spiritual in origin. It is obvious that caste-like, hierarchical
Gradual segmentation and stratification must be enforced. No one can be completely deprived of their
rights; everyone must have fundamental rights. At the same time, complete legal equality is unrealistic
and destructive. Caste boundaries — under normal circumstances
— can only be crossed in very exceptional cases.

This cannot be achieved today or in the foreseeable future, and we are fully aware of this
, and we do not condone naivety on anyone's part, least of all our own. Nevertheless, we believe that
this impossibility is not absolute: the seeds of possibility — in this regard — have not yet been
completely burned away. Furthermore, we also know that it is worth
to set as a goal something that cannot and will not be realised under any circumstances. We must
work as if it could actually be realised.

This awakens inner forces, forces that are, on the one hand, transcendental in nature
consequences, but on the other hand, these forces may flow back into the earthly-human
world. Not only should the most obvious positive possibilities be realised, but attempts should also be
made to realise the almost impossible.

It is not yet too late to revive countries and empires, even now, when there is almost no hope of
achieving this, but such attempts can still awaken a receptiveness to true and traditional pure right-
wing politics and its latent capabilities.

In the closing period of Kali Yuga, the current pseudo-states will also disintegrate, but the
In theory, a right-wing and traditional restoration — even if it lasted no longer than a day — could
ensure a more dignified end.

THE TRADITIONAL CONCEPT OF GOD AND DIVINITY

The materialistic atheism of the present age, which has become generally dominant after the decline of normative, value-free Marxism, is obviously the most fundamental heresy from the point of view of all religions, one that does not even deserve to be called heresy if it were not lurking in the background of contemporary religions of traditional origin or without a traditional basis — not even too hidden — immediately noticeable to the keenest attention.

Materialistic atheism is still on the rise because the darkness and fulfilling the duty that determined its creation and its unfolding. Complete separation from heaven and earth has not yet been achieved, but the time is not far off when it will be realised to the extent that it can be possible: this will correspond to almost complete realisation, but not absolute realisation, because that would entail the complete destruction of everything.

The external and lower forces of darkness have been flowing into human civilisation, culture and religion (confessio and religio) for some time now, and are beginning to infect the sciences, which are already paralysed by materialism, and to further infect the various branches of art that have already been infected by these forces
various branches of art already infected by these forces.

Materialistic atheism and counter-spiritual pseudo-occultism are manifestations of the dark forces with which we are unwilling to engage in dialogue or debate, since our platforms are so far apart that it would be impossible to agree on anything. (We also consider the dialogues between representatives of the Roman Catholic Church with Marxists as impossible and foolish.) The universal theology of the traditional view of existence — materialist
With the exception of atheism, it is willing to accept all possible conceptions of God, together and simultaneously, but not at all to the same extent, rather with sharp distinctions and ranking selections in this regard.

After rejecting atheism, we must decide between polytheism and monotheism. First of all, we must state that, in our opinion, there is no such thing as "pure and perfect" polytheism does not and never has existed. Behind all polytheism — either explicitly or implicitly, lies "henotheism" or monotheism. This does not mean that explicit henotheism or monotheism, or possibly monenotheism, is superior to monotheism that expresses itself in polytheism.

It may be superior, but not because of the number of gods. The Greeks' polytheism is expressed by the "Hen" who stands above all gods, who is the It appeared in "Neoplatonism," but its central significance probably existed earlier, albeit in a hidden form.

Monotheism is undoubtedly more concentrated than polytheism, but in terms of the differentiation of divine presence, it is less able to achieve and maintain the intensity of perspective that polytheism could easily achieve.

Pantheism or pantotheism can be of two kinds: immanent and transcendental.

immanent pantheism in itself and made exclusive: completely unacceptable. It posits the presence of the deity in everything, but from the side of the natural universe. The

Transcendental pantheism, also known as theopantism or theopanism, also teaches the presence of divinity in everything, but not in the natural world, rather in the primacy of divinity. The unity of the two types of pantheism or pantotheism: pantotheism or theopantism immanentalis et transscendentalis already represents a

concept of God which, supplemented by monotheism and polytheism, truly corresponds to the traditional concept of God.

Friedrich Krause — a name that is little known today, but a philosopher and theological thinker who can be considered equal to Hegel, Fichte, Schelling and Schopenhauer in many respects — explored the unification of pantheism and monotheism, which, incidentally, has always existed in traditional conceptions, albeit in an implicit form. Krause called his synthesis pantheism, which means that everything is in God — I am myself, or rather, I can actually become that.

According to heterotheism, God or the Divine is absolutely different from me — I myself can never become God, since I am not essentially God, and I do not possess the potential to become that. God — whether present within me or not — is not identical with me, neither actually nor potentially.

Heterotheism posits the inner God in a verbal-nominal way, but in fact accepts the external and strongly personal conception of God. God — in this view — is a powerful personal being with human-like thoughts, intentions, will, feelings, anger and forgiveness, love and hatred, mercy and mercilessness.

The traditional view takes the unconditional primacy of autotheism. It also accepts heterotheism, but only in the background. Heterotheism can only be brought to the fore if this foregrounding is, in all likelihood, only transitional, — and even if someone is only capable of this, i.e. completely incapable of autotheism. Under such circumstances, it is legitimate to accept the prioritisation of heterotheism, — since this is also superior to the position of materialistic atheism.

In addition to all this, the traditional position also emphatically accepts the assumption of the supremacy of gods and the supremacy of God

— with particular reference to the relevant doctrinal chapters of the Hindu and Buddhist traditions.

Metatheism — specifically, suprapersonal autometatheism, but even more so suprapersonal autometatheopantheism, can be considered the basic position of Traditionalis Spiritualis et Metaphysica with regard to the concept of divinity, from which all other concepts of divinity can be derived and to which all concepts of divinity can be traced back.

Any anthropomorphic conception of the gods, God, or the Divine is rejected from the traditional position. The Man of the Beginning — but to a lesser extent, the First Man — Anthrōpos Theomorphikos — traces of this are still present in man, but Theos Anthrōpomorphikos — only in pictorial representation.

may be legitimately raised, but not according to all traditions and religions.

