

Noomakhia Lecture 1. Introduction - Alexander Dugin (Serbia 2018) (2)

Thank you, Professor Dugin, for your visit, and... Thank you. Dear friends, it's the final part of our geopolitical school, Alkanian Serbian Geopolitical School, experimental course, and that is based on the previous lecture courses that are already made by Mr. Savin, Mr. Bogdanov, Mr. Karovin. I presume that you have understood well the previous courses.

They are necessary to understand this final metaphysical and philosophical summary of multipolar approach to understand the very essence of modern situation concerning cultures, civilizations, societies, globalizations, and the place of identity in this context. But, knowledge is the new philosophical discipline or approach developed by Romanian and Russian schools of thought. There are two branches in knowledge, Romanian one and Russian one.

Romanian is represented by philosopher Ulyan Blago, and his kind of continuator, modern professor Badescu, and Russian knowledge is completely different, but having the same sources of inspiration is developed in my person and my friends. I have published already 18 books of Noa Machia, 18 volumes like that, more or less 800 pages each one, so that is a kind of already made work. It is not finished yet.

I am working on the 20th books now, but it will have 21, maybe 22 volumes in all. So, that is the project that is based on the special philosophical metaphysical approach. I try to explain in this course, in the 10 lectures, they are very important, because they are kind of summary of everything said and done before.

So, excuse me, I speak in English, but the problem is not only that we lack qualified translator from Russian to Serbian, but there is a kind of new created terms as well in Russian. To Russian understand Noa Machia in Russian is difficult. To Serbian it is almost impossible, because the translation, nobody can make correct translation.

If I would know Serbian well enough, I would prefer to make this lecture in Serbian. But I doubt that there is someone beside myself that could make such philosophical translation. So, excuse me for English and this curse, but I could stop or return to the point if you miss something.

You could ask, if you don't understand the word, the term, important term, ask myself or Bobana, we will try to translate in Serbian to find the correct term, because the philosophical terminology is not sufficiently developed. Neither in Russia nor in Serbia. So, it is a kind of, we are always having in mind German or English or French words in order to transmit the concept.

So, that is a kind, I use English in conceptual way to transmit the concepts, not the terms

of our native languages. So, first, we will have ten lectures during these days up to the Friday, ten lectures. It is very important to be present, because if you miss something, you could never get what is going on in the next part.

So, and this, today, we will have two lectures, introduction. But they are most important among all that. So, we need to concentrate today and to try to put other concerns aside, in order to concentrate on that.

If you get that, you will understand, you will have the keys, keys to open any intellectual doors in this course. If not, that will be the problem. So, I invite you to concentrate.

Thank you for your presence. Today, first lecture, introduction of what is Noology. Noology.

Noology is the new term, Noology. Noology consists of two roots, two words. Noos, Greek, word Noos.

And Logos, that is the science of teaching. So, the Noology is the teaching of Noos. What is the Noos in Greek? That is a very, very serious word.

And if you try to translate it, it is in Russian, it could be Um, in Russian. It is intelligence, intelligence. It is as well mind, other soul, thought, mystery, thought.

Or it could be a kind of consciousness. In German, Bewusstsein, Bewusstsein. It is something that deep, that lays at the depth of the human thought.

But what is human? Human is the being that is different from any other beings in the world when one thinks. It is thinking being. So, every other qualities we share with other beings.

But thought is the same as to be human, to be thinking. Thinking creature, thinking being is human. So, the thought is the human.

To think is human. We have bodies, we have kind of instincts or some pains or suffering or joy. But the other creatures as well have the same.

But nobody except us in the living world have thought. So, the thought or Noos is the essence of the man. The man is thought.

And the rest is man and not only. But the thought is the only, only aspect of man that makes us human. To be human is to be thinking.

So, the Noos as a kind of thought and mind is the deepest root of human being. Of humanness, of mankind. We are human because of thinking, because of Noos.

We are ourselves because there is the Noos. Without Noos, no human. No human, not

us.

We are human because there is the Noos. So, thinking about the Noos, Noology, trying to explore Noology is the same as to explore ourselves. It's not the kind of alienated object.

To think about Noos is the same as to think about us. About our deepest nature. It is not abstract.

So, it is a kind of introspection. We are speaking, we are learning our depth. So, we are learning humanness of human beings.

