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In Atlantis ( June 1929 ), Mr. Paul Le Cour noted the note to our article last May, ( 1 ) in which we affirmed the distinction of Hyperboraeus and Atlantis, against those who want to confuse them and who speak of ’ « Hyperborean Atlantis ». To tell the truth, although this expression indeed seems to belong to Mr. The Court, we were not only thinking of him by writing this note, because he is not alone in committing the confusion in question; it is also found in Mr. Herman Wirth, author of an important work on the origins of humanity (Der Aufgang der Menschheit) published recently in Germany, and which constantly uses the term « North Atlantic » to designate the region which was the starting point of the primordial tradition. On the other hand, Mr. The Court is indeed the only one, to our knowledge at least, who lent us to ourselves the assertion of the existence of a « Hyperborean Atlantis » ; if we had not named it about it, it is that people's issues matter very little to us, and that the only thing that mattered to us was to warn our readers against a false interpretation, wherever it might come from. We wonder how Mr. The Court read us; we even wonder more

than ever, because now he makes us say that the North Pole, at the time of the origins, « was not that of today, but a neighboring region, it seems, Iceland and Greenland »; where could he have found this ? We are absolutely certain that we have never written a single word on this, that we have never made the slightest allusion to this question, which is secondary to our point of view, a possible displacement of the pole since the beginning of our Manvantara, ( 2 ) all the more reason, have we never specified its original situation which, moreover, would perhaps be, for many various reasons, quite difficult to define in relation to current lands. The Court also said that, « despite our Hinduism, we agree that the origin of traditions is Western »; we do not agree, quite the contrary, because we say it is polar, and the pole, which we know, is no more western than eastern; we persist in thinking that, as we said in the note, the North and the West are two different cardinal points.

It was only at a time of origin that the seat of the primordial tradition, transferred to other regions, could have become, either western or eastern, western for certain periods and eastern for others, and in any case, surely oriental last and already well before the beginning of the so-called historic « » times because they are the only ones accessible to the investigations of the story ( profane « ». Besides, it is well noticed, it is by no means « despite our Hinduism » ( M. The Court, using this word, probably does not believe it said so correctly ), but on the contrary because of it, that we consider the origin of traditions as Nordic, and even more exactly as polar, since this is expressly affirmed in Vêda, as well as in other sacred books.( 3 ) The earth where the sun went around the horizon without setting had to be located well near the pole, if not at the very pole; it is also said that, later, representatives of tradition transported themselves to a region where the longest day was double the shortest day, but this already relates to a later phase, which, geographically, obviously has nothing to do with Hyperborée. The Court may be right to distinguish a southern Atlantis from a northern Atlanticide, although they should not have been originally separated ; but it is no less true that the northern Atlantis itself was not hyperborean.

What complicates the question a lot, we very much recognize it, is that the same designations were applied, in the future, to very diverse regions, and not only to the successive locations of the essential traditional center, but also to secondary centers which proceeded more or less directly. We pointed out this difficulty in our study on The King of the World, where, precisely on the very page to which Mr. The Court refers, we wrote this: « We must distinguish the Atlantean Tula ( the place of origin of the Toltecs, which was probably located in the northern Atlantis ) of the hyperborean Tula; and it is the latter which, in reality, represents the first and supreme center for the whole of present-day Manvantara ; it was she who was the ’ « sacred island » par excellence, and her situation was literally polar at the origin. All the other « sacred islands », which are designated everywhere by names of identical meaning, were only images of that one ; and this even applies to the spiritual center of the Atlantean tradition, which governs only a secondary historical cycle, subordinate to Manvantara.( 4 ) » And we added in note: « A great difficulty, to determine the point of junction of the Atlantean tradition with the hyperborean tradition, comes from certain name substitutions which may give rise to

multiple confusion; but the question, despite everything, may not be entirely insoluble. »