Monotheism or monenotheism can also take many forms, because even in the case of a single and unique God, it is possible to raise the question of whether there is only one, two, three or more persons

in unity. In this sense, there is: unitarian, binitarian, trinitarian, quaternitarian, quinitarian, senitarian, septenitarian, and plurimitarian monotheism. (Note that although monotheism trinitarian is not strictly speaking tritheism, the general concept of God — with regard to the Holy Trinity — is in fact tritheistic.)

From a traditional point of view, all forms of monotheism are acceptable and even desirable, as are dyotheism and tritheism.

A more important question is whether God or Divinity is personal or impersonal. The traditional view takes a position primarily in favour of suprapersonal theism; from this position, one can "open up" to both apersonal or impersonal theism and personal theism. Personhood here does not arise in relation to one or more persons, but rather in relation to the very existence of personhood. In any case, suprapersonal theism is the basis; within this, apersonal or impersonal theism can generally provide a higher perspective, but this is not always the case without exception. There is no doubt that it is easier to reconnect to suprapersonal theism, which is the basis, from apersonal theism than from personal theism. From this we must conclude that the personal conception of God must remain in the background behind the apersonal conception.

It is also very important whether we accept primarily an external or an internal God. From a traditional point of view, both conceptions are valid, but it is essential to assume the primacy of the internal God. (Of course, we are not talking here about spatial externality and internality.)

The question of the primacy of autotheism and heterotheism is more important than anything else. Autotheism is based on solipsism: I declare that, in essence and potentially, I am God. Not only is God within me, but — let us repeat — in essence and potentially, I am God.

The assumption of anthrōpopatheia — linked to the emotional world of feelings and passions of modern man — is an anti-spiritual and anti-traditional manifestation, which must be rejected as rejected by all those who have spiritually oriented goals.

The dominant religion of the Western world is Christianity, the collection of Christian denominations. Christianity has eliminated its own Gnostic esoteric tendencies — almost eradicating from itself, and therefore its conception of God is strongly personal, based either on Unitarian, Binitarian, or — most commonly — Trinitarian monotheism; nominally positing an inner God, but in reality accepting an "outer" God, and explicitly heterotheistic. The above applies to almost all Christian denominations. applicable, and those that are not are also not too far removed from the stated positions. No denomination openly professes anthropomorphism and anthropopathism, but none of them—at least on a plebeian-populist level—is far from expressing its conception of God in this way "internally."

Autotheism is particularly far removed from all Christian denominations. It would be possible to develop a Christian theology that could also accept autotheism, but only for narrow "private use"; and it could perhaps be argued — albeit with considerable difficulty and contrivance — that such theologoumena are implicitly present in the deepest and highest teachings of Christianity — as the seeds or germs of autotheism

, but there is little hope, and probably even less, for the creation and maintenance of a significant and functioning denomination representing such a theology.

Islam has Sufi and other Gnostic-like movements that are very
They are close to autotheism and, in fact, accept the basic principles of autotheism, even if not explicitly.

If we can still be tolerant of heterotheism at the level of religion — *confessio et religio* — we must unconditionally abandon this tolerant attitude when it comes to the dilemma of heterotheism versus autotheism arises in relation to pro-initiation, initiation, and supra-realisation (e.g. the various paths of yoga).

, the dilemma of heterotheism versus autotheism arises. In this case, and exclusively, autometatheopantholismus suprapersonalis can be acceptable and sustainable, supported by the philosophical-hyperphilosophical view of existence that we have called metidealismus immanentali-transscendentalis et transscendentali-immanentalis theourgo-magico-solipsisticus absolutus. There is no room for compromise in this regard.

Heterotheism is at an unimaginable height compared to materialistic atheism — one might say: in cultural terms — but the difference between them becomes much smaller when heterotheism and atheism are compared together with autotheism in the context of initiation and metaphysical realisation beyond realisation. The difference is then hardly significant, because both atheism and heterotheism — conceptually — contradict initiation and true realisation, in such a way that the former two undermine the possibilities of the latter two, even before the preparatory operations have been carried out.

Initiation and metaphysical realisation are not dependent on the view of existence, but the paths leading to them are closely related to the inner, higher and essential nature, and the nature of the view of existence — as a basic view — is by no means irrelevant, especially in its initial stage; on the contrary, in a negative case, it can
It also prevents us from reaching the stage that could rightly be called transcendental.

Underestimating the significance of the concept of God and, more generally, of the concept of existence — as well as overestimating it excessively — is a sure sign of an "outsider" attitude, dilettantism in the worst sense of the word
sense, as well as a failure to ever come close to the essential and a further distancing from the essential.

PRODINIATIO, INITIATIO ET SUPRAREALIFICATIO METAPHYSICA

Modern man — as modern man — that is, as a person of the age of anti-traditionalism, antirituality and antimetaphysics — is completely uninitiated and utterly incapable of adequately finding the paths of metaphysical realisation beyond realisation.

There is no doubt that according to traditional – strictly Buddhist – doctrines, all beings are capable of Metaphysical Awakening. However, while this is true in terms of potentiality, it is not true in terms of potentialitas actuabilis – that is, possibility – is not true for all beings, nor even for all human beings. In terms of potentialitas priæactualis — that is, virtuality — it is true only for a very few.

We are not saying that people of the present age — say, the end of the 20th century — are incapable of undertaking any true and actual Spiritual Path, but that modern people — as modern people — are incapable of doing so. It is true that people of the present age and modern people — Conceptually and factually, they usually overlap, but the two are not necessarily identical. There are people today who, on the one hand, truly belong to the present age, but on the other hand, cannot be called modern, or only to a limited extent. Among them among them may be those who are capable of "pro-archaicising" themselves and thus coming into contact with true initiation.

René Guénon makes a strict distinction between initiation and metaphysical realisation, while others do not see any significant difference between the highest degrees of initiation and metaphysical realisation

significant difference between the highest degrees of initiation and metaphysical realisation. In this case, we tend to agree with René Guénon's classification, because it makes certain important distinctions clearer, but

We do not reject classifications that differ from this, but are essentially the same in spiritual terms.

Modern man — as modern man — is uninitiated. If people today truly have spiritual goals, they must deprive themselves — not of their contemporaneity, but of their modernity.