That is the Noos. But we could present human being from different point of view. And Noology presents human being from one point of view.

From its essential point of view. So, it is the study of the thought as such. That is very, very important.

And Noology as well is philosophical basis of multipolarity. Why multipolarity? Because the idea of Noology is that there is not only one kind of thinking universal and common for all humanity. That there are differences.

So, when we try to study Noos, the intellect, the mind, the thought, carefully. We discover how much the process of thinking depends on culture. If you are thinking in one culture, you think in one way.

If you belong to the other culture, to the other ethnic group, to the other religion, to other age, you think completely differently. But you are still human, still Serbs, Russian, French, or English, or Chinese, or African. But belonging to different cultures and spaces and times, you think differently.

So, if we want to study Noos and the thought as such, we need to take into account these differences. And without studying the differences of way of thinking, we could not arrive to the essence of thinking. For example, if we study, if we presume that everybody thinks as ourselves.

So, we will study our thought. But it is only but, because, for example, Croatians, or Albanians, or Russians, or English, or American, or African, or Chinese, or Muslims, they think differently. Not only about secondary aspects, they think differently about the nature of human.

About life, death, family, gender, history, time and space. About God, matter, world, about everything. So, that is knowledge, it is a kind of phenomenology of the mind.

So, we don't prescribe how the Noos should be, or what the thought should be, must be. We try to explore how it is, how thought works, presents itself in different contexts. And this recognition of the differences, without any prescription, normative prescription of

how the man should normally think, that is the special feature of knowledge.

So, we are starting from the recognition of the differences, and we are trying to understand better and deeper the differences. Not trying to unite or impose something as universal, but trying to discover. That is very important feature.

That is why knowledge is dedicated to study of the cultures, concrete cultures. And my books and the project of knowledge, most of them are dedicated for European culture, from France, French logos, from English logos, from Eastern European logos, for Russian logos, for American logos, for Chinese, Iranian, and so on. We are studying cultures and basing on the cultures.

We are reducing from these cultures their way of thinking. And only in that way we are arriving to have the complete vision of the human thought. Not, we say, human should be as, for example, modern European, white, atheist, materialist, liberal human being should be.

So, that is a concrete result of Anglo-Saxon European civilization. It is geographically and historically limited. And it is not universal.

It is English way of develop their history, English, American, European. And if we go to Eastern Europe, to South, to Russian, to Chinese, to Muslim world, that is, they don't go that way, American or English or European. They go their, everybody goes its own ways.

And there is the conflict, the conflict of civilizations. As well, the key to understand what is going on now with your country, with our country, how we are dealing with the West, how they treat us, why they treat us so and so, why we respond, why we resist, or why we submit. But the essence of knowledge is recognition of the plurality of the minds of the cultures.

And plurality means there is no only one universal normative way of development of mind. There are minds, not a mind. Or there is different manifestations of one mind, maybe, but so differently and so specially that we need to study carefully each case.

Serbian case, Russian case, French case, German case. Not to create hierarchy. It's more developed, it's less developed.

But to understand how everybody thinks in different conditions. So that is knowledge. Knowledge is multi-level analysis.

In knowledge we are using philosophy. So the minimal knowledge of philosophy is necessary to understand what is going on because philosophy is the mirror, mirror of the thought. And studying philosophy, we are saving time to study the other politics, history, because in philosophy everything is in contact with it.

It is simultaneously presented in the philosophy. So if we are reading history of philosophy, we are reading the history of humanity. Why? Because to think is to be human.

So, and philosophers consecrate all their life, all their efforts on thinking. So they are more human than others. They are more clear human than others.

So they are making the same thing as everybody, but in a special way. They are concentrated on this humanness of humans. And others, well, they participate.

So we could say that every man is a philosopher. But philosophers are complete men, accomplished men, perfect men. They are dedicated to the main goal of humans to think.

So that is why philosophy is so important in technology. History of religions. It's very important because religion is the other way to think.

A religion is based on the premises of the thought. So without knowledge of different religions, at least little, small knowledge, but some knowledge, we could not understand knowledge, because religion is as well the mirror of the thought. So there is projection of our thought on the gods, on the relations between the reason of being, the source of being, creation, gods, the time, and many other things are present in the religion that reflect the structure of those.