Speaking of this « junction point », we mainly thought of Druidisme; and here, precisely, about Druidism, we still find in Atlantis ( July – August 1929 ) another note which proves how difficult it is sometimes to be understood. About our June article on « triple enclosure »,( 5 ) M. The Court writes this: « It is to restrict the scope of this emblem to make it only a druid symbol ; it is likely that it is anterior to him and that he radiates beyond the Druid world. » However, we are so far from making it only a druid symbol that, in this article, after having noted, according to Mr. The Court itself, examples found in Italy and Greece, we said: « The fact that this same figure is found elsewhere than among the Celts would indicate that there were, in other traditional forms, initiation hierarchies formed on the same ( model as the druid hierarchy ), which is perfectly normal. » As for the question of anticipation, we should first know when exactly Druidism dates back,and it is likely that it goes back much higher than is usually believed, especially since the Druids were the owners of a tradition in which a notable part was undoubtedly of hyperborean origin.

We will take this opportunity to make another remark which is important: we say « Hyperborée » to conform to the use which has prevailed since the Greeks ; but the use of this word shows that these, at the time « classic » at least, had already lost the meaning of the primitive designation. Indeed, it would actually suffice to say « Borée », word strictly equivalent to the Vara sanscrit ( A ), or rather, when it comes to a land, to its feminine derivative Vârâhî : it is the « land of the boar », which also became the « land of the bear » at one time, during the period of predominance of the Kshatriyas which Parashu-Râma ended.( 6 )

To complete this necessary clarification, we still have a few words to say on three or four questions which Mr. The Court incidentally addresses in his two notes; and, first, there is an allusion to swastika, which he says « we are making the sign of the pole ». Without putting the slightest animosity into it, we will ask here Mr. Le Cour not to assimilate our case to his, because finally we must say things as they are : we consider it as a « researcher » ( and this is by no means to diminish its merit ), which offers explanations according to personal views, sometimes somewhat adventurous, and it is indeed his right, since it is not linked to any tradition currently alive and is not in possession of any data received by direct transmission; we could say, in other words, that he does archeology,while we do initiation science, and there are two points of view there, even when they touch on the same subjects, cannot coincide in any way.

We do not « make » point of the swatiska the sign of the pole: we say that it is that and that it always has been, that such is its true traditional meaning, which is quite different; this is a fact to which neither Mr. The Court nor we can do anything. M. The Court, which can obviously only make more or less hypothetical interpretations, claims that the swatiska « is only a symbol relating to an ideal without elevation » ; ( 7 ) this is his way of seeing things, but it is nothing more, and we are all the less willing to discuss it since it represents after all only a simple sentimental appreciation ; « high » or not, an ideal « is for us something fairly hollow, and, in truth, these are much more positive » positive «, we would be happy to say if we had not abused this word so much. Mr. The Court, on the other hand, does not seem satisfied with the note that we devoted to the article by one of his collaborators who wanted to see any force an opposition between the East and the West, and who demonstrated, vis-à-vis the East, of a completely deplorable exclusivism. ( 8 ) He writes on this astonishing things: « Mr. René Guénon, who is a pure logician, cannot search, both in the East and in the West, that the purely intellectual side of things, as his writings prove; he still shows it by declaring that Agni is self-sufficient ( see Regnabit, April 1926 ) and ignoring the Aor-Agni duality, which we will often return to, because it is the cornerstone of the world's edifice manifested. » Whatever we usually disagree with what we write about us, we still cannot let it be said that we are a pure « logician »,

whereas on the contrary we consider logic and dialectics only as simple instruments of exposure, sometimes useful in this respect, but of an entirely external character, and without any interest in themselves; we only get attached, let's repeat it again, only from an initiation point of view, and everything else, that is to say what is only profane « profane » knowledge, is entirely devoid of value in our eyes. If it is true that we often speak of ’ « pure intellectuality », it is that this expression has a completely different meaning for us than for Mr. The Court, which seems to confuse « intelligence » with « reason », and which also envisages a «