This "demodernisation" is part of the restorative, corrective and preparatory operations — the circle of corrective

preparations, but it can only take place after certain further preparatory operations have been carried out.

Pre-initiation — prodiniation — is no longer demodernisation, but — as mentioned above — pro-archaification. A person who is merely non-modern is not yet ready for initiation; near-archaicity is a prerequisite for initiability.

For people of the present day—modern people—the mysteries of the past have become inaccessible, the paths leading to them untraceable and, in any case, impassable. There are no new, contemporary and modern mysteries or paths of initiation, nor can there be. Our view here — fundamentally — from trends such as Steiner's anthroposophy,

which categorically asserts the impassability of the old paths, but claims the birth of a new, contemporary, modern mystery, the discoverability and revelation of new, contemporary, modern paths of initiation.

In our opinion, this assumption is based on error, and its dissemination is a deceptive deception and misguidance based on error and misguidance.

The old roads are impassable for modern man, and new, contemporary — and above all — modern roads do not exist, except in the realm of pseudo-initiations and counter-initiations, because there, unfortunately, there are plenty of typically modern roads and paths leading to nowhere.

The ancient roads are still passable today, but not for modern man, only for those who have deprived themselves of their own modernity and — beyond that — have, to a certain extent, "archaicised" themselves to such an extent that they can embark on the path of initiation "archaicisation".

The name of the first major stage of initiation is initiation itself, in Greek: "ho baptismos" or "to baptisma". (Its English name — baptism or christening — does not at all express the presumed process that does not take place, even though it should take place. go to the baptism of Christian children or adults.

The Roman Catholic Church correctly teaches that baptism or baptisma is a prerequisite for prerequisite for salvation — salus, sōterā. We also correctly say that salus is the prerequisite for Metaphysical Awakening — Redexvigilatio or Exvigilatio Metaphysica.

Another question is whether, in Christian baptismos, true baptismos perhaps only took place at the beginning, and later not always, and even later only exceptionally, and in modern and contemporary times almost never.

Initiation is not only a prerequisite for bliss that surpasses and transcends heavenly states, but — however strange it may seem — also a prerequisite for damnation in hell, because ordinary human consciousness disappears almost immediately or gradually after death. In order to be a permanent part of any state, not to mention participating in aiōnial immortality immortality: a certain degree of initiation is necessary — and this applies even to states of hellish damnation.

We cannot fail to mention in a few words the traditional position on mysticism.

Mysticism — unfortunately — does not replace esotericism or esoterism in the work of one author (and the meanings of these two latter terms are also quite different from each other). As this creates confusion, we cannot approve of it, but since we cannot change it, we can only raise awareness that mysticism often does not appear in the strict sense of the word, but never among traditional authors, who, when writing or speaking about mysticism, always mean true mysticism in the strict sense.

Just as mysterion, mysteriosophia, mystes and mysteriosophos are always mentioned in a positive in a positive sense — in the traditional sense — the situation is not so clear in the case of mystica, mystikos, and mysticus. Mystica passiva, which always aimed at some kind of dissolution or merging, even if purely spiritual: the traditional

expressly rejected from the point of view of spirituality. In the case of mysticism, there is always the danger that it will become *mystica passiva*, which is why mysticism is not generally considered, from a traditional point of view, to be among the most highly valued paths and possibilities.

The development of *actitudo mystica* — through initiation and realisation — is essential because it protects the traveller from becoming stuck at different levels and ensures the development of *universalificatio*. However, this is not yet *mystica* and has nothing to do with *mystica passiva*; if its awakening begins to lead to *mystica*, the process must be stopped and only resumed after certain corrections have been made:

Christianity — mainly Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy, but also some Protestant denominations — placed emphasis on mysticism, but not on *mystica passiva*, although *mystica passiva* also appeared strongly in these orientations. However, there were some mystics who were able to rise above mysticism and realise a completely different orientation, which in many respects can rightly be called Gnostic: Meister Johann Eckhart stands out in every respect from the otherwise very distinguished circle of medieval Christian mystics, theologians and philosophers. His high-quality written oeuvre, the

The most significant parts are precisely those passages that the high ecclesiastical circles representing the "official" line were unwilling to accept, — here too, emphasising the fact that Christianity willingly worked — almost always — against itself, and its tendency towards self-destruction and self-ruin very often came to fruition.

Mysticism — in fact, although unspoken: *mystica passiva* — appeared in traditional religions and in most religions in general, never at the lowest and never at the highest possible religious level, but it only reached a high pedestal within Christianity and within the Hasidic branch of Judaism. Within Christian monastic orders, there were some — primarily the Discalced Carmelites and the Order of Saint Benedict — that had a kind of "quasi-prodinitiativus" path, partly on "mystical" grounds, but not exclusively on such a basis. In Eastern Orthodox Christianity, monasticism
There were — and still are — certain tendencies that, although they may be considered mystical, by no means exclusively mystical paths, and the "hypermystical" component can protect those who follow this path from passivity.

Almost all occultist movements — nominally or in reality — possess some kind of "initiation" methodology: these — without exaggeration, we can say without exception — are either pseudo-initiation — "pseudo-initiatic" — or counter-initiation — "counter-initiatic" initiatory" methods. These can be recognised by the fact that they are either unable to break away from the sphere of personality and individuality, or — and this is more common — they break away from it, but it is not the supra-personal Self that takes over internal control, but some kind of at first inexperienced, but later — through its effects — experienced — hidden force and power, which we call the directly inexperienced "heteron". The gradual abandonment of spiritual autonomy — sooner or later manifesting itself as a concomitant these tendencies. False initiation is not without danger, and counter-initiation is extremely and fatally dangerous. The "diligent aspirant" who follows these counter-paths — if he is truly "unwavering" — will inevitably "transcend" downward, the consequences of which consequences will include, first, pneumothopathy and pneumatosis, and later psychopathy and psychosis, accompanied by a wide variety of mostly serious physical illnesses in the strict sense of the word. If the "aspiring" person continues to "aspire" even more intensely, they will turn to the pathless ways of methodical, noetic and ontic total annihilation.