So in knowledge we need to know as well a little bit religion. What is very important, what is maybe new? In knowledge we need to have some knowledge of geopolitics. Because geopolitics, it is concretization of civilization.

So that is a kind of generalization. And if we discard geopolitical position of thinker, we could not understand what he means. Because we are defined by philosophical tradition, by religious tradition, but we are as well defined our position in the world, our way of thinking.

So our own cultural knowledge is defined by our geopolitical position. If you belong to the civilization of the sea, sea power, or civilization of the Earth, you think differently. Earthly way, in the way of sea power, so that is very important difference.

And position on the geopolitical map of the world is very important to interpret concretely the thought. So geopolitics is absolutely in the way. World history, it's main topic.

We need to know the history of different peoples and cultures. Basic knowledge of sociology. Because sociology, it is the discipline that shows how much the way of our being is defined by society.

So that is very important, because society is very important way of self-reflection. Because if we know how much society and its principles is inside us, so we will discover that our individuality, our originality is almost zero, is almost inexistent quantity. Everything in us is put by the society.

Every our ideas, we think, I am thinking that. It is not I that thinks, that society through me thinks. That sociology is very important.

Anthropology and about all the new anthropological school from Franz Boas and Claude Lévi-Strauss and the other tradition. And I suggest that in development of our course, we absolutely need to have a kind of anthropological course about anthropology. It is very important part.

And modern anthropology shows how ethnical tradition and condition of the living and the nature and the culture and the balance between the nature and culture defines the values of the society and how different the society are. That is very important gain of modern anthropology. Old anthropology of 19th century was based on the evolutionary theory.

So everybody is developing, there are developed society and underdeveloped society. Modern anthropology show there is no such things as development. There are differences.

And in order to study archaic society, we could discover the society more complicated and more complex than our society. But they are different. They are not underdeveloped.

They are not childish stage of the same culture. That is maybe mature, maybe childish, maybe old stage of different culture. That we need to study carefully without projecting our own ideas on them.

That is the gain of modern anthropology. That is one of the main principle of knowledge and knowledge. There is ethno-sociology.

That put together ethnology and sociology. You had a course already about ethno-sociology. It's very important and key course.

The theory of imagination. I would suggest strongly to read the books of Carl Gustav Jung, Gaston Bachelard, but above all Gilbert Durand, French author about sociology of imagination. That is very important.

It will be used of his methods and his teachings will be used in our course as a kind of methodological basis. I will explain in short terms what is sociology of imagination of Gilbert Durand. I have made doctorate on that, sociology of imagination.

And it will be of use. So, phenomenology. I recommend you to study Heidegger and Husserl.

The most important idea of phenomenology. That the thing we are thinking of exists in our minds. All that, all the quality of the things belong to our minds.

So, what the thing is beyond our mind is something we could guess. There is no evidence, no quality. It's almost nothing or for example existence or not existence of the thing outside of our perception changes absolutely nothing in our relations with the thing.

That is the main law of phenomenology. So, things are present inside of our thought, in our thinking process. That is the main law of phenomenology developed by Edmund Husserl and Martin Heidegger and other philosophers of the same mind.

So, structuralism. The structuralism of Ferdinand de Saussure, Lévi-Strauss, Paul Gricot. It's very important as well because structuralism, that is philosophical method that explains that everything exists in the structures.

So, structure is something invisible but that defines the meaning. So, the language is much more important than the discourse or the things are said in that language. The language predefines what we are going to say.

So, what we are saying, it is citations from the language, from the dictionary. So, our speech that we are so proud of, thinking that is something completely original. Let's go to the cinema, for example.

We say, let's be the world, let's be the light. God's announcement from nothing, from the void. But it is mostly, it is a pure citation.

Many other men and women say to each other, let's go to the cinema. So, that is citation and it is defined by the structure of the language. There is nothing, zero originality in that.

So, with all our judgments, the same, all our words and discourses, we are repeating the things that were said many times, millions and millions of times before us by the other and that is no order. There is repetition of the structure. That is the language that speaks by itself.

That is the concept of structuralism and the philosophy of structuralism. Structuralism is a very interesting and very important methodological aspect that we use in our mind. As well, I suggest reading Heidegger, I think, Fourth Political Theory.

I suggest reading traditionalist philosophers of the school of René Guénon and Julius Evola. They are very important. I suggest reading Bachofen about the gender and the

matriarchy.