aesthetic intuition », when there is no other true intuition than ’ « intellectual intuition », of a supra-rational order ; there is something else that is otherwise great that someone who obviously does not have the slightest hint of what « metaphysical achievement » may be, and who probably thinks that we are only a kind of theorist, which proves once again that he has read our writings very badly, which nevertheless seem to concern him strangely. As for the history of Aor-Agni, that

we do not ’ « ignore » not at all, it would be good to finish once and for all with these daydreams, for which Mr. The Court is not responsible : if « Agni is self-sufficient », it is for the good reason that this term, in Sanskrit, designates fire in all these aspects, without any exception, and those who claim otherwise simply prove their total ignorance of the Hindu tradition.

We didn't say anything else in our article note Regnabit, which we believe it necessary to reproduce here verbatim: « Knowing that, among the readers of Regnabit, there are some who are aware of the theories of a school whose work, although very interesting and very valuable in many respects, nevertheless calls for certain reservations, we must say here that we cannot accept the use of the terms Aor and Agni to designate the two complementary aspects of the light ( light and heat ). Indeed, the first of these two words is Hebrew, while the second is Sanskrit, and one cannot thus associate terms borrowed from different traditions, whatever real concordances exist between them, and even the land identity that hides in the diversity of their forms ; « syncretism » should not be confused with the real synthesis. In addition, if Aor is exclusively light,Agni is the igneous principle considered entirely ( Latin ignis being exactly the same word ), therefore both as light and as heat ; the restriction of this term to the designation of the second aspect is completely arbitrary and unjustified. » There is hardly any need to say that, in writing this note, we have not thought in the least of Mr. Le Cour ; we were only thinking of the Hieron of Paray-le-Monial, to which the invention of this bizarre verbal association belongs. We believe that we should not take into account a fantasy stemming from the somewhat too fertile imagination of Mr. de Sarachaga, therefore entirely devoid of authority and not having the least traditional value, to which we intend to stick strictly.the restriction of this term to the designation of the second aspect is completely arbitrary and unjustified. » There is hardly any need to say that, in writing this note, we have not thought in the least of Mr. Le Cour ; we were only thinking of the Hieron of Paray-le-Monial, to which the invention of this bizarre verbal association belongs. We believe that we should not take into account a fantasy stemming from the somewhat too fertile imagination of Mr. de Sarachaga, therefore entirely devoid of authority and not having the least traditional value, to which we intend to stick strictly.the restriction of this term to the designation of the second aspect is completely arbitrary and unjustified. » There is hardly any need to say that, in writing this note, we have not thought in the least of Mr. Le Cour ; we were only thinking of the Hieron of Paray-le-Monial, to which the invention of this bizarre verbal association belongs. We believe that we should not take into account a fantasy stemming from the somewhat too fertile imagination of Mr. de Sarachaga, therefore entirely devoid of authority and not having the least traditional value, to which we intend to stick strictly.we were only thinking of the Hieron of Paray-le-Monial, to which the invention of this bizarre verbal association belongs. We believe that we should not take into account a fantasy stemming from the somewhat too fertile imagination of Mr. de Sarachaga, therefore entirely devoid of authority and not having the least traditional value, to which we intend to stick strictly.we were only thinking of the Hieron of Paray-le-Monial, to which the invention of this bizarre verbal association belongs. We believe that we should not take into account a fantasy stemming from the somewhat too fertile imagination of Mr. de Sarachaga, therefore entirely devoid of authority and not having the least traditional value, to which we intend to stick strictly.( 9 )

Finally, Mr. The Court took advantage of the circumstance to reaffirm the anti-metaphysical and anti-initial theory of ’ « western individualism », which, after all, is his business and only hires him; and he adds, with a kind of pride which shows that he is indeed very little free from individual contingencies : « We maintain our point of view because we are the ancestors in the field of knowledge. »

This claim is really a bit extraordinary; Does the Court therefore think he is so old ? Not only are modern Westerners no one's ancestors, but they are not even legitimate descendants, because they have lost the key to their own tradition ; it was not « in the East that there was a deviation », whatever may be said by those who ignore everything about oriental doctrines. The « ancestors », to use the word of Mr. The Court, are the effective holders of the primordial tradition; there can be no others, and, in the present day, these are certainly not in the West.