The outline of Steiner's anthroposophy "Schulung" — mentioned several times — goes hand in hand, through several stages, with what we also consider adequate on traditional spiritual grounds. These phases are characterised by explicit and autonomous consciousness, and they — here and now — could only be evaluated positively if — at a higher level — they were not followed by a relative and partial emptying of consciousness, which is realised from the silence of conscious functions.

In the case of traditional — prodiniatic-initiatic — paths, it is also possible to reach a stage of — relative and partial — emptying and emptiness of consciousness, — and then two possible tasks can be accomplished: either the infinitisation and absolutisation of this emptiness, or the "creation" of a relatively empty space of consciousness.

The task prescribed in Steiner's higher-level, further developed "Schulung" is different from either of the two tasks associated with the traditional spiritual paths mentioned above. In the silence of the conscious functions, in the partial and relative emptiness and emptying of consciousness, conscious awareness remains (so far, so good), and then one must "wait", observe and notice that "spiritual world thinking", "cosmic thinking" or "imaginatio" subtly enters or "forms" itself in the conscious space. Here, the autonomous, alert consciousness that has been maintained and preserved until now, and indeed heightened, comes into its own. The "anthroposophical" path up to this point, and only up to this point, is by no means a wrong turn, but from this point on, it clearly is. The dangers along this path are not too great, because only a very few have attained these levels have been reached by only a negligible few, and even among these few, they are mostly those who were born with latent occult abilities (Rudolf Steiner himself was one such person), and in the future, even fewer will likely reach this point.

Mysticism is a strongly "inward-looking" possibility and — in most cases — a path to dissolution. However, there are also special "outward-looking" varieties of mysticism — such as the unique approach of Jiddu Krishnamurti's unique approach, which did not require followers or following, and which in many respects deserves attention, but is nevertheless unacceptable in its entirety.

Among the aberrations mentioned above are Silva's "mind control" and Hubbard's "Dianetics" and various approaches recommending "alternative" and "regression hypnosis" do not present themselves as paths to "initiation", but their function is very similar to the methodology of pseudo- and counter-initiation trends. The rather vulgar Darnel-type "training" is also more or less similar to these.

The "Krishna Consciousness Movement," which has also been mentioned, is the application of the methods of the "Transcendental Meditation" movement, performed with low intensity: pseudo-initiation, with high intensity: counter-initiation in nature.

The true paths of Yōga have — for a very long time — almost never been directly accessible. They have almost always been preceded by some kind of initiation — dīksā — often caste initiation — varṇa-dīksā — or pre-yōga: Prayōga. The pre-yoga of Hatha-Yoga is Byāyāma-Prayoga, which included — among many other things — 840 āsanas perfectly executed, concentrative-meditative-contemplative mastery, the a variety of breathing exercises developed from prāṇāyāma (controlled breathing exercises are still

are far from identical with prāṇāyāmá, — contrary to the erroneous and ignorant opinions propagated by Indians — prāṇāyāma practised at the level of Byāyāma-Prayōga prāṇāyāma is not yet identical with Yōga, in this case with prāṇāyāmá performed at the level of Hatha-Yōga

prāṇāyāmá, — but even to reach the peak of Byāyāma-Prayōga, one must possess abilities such as the ability to suspend breathing and circulation for an unlimited period of time, accompanied by a high level of consciousness and free from any kind of damage. As already noted, this is not the legendary peak ability of the Mahā-Gurus of Hatha-Yoga, but the ability of the Byāyāma-Prayōgi who has reached the limits of Hatha-Yoga and fulfilled the prerequisite of becoming a practising disciple of Hatha-Yoga.

This shows that there are many conceptual and nominal errors circulating about Yōga, and within that, Hatha-Yōga, which are at the same time pitifully ridiculous and brazenly abusive. We are not aware of any Westerners who have become Hatha Yogis, at least in modern times, and we do not consider this to be

likely. As for whether any Westerners who had previously travelled to the East had followed this path would have progressed, we do not know, but it cannot be ruled out. Westerners have not reached the level of Byāyāma-Prayōgī in recent centuries either — we can say this with reasonable certainty

. In fact, we can go even further: those Indians who today pose as gurus of Hatha-Yoga or even Rāja-Yoga before their devout and foolish followers have certainly not even set foot on the path of Byāyāma-Prayōga or any other Prayōga,

let alone the true Yōga. This applies even more so to the "men of God" of the East in the present day . For Westerners — with the exception of certain alchemical-hermetic masters — the paths to perfect mastery, which also radiate to the body, have been completely closed for a very long time.

There may have been those who were born virtual initiates or born and virtually quasi-initiates who, having undergone a life-initiation of supernal enlightenment, attained initiation and even more than that, reaching higher levels, with certain qualitative abilities that could be attributed to the body.

. There may also have been those who, even in the first half of the 20th century, in the West, reached certain degrees of prodinciation and initiation in Initiation Centres certain degrees of prodinciation and initiation. These Centres were, on the one hand, completely closed and secret, and on the other hand, perhaps without exception today, not only secret retreat, but also into complete invisibility, unless they ceased to exist altogether.

In the present day, in the second half of the 20th century, the once secret, but at least strictly exclusive societies and orders — have indeed been replaced by organisations with identical or similar names.

— pseudo-societies and pseudo-orders, pseudo-brotherhoods have emerged and continue to emerge. Rosicrucianism is one of the most popular of these, but Hermeticism and combinations of these are also among the favourites. These movements are not only completely false and hypocritical, but often offer dangerous pseudo-initiation and counter-initiation methods. Pseudo-Rosicrucian "transfiguratio" is more of a pseudo-prodinciation, but it can also be "further developed" into a counter-initiation.

The situation of spiritually oriented people today is far from hopeless, and the idea that the line we represent teaches complete hopelessness is simply not true. At the same time, however, we must say that spiritually

people today do not have much reason for far-reaching hope. moment. There are very few exceptional people who, like prodinciation

prepare for the foundation of autocorrective-preparative initiation. Without this, it is impossible to proceed.

Anyone who is even slightly ambitious — who wants to begin the path of initiation and metaphysical realisation, but has no idea what they are actually talking about. This is not possible even for those who are at the spiritual peak today, and — as time progresses — it will become less and less possible. We will have to "start" from further and further away in order to reach the actual "starting position" and actually take off from there (if we want to freely apply the principle of "air start"). At one time, neither Prayōga, nor initiation in the strict sense. Later, these preparations became indispensable, but preliminary initiation was still not necessary. Then this too became indispensable. Subsequently, autocorrective preparatory operations also became necessary, and even preparation for these. But even now, far fewer people are suitable for this than were once suitable for true and direct initiation. At the same time, it is not possible to increase indefinitely the principle and practice of starting from behind from behind. This too will come to an end one day, and it seems that this "one day" is right now, at the very end of the 20th century, or right now, or in the very near future.

It is almost certain — and according to certain doctrines, it can even be said with certainty — that even at the very end of the closing phase of Kali Yuga, there will still be those who are capable of pre-initiation, initiation, and metaphysical realisation, even when the majority of people have gone mad and stupid, and already seriously and fatally ill at birth, with illnesses affecting every aspect of their lives.

The "suprerealificatio metaphysica" — as an intermediate goal, and the "Autotransscendentificatio Metaphysica Absoluta" — as the ultimate and absolute goal: primarily not in general and generally, but strictly in relation to myself. I must assess and determine the possibilities of this intuitively and consideratively, then concentratively, meditatively and contemplatively, and I must decide for myself in this regard

. If I find even the slightest possibility of this, then it is right to decide to strive unconditionally for it; if I see no possibility of this, then it is right to strive for what I can achieve, even if it is difficult.

In this regard and context, there is no absolute "must". There is no "must" to awaken metaphysically, to realise, or to attain initiation. The words of spiritual outsiders, dilettantes, and those who cannot see beyond their own noses are still "must" at this stage. "Must" becomes valid, and indeed inexorably valid, when I have decided absolutely and definitively decided to embark on the path to realising "absolution"; for here actions are required to stay on the path and move forward, to which "must" can truly be applied, and indeed cannot be abstracted from. At this point, "moralitas conventionalis" — partly suddenly, partly gradually — loses its validity, but — obviously — not in the sense of "amoralitas", "immoralitas" or "antimoralitas". At this point, "moralitas sacro-pragmatica normativa suprerealificationis" comes into effect, according to which, first and foremost, one must consider what promotes implementation and what hinders or complicates it. The former is appropriate, while the latter is not, but should be avoided; options that appear indifferent require further, more thorough examination. There may be coincidences with "moralitas conventionalis", but such coincidences are by no means necessary and have no significance, because moralitas Conventional morality has now been superseded, with good reason and entirely justified.

conventionalis can only be expected — but must be expected — from those who exist at a conventional level of life, or from those who should exist at this level but have abandoned it outwardly and downwardly, and who should return to the conventional lifestyle so that they can eventually abandon it inwards and upwards.

The prerequisites for prodination in terms of ability are — approximately — the following: the extremely high degree and intensity of the existence of "ratio discursiva" and "cogitatio dialectica" of an extremely high degree and intensity, existing on the one hand from birth and on the other hand developed; the high level of "intellectus intuitivus" and "cogitatio supradialectica"; the deeply intense existence of "sensus transemotionalis"; the supranormal intensity of will and volition.

Furthermore: a high degree of inner balance, exceptionally strong self-control, paradigmatic, high-level, powerful self-control, above-average general alertness, presence of mind, seriousness and humour, fearlessness and intrepidity, all-encompassing, extensive and intense interest, decisive masculinity and exceptionally high-quality, powerful virility, *actitudo aristocratica* in its most expressive form, continuously refined and enhanced, unwavering perseverance.

These must be largely possessed before "prepreparation". Scientific, artistic and philosophical qualitative abilities must be innate, but their continuous further developed. In contrast, special talents and specific "talents" in any particular direction are not necessarily required for those who embark on the path to realisation.

True erudition is very important, but even this is not an "absolute requirement"; however, it is certain that "cogitatio thematica" must precede "cogitatio hyperthematica", but thematic thinking must be continuously nourished with topics, and for this, a broad and thorough education provides a significant foundation.

The most important and valuable skills are those that are developed and acquired by the aspirant in the course of their intellectual journey. However, these must be preceded by the development of skills which, although less valuable, are acquired before embarking on the journey. These also require a prerequisite that already exists, at least the constant presence of basic spiritual abilities possessed from birth. This is often underestimated by those who advocate "paths open to all". In their opinion, no special attention needs to be paid to this, because everyone — or almost everyone — Everyone — there have never been open paths, there are none now, and there never will be. The presence and significance of pre-existing basic abilities are of crucial importance. We intend to deal with implementation, implementation operations, and implementation paths in other, further writings. We cannot even touch on these here and now, but we must that in the present day, when all previous paths have become impassable or have turned into wrong turns (since in the present day we have to reckon not only with paths that were wrong turns from the outset, but also with paths that have turned into wrong turns), — the most dangerous and difficult paths remain — admittedly only to a very small extent, but still as passable paths.

Hindu and Buddhist Tantra-Yoga, as well as the tantra-equivalent paths of other great traditions — though not directly, of course — have remained somewhat passable. Initiation Initiations and Prayōgas lead the way to these paths, which must be preceded by pre-initiation, corrective preparation, and preparation for the preparations

. These opportunities are only available to a very small number of exceptional people (and even these are closed off almost completely within a very short time).

The highest path is Rāja-Yōga, in this case the Hindu, Buddhist and Jain versions of Rāja-Tantra-Yōga or Tantrika-Rāja-Yōga, as well as the various tantra-equivalent and yōga-equivalent paths mentioned above, such as Taoism. (Such a path is, incidentally, the highest level of Hermetic alchemy).

Tantric and tantra-equivalent trends were undoubtedly present in all true traditions at some point in their history. In terms of realisation, these traditions always represented the Summit of Summits, as well as in terms of doctrines closely related to realisation. The Tantric and Tantra-equivalent trends strongly represent both the presence of gnōsis and "prākhsis hēroikē", but even more so their unification in "mageiā theourgikē".