Source: <http://elkorg-projects.blogspot.fr/2014/01/ii-atlantide-et-hyperboree.html_>

( A ) Oleg note :

In Sansckrit the “ V ” from “ Varâha ” B “ ” in Spanish ( - bringing it closer to the word ) Borée “ - and meaning Boar earth, the word French Verrat is a namesake of Sanglier ! Thus, the ancient land of the Boar became land of the Bear ( Bär in German, Bear an English .... ) following the glaciation. In Iranian Avestas, “ Vara ” means enclosure : Yima requests to build a Vara ( enclosure or arch ) to preserve all seeds because it has been warned that the Airyana Vaêjo ( paradise of Iranians ) will be covered by a thick layer of ice cream. The Airyana Vaêjo is in a place where the Sun only sets once a year, that is to say at the Pole.

Notes:

( 1 ) Article entitled Lightning stones published in The Veil of Isis, n ° of May 1929 and forming the chapter

XXV of the collection Fundamental symbols of Sacred Science.

( 2 ) This question seems to be linked to that of the inclination of the terrestrial axis, inclination which, according to

some traditional data would not have existed from the outset, but would be a consequence of what is designated in Western language as the « fall of humans ».

( 3 ) Those who would like to have specific references in this regard could find them in the

remarkable work by B. G. Tilak, The Arctic Home in the Veda, which unfortunately seems to be

remained completely unknown in Europe, probably because its author was a Hindu not

westernized.

( 4 ) Regarding the Atlantean Tula, we believe it interesting to reproduce here information that we have noted in a geographic chronicle of the Debates Journal ( January 22, 1929 ), on The Indians of the Isthmus of Panama, and whose importance certainly escaped the very author of this article: « In 1925, a large part of the Cuna Indians rose, killed the Panama gendarmes who lived on their territory and founded the Independent Republic of Tule, whose flag is a swastika on an orange background with a red border. This republic still exists today. » This seems to indicate that there is still much more to be believed in the traditions of ancient America.

( 5 ) Article entitled The triple Druid enclosure published in The Veil of Isis, 1929 and forming chapter x of Fundamental symbols of Sacred Science.

( 6 ) This name of Vârâhî applies to the « sacred land », symbolically assimilated to a certain aspect of the Shakti of Vishnu, which is then considered more specifically in its third avatâra ; there is much to be said on this subject, and perhaps we will come back to this some day. This same name could never designate Europe as Saint-Yves d'Alveydre seems to have believed it; on the other hand, we might have seen a little more clearly on these questions, in the West, if Fabre d'Olivet and those who followed him had inextricably mixed the history of Parashu-Râma and that of Râma-Chandra, that is to say the sixth and seventh avatâras, which are however distinct in all respects.

( 7 ) We want to assume that, in writing these words, Mr. The Court had rather in view of the interpretations

modern and non-traditional swastika, such as those that could have been designed for example «

German racists », who indeed claimed to take this emblem, by wearing it out

the baroque and insignificant designation of hakenkreuz or « hook cross ».

( 8 ) The Court accuses us of having said in this connection that its collaborator « surely does not have the gift

» languages, and he finds that « is an unfortunate affirmation »; it simply confuses, alas ! the « gift of languages » with linguistic knowledge; what it is has absolutely nothing to do with learning.

( 9 ) It was the same M. de Sarachaga who wrote zwadisca for swastika; one of the disciples, to whom we noticed it one day, assured us that he must have had his reasons for writing it like this; this is a little too easy justification !