PISTIS, GNŌSIS, PRĀKHSIS HĒROIKĒ AND MAGEIĀ THEOURGIKĒ

Pistis — Latin: fides — has a much broader meaning than the English word "faith". It expresses this, but much more than that. If we wanted to interpret it, we would have to say that it could primarily be called "certitudo transcendentalis": transcendental certainty, adding that this certainty is presupposed, and also that it is intuitively presupposed. According to this view, there is no need to contrast pistis and gnōsis in any way, which in any case can only be considered if we wish to claim absolute priority for pistis over gnōsis, or — if gnōsis were presented as something whose realisation would be unhindered by anything else, as is the case with pistis.

We consider true pistis to be a prerequisite for gnōsis. We cannot say that "faith," cognition, or "knowledge" is a prerequisite, but we can say that intuitive, presupposed transcendental certainty is a prerequisite for knowledge based on transcendental cognition: we can say this, and indeed, we must say this.

Gnosis — essentially, in principle — stands above pistis — this is obvious. But there are realised degrees of pistis that exceed certain degrees of gnosis.

Gnosis is also based on spiritual activity, or rather transactivity, but it cannot be considered a strictly actional path: it is the path of cognition and knowledge. Prākhsis hēroikē is indeed an action-oriented path, and its action-orientedness is directed primarily towards the realisation of "borderline situations"; of course, transactionality must also be realised here — at the higher levels of the path — in the sense of "wei-wu-wei", in the sense of "karmākarma", in the sense of a unity that transcends even the unity of action and non-action.

In Karma-Yoga — which is actually always Karmākarma-Yoga — it is not merely a question of action. Action is commonly nothing more than a "horizontal" modification taking place at the same level of existence. There may be, and indeed there is, an element of cognition in this, but it is not significant. There is also an action-like quality to cognition, but this is not the essential point. René Guénon made his statements on this subject very decisively and very correctly. (In this regard, René Guénon went so far as to consider karma-mārga not the path of the ksatriyas, but the path of the vaiśyas, and he classified bhakti-mārga as the characteristic path of the ksatriyas. There are indeed Hindu teachings in this direction, for René Guénon was never wrong in this regard, but these are exceptional — if not exactly marginal — teachings. Guénon's his aversion to action that led him to draw on these elements of teaching.)

With regard to ordinary action, René Guénon's observations are virtually irrefutable. However, Guénon did not pay attention to the fact that a form of action that is completely different from ordinary action is also possible, namely, the deed. The deed, which is in fact always a non-deed, the element of action and the element of cognition are always present together. It is true that the aspect of action stands out, but the aspect of cognition is also strongly present, even if not so conspicuously.

The deed is primarily realised in heroic action during the knight's journey, the purpose of which — among other things — is to transmute the knight's own combativeness into heroism

. Pistis also plays a role in this journey, and gnōsis is also present. Although the orders of knights had primarily action-oriented goals, at least directly, they were always strongly oriented towards gnōsis.

The highest paths belong to the true circle of "mageiā theourgikē". Those who embarked on these paths (any of these paths) had to possess the highest degree of pistis, had to reach high levels in both gnōsis and prākhsis hēroikē, or possess those — one might say superhuman — abilities that are developed and acquired through advancement on these paths. The rejection is essentially an anti-traditional and anti-spiritual position. The traditional view of existence is by no means "militaristic" or bellicose, but it is similar to the position and behaviour that Frithjof Schuon — quite correctly — attributes to true Buddhism, which is pacifist but does not side with pacifism and is not pacifist at all.

"Pacifism" (commonly but incorrectly referred to as pacifism) fails to recognise the truly pacific principle, which is of fundamental importance, that only "pax post victoriam vigorum lucis", i.e. peace following the victory of the forces of light, can be accepted — precisely from a traditional point of view. "Pacifismus" advocates peace at all costs, and thus — willingly or unwillingly — also the realisation of "pax post victoriam vigorum tenebrarum", peace following the victory of the forces of darkness; and since — in Kali Yuga — the victory of the forces of darkness — if not the ultimate victory — is incomparably more likely than the victory of the forces of light, pacifism serves — indirectly — the peace that follows the victory of the forces of darkness.

Adherents of the traditional view of life — although not inherently "warmongers" — are not frightened by the idea of war. The unconditional acceptance of war, just like the unconditional acceptance of peace or their unconditional rejection, are expressions of an extreme expressions of "samsara" attitudes. The victory of darkness and the peace that follows can never be accepted, either in the so-called external world or in the so-called internal world. All those who have set themselves spiritual goals must fight against this, and indeed it is essential that they do so for themselves. Accepting the victory of communism and the peace that followed without question is exactly the same as someone peacefully I would accept that he is literally going mad, even if — by whatever drastic means — he could still do something about it.

Through "mageiā theourgikē" — as we have noted — in a sense, everyone was a "Gnostic" in some sense, and everyone had to possess the quality of chivalrous-heroic action.

René Guénon sharply distinguishes between "mageiā/magia" and "theurgiā", placing the former much lower than the latter. Without rejecting René Guénon's position, we believe it is more appropriate to distinguish between "mageiā goētikē" — also known as "daimonomageia" (dæmonomagia) and "mageiā theourgikē" or "theourgomageia" (theourgomagia), adding that the "agathodaimonomageia" cannot be rejected if the aspirant does not drop anchor here permanently, but rather sees it as a transitional phase on his own path, which he will later leave behind in the sense of
By the way, it should be noted that "magia nigra" and "magia alba"

Incidentally, it should be noted that "magia nigra" and "magia alba" — "black magic" and "white magic" — is erroneous and incorrect, since "magia nigra" is closely related to the "nigredo" stages of "Alchemia Hermetica", while "magia alba" is related to the "albedo" stages, and "magia rubra" or "magia rubea" — "red magic" — is closely related to the stages of "rubedo". What is commonly referred to as "black magic" should be called "kakodaimonomageia" ("cacodæmonomagia"), and what is called "white magic" should be called "agathodaimonomageia" ("agathodæmonomagia") hereafter — correctly and accurately.

At present, almost only the possibilities of kakodaimonomageia are open, and almost only this is possible. This is a fact. However, this fact does not completely rule out the possibility that, quite exceptionally, other possibilities may open up for those few who are capable of legitimately opening even the most closed gates of the most closed paths.

The tantric and tantra-equivalent paths — although they were strongly "gnostic" and perhaps even more strongly emphasised "prākhsis hēroikē" — were most closely related to "mageiā theourgikē" — and still are. One of the Rāja-Tantra-Yōga traditions is Laya-Kriyā-Yōga. "Laya" refers to magical dissolution, while "kriyā" refers to magical creative action. This Yōga tradition is the most radical of the Śaivya-Tantra-Yōga paths and, within that, the Vāmācāra traditions, which represent the "left-hand path": the pinnacle of the paths associated with the Hindu tradition.

These paths are: pistis, gnōsis, prakhsis (hēroikē) and mageiā theourgikē — in our opinion. — are closely related. Even today, they are not completely inaccessible: while the the corresponding Yōga levels, it is possible to reach the corresponding Mārga levels — obviously only for very few people and only in very exceptional cases.

WOMAN AND MAN

This book only deals with this issue in a very tangential way. The traditional position on this issue was summarised most completely and perfectly by Julius Evola in his seminal work *Metafisica del Sesso*, but he also deals with the issue in his other works, such as *Lo Yoga della Potenza* and *Cavalcare la Tigre*, as well as elsewhere. In addition to all this, there are still plenty of aspects of this theme that need to be further examined and elaborated upon, which means that it is not unnecessary to deal with them in more detail, even after Julius Evola, namely the noetic, ontic and metaphysical reality of "sexus".

even after Julius Evola — with the noetic, ontic and metaphysical reality of "sexus". Here and now We will limit ourselves to a few remarks that are essential for clarifying the traditional view of existence.

It is obvious that the "Auton" and the "Atmā" have no gender. They are infinitely above sexual duality, and it is also above the states of "Androgynos" and "Hyperandrogynos".

The Spirit — as Spirit "in se" — also has no gender, but the Spirit — "in alio" — corresponds to the male gender in living states of being, and prior to living states of being, it is the Human Spirit that we call male.

The unity of Nature and Spirit is Wholeness. Wholeness: woman and man — together, but in a unity that transcends the sum of both.

The Androgyne is half completely male, half completely female, so it is not half male in one half and half female in the other. The Androgyne is the representative of Wholeness, the Vir, the Male — the Spirit, the Woman — Nature. The Man is, in principle, above the Woman, just as the Spirit is above Nature. However, they create and represent Wholeness together, in a unity above unity . On the one hand, Man — as the representative of Spirit — occupies a higher position than a higher position than the Androgyne, but on the other hand — since Totality is not expressed in and through him, except indirectly at most — his position is lower than that of the that of the Androgyne. The Hyperandrogynous is the Androgyne in itself, "inward" and "upward".

The "actus sexualis" — in its inner theoretical essence — is the Androgynos-restoring re- is aimed at realisation rather than procreation. This — at least in terms of "external" experience — ultimately does not happen: either children are born from the partial and relative "unio sexualis" — girls and boys, not Androgynos offspring — or, for the nothing comes from the "external" and general experience, nothing follows from the "actus", although occult experience can still observe subtle realities in such cases.

The "Vāmācārā" versions of the Śaivya-Tantra schools also include in the sphere of realisation that which — commonly — would rather work against realisation, thus also including sexuality. In a sense — essentially — sexuality is present in all realisation, since realisation is *reductio* and *restauratio*, in which the unity of Wholeness is restored. Radical Tantrism, however, directly and unambiguously involves sexuality in an *inconcreto* manner sexuality directly and unambiguously, "inconcreto", into the sphere of Mārga and Yōga.

The yōginī is not a female yōgi: the yōginī only has meaning and — as the yogi's partner in realisation. On the path, the yōginī also follows the path of realisation, towards the absolute goal, but in a different way than the yogi. The yōginī represents Śakti, the spiritual force and power in natural existence, while the yogi represents Śaktá, the ruler, the Sovereign, who possesses power and strength, and who is — in essence — identical with Śiva. The yogi — in an external sense — is capable of progressing alone, because he can draw out from within himself the Śakti, and she can even experience this as World Śakti. The yōginī is not completely, or rather, only very slightly autonomous in her realisation. The yōginī can only achieve the preliminary stages of the ultimate goal together with the yōgi, and only in unity with the yōgi. The yōgi also needs the yōginī, but this can also be the invisible Śakti — as the invisible yōginī. The yōgi does not need the yōginī in the same sense as the yōginī needs the yōgi. The Man does not stand above the Woman in a common way, but from the position he is called to represent. There is a difference between the female man and the woman, but the difference is much smaller than that between the male human — Mās — and the true Man — Vir. Mās — the male human — stands lower than Man, Homo, but Vir — in essence — occupies a higher rung on the ladder than Homo.

The basic form of the various specific relationships between Man and Woman related to fulfilment is marriage. The "prototype" of marriage is "monogamy" — as "monogynaikiā", meaning monogamy, and "monandriā", meaning monogamy. This is true, and there is no disputing it.

The nature of "prototypos" is a solid foundation, but it is not an absolute and exclusive law. For men, complete celibacy — agamiā — is just as legitimate a way of life as monogamy, polygamy or polyandry. The number of wives — female partners — can be zero, it can be one, it can be two, and it can be any number. But it is more appropriate if the number of wives is zero, or one, or — in any case, an even number of women; it is even more appropriate and harmonious if the number of wives, female companions, is zero, or one, or merus primarius minus unus, that is, the total number is either one or numerus primarius. (Incidentally, it is interesting, but true: the number of disciples — in a harmonious case — is similar to that of wives and female companions, i.e. either zero, one, or the tribal number minus one.)

Polygynaikiā is an anti-traditional and anti-spiritual formation. There were societies where it was permitted in the form of group marriage. (Each of the brothers' wives — In fact, each of them was the wife of all of them; and each of the wives was the husband of all of the male brothers, not just her husband in the strict sense. This form of marriage was also and was even a common form of marriage. Prostitutio hierogamica was also, in a sense, a form of quasi-legitimate polyandry, because polyandry itself, as we have just mentioned, is completely unacceptable. mentioned above, is completely unacceptable. The fact that individual traditional states, societies and religions adhered to a particular form of marriage may have had many external, internal psychological, occult and other reasons and contexts; with the exception of the very rare "clear-cut" polyandry, all of these are ultimately acceptable.

In principle, there would be no obstacle to introducing the appropriate form of polygamy in any country on Earth. In many respects, this could be realised or not, depending on the intentions of the dominant religions and the degree of coercion exerted by customs.

This should be taken into account in any case, even if the introduction could be enforced by means of power despite all opposition.

Despite our complete recognition and respect for Johann Jakob Bachofen, we must say that "pure" matriarchy probably never existed anywhere. There were, of course, matriarchies to a certain extent, but these were essentially no more ancient than patriarchies. It is likely that among peoples dominated by lemuric culture, there may have been more approximate matriarchies than elsewhere. This explains to some extent the peculiar antiquity of matriarchies that were not pure but did exist at one time. There were also peculiar, mixed formations, such as the prominence of the maternal family tree and the inheritance of the associated dignities, alongside polygamy.

The Androgynos (Androgynus) and the Hermaphroditos or Hermaphroditēs or Hermaphrodite (Hermaphroditus, Hermaphrodita) cannot be contrasted with each other. They are, in fact, the same. Those who are half-man and half-woman are gynandromorphs, neither androgynous nor hermaphroditic; anyone who would argue otherwise is seriously mistaken.

In one of his outstanding works, *Scientia Sacra II*, Béla Hamvas devotes a very valuable chapter to Androgynos. However, we must note that this excellent study contains one or two approaches that cannot be fully accepted, particularly from the perspective of traditional spirituality.

Béla Hamvas sees the path to the realisation of the Androgyne in the fact that the man, within himself, inwardly, and women, similarly, to men. However, this — thus — cannot be accepted. This will not work; and even if it did, it would be nothing more than gynandromorphē, or, as Hamvas incorrectly calls it, Hermaphrodite: half-man, half-woman, and therefore an incomplete entity. (Incidentally, in humans, "perfect" gynandromorphism does not occur externally, at most it is approximate and even then rare; balanced forms of internal gynandromorphism are also rare, but internal gynandromorphism that leans in one direction or the other, with certain external signs clearly indicating this, cannot be considered a rarity.

The path to the realisation of Androgyny — as we have already mentioned — is much more likely to be achieved if the man becomes more and more masculine, so that the woman within him — to the utmost extent of possibility — through "exseparatio" — and the woman similarly eliminates the man within her. Unity is restored through repeated sexual can be approached by means of "blowing up and blowing together". A man cannot — by means of approximation — become partly a woman without losing part of his manhood, and this is also true — *mutatis mutandis* — for women. , *mutatis mutandis*.

The reality of *virilitas solaris* and *feminitas lunaris*, as well as *androgynitas* and *hyperandrogynitas*, can be most correctly interpreted and understood from a solipsistic approach, starting from the self , while all other approaches — including those that are otherwise valid — are only secondary, at best secondary.

The traditional spiritual view of homosexuality — which is rather negative with regard to male homosexuality, but even with regard to male "bisexuality" — is tolerant of traditional-spiritual attitudes towards female — exclusive —

is tolerant, and towards female bisexuality it is accepting. Controlled heterosexuality — even in the absence of a higher orientation — cannot be considered a "sin" in itself. The uncontrolled expression of any kind of sexuality — in the case of a person with a higher orientation — can be a serious mistake and a source of further serious mistakes, with particular attention to the inherent sexuality — and It is indeed hidden, but extremely intense — Heteron presence.

From the point of view of realisation, the physical, mental and spiritual graspability of sexuality still exists to a greater or lesser extent, mainly in theory, but it is continuously and rapidly diminishing.

AFTERWORD

Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Metaphysica is by no means a philosophy of existence.

This can be stated with absolute certainty. However, it can also be stated that, based on the basic principles of Traditionalitas Spiritualis et Metaphysica, it is possible to develop a comprehensive comprehensive and coherent view of existence. This is essentially always the case. In a more traditional age, it would have been and would be meaningless in many respects to develop a traditional view of existence separately from traditionality, but even in such an age it would not have been completely meaningless. Now, when the anti-traditional, anti-spiritual and "Scotasmocratic" forces — on the planes of manifestation — have an unconditional advantage over traditional-spiritual and "photismocratic" forces: the continuation of this has become particularly justified. Counterarguments can be put forward against this, even traditionally inspired counterarguments. Even so, we cannot change our position that it is more appropriate to take adequate action in relation to the re-establishment and further development of the traditional view of existence than to neglect to do so, even if this neglect had — justifiably — positive aspects.

Our goal was—and will continue to be, especially in our writings—to develop a "solipsismus hyperphilosophicus" — a partly philosophical formulation — into closest possible connection with the doctrinal propositions arising from the spirit of tradition : we believe that in this regard we have perhaps succeeded in drawing attention to this direction, somewhat more decisively than is usually the case with books on such topics and consequently — is customary.

We also wanted to draw attention to the fact that the integral view of existence derived from the principles of traditionalism is inseparable, in political and social terms, from the strictly radical representation of the traditional ultra-right-wing, ultra-conservative, imperial-monarchist position in the true sense of the word. This is more or less a requirement even for those who are explicitly open to apoliticality from metapoliticality and have turned away from the political sphere, because the position is such an internal intellectual act that it must be carried out — in every direction — even if the orientation in the strict sense is different from that to which the position specifically refers.

The traditionally inspired view of existence is much more flexible than any other view of existence, but this does not mean that it sacrifices any of its decisiveness in connection with this flexibility. The view of existence that follows from the spirit of traditionalism is indeed an "intransigent" approach. Our goal was to demonstrate both the flexibility and the "intransigence" of this approach in an almost demonstrative manner. Perhaps we have succeeded in achieving our goal in this respect as well.

The characteristics of this book are: brevity, sketchiness, general comprehensibility, and The deliberate and very definite avoidance of "literary style" — at the same time, the abundance of terminology, the frequent and dense use of mainly Latin and Greek neologisms, often accompanied by a tendency towards scientific writing style.

The author of these lines intends to elaborate on the topics raised in the book in more detail in other books.