It is very important because the study of matriarchy is the essential part of knowledge in Malabar. I will explain why. So, Bachofen has written the book that is called Mutterrecht, The Law of Mother, Mutterrecht.

That is a classical book about how pre-Indo-European Mediterranean matriarchy was. So, that is very important and it is a basic classical work. As well, structuralist author Georges Dumézil, we will mention him, and Claude Lévi-Strauss, as I have said, about modern structuralist anthropology and knowledge.

So, there are more or less a kind of fields or methods of schools we are using in knowledge. But there are many studies, pluridisciplinary studies of such kind. So, there is nothing new or nothing concrete of everything I have just said.

And what is originality of normachia as such? And that is the most important point. All that, all the mentioned disciplines and methods in the field of studies are auxiliaries. They help us to understand the tools.

But what is the main method? The main method is the concept that this time it is something new. Partly, and I will explain why. About existence of three locus.

Three locus. What is three locus? So, my idea is that the nous as a thought or mind or intellect manifests itself in three distinguished different forms. In three.

No more, no less. In three forms. That is approximation in any methodological approach.

But that is what the French call *crédulictisme*. That is a kind of reading. If we accept that, everything will be put in the context of this methodological approach.

So, one mind and three forms. Three major forms. With many, many subdivisions, many other forms included in this main global general forms of the process of the thought that I am calling locus.

So, there is one nous and three locus. How locus relate, three locus and each of them relate to the nous, we put out of the questions. That is too metaphysical.

It is not so important for us. So, the most important idea that the nous cannot manifest itself without passing through these three locus. There is no thought beyond, outside of these three locus.

But these three locus we could find in any culture. They had no destiny for one of them. There is no hierarchy between these three locus.

And we find all three locus necessary in any kind of culture. So, that is the result of my work, the result of the studies, of the researches. So, I started from the hypothesis that

we may be, we will find them in any culture.

Maybe, maybe not. And after studying any culture in the world, including most archaic, archaic one, in Oceania, in Africa, in India, or Southern and Northern America, I have arrived to the point where this hypothesis was confirmed. So, in any culture, in any society, archaic or modern, or postmodern, or EU, European, not European, in any time, in any form of society, we could discover these three locus.

In different proportions, in different balance. They could be combined in many ways, in million ways. And that is dynamic, I will explain how they are changing this balance of the locus.

But they are present everywhere. So, no culture, no people, no religion, no region could say, we are, we have this locus and only this, or this too. Everybody has three locus, every culture.

So, that is very important. And that shows that we could not create, construct the hierarchy between the culture or people, because the three locus, they combine with each other in completely special way. And the way of combination is proper to each culture.

So, that is a kind of our history, our identity. The identity of the people, of the culture, of the religion, consists precisely in this combination and the changes of the balance of these three locus. So, because there are so many forms to combine them, so, there are unlimited possibilities of the human society, and no way to create hierarchy, because the archaic society can be with domination of one locus, and modern with other, and vice versa.

So, there is no general rule that could be universal. And that is very important point, because that shows that we are dealing in our science, in our methodology, in our politics, in our culture, with kind of racist colonial approach in any culture. We just projecting our own locus as something universal.

But the careful study of the culture shows that that is illegitimate procedure. There is racism. It's the basic idea to say, my locus or my special culture is universal.

So, that is without studying the other, without asking the other. And after that, after declaring that our culture is universal one, so, we put ourselves as an example for the other. And the other are either the same as ourselves or less developed.

And that is the case of modern European civilization and of us in the way we belong to it. If we accept that, we are entering in this racist attitude toward the history, toward the past, toward ourselves. And we are declaring that is universal, that is the only way of development, and everybody is going that way.

So, there is only one culture, one locus, our. And our locus is universal and the measure of the things. That is completely wrong.

That is based on exaggeration of our own self. That is something I will show that is completely illegitimate. And there is not only open biological racism.

Modern liberalism, communism, any kind of globalization are absolutely racist. Because they are based on the universalism of the historic experience of the past of the humanity. Put as the whole of the humanity, as the goal, for example, who is in the eyes of globalists, Africa, African, black, negro.

He is the man on the way to be white, modern, capitalist, liberal, European, Eurocentric man. So, he is a kind of underdeveloped European. He is not the representative of the culture going its own way.

It is something that is on the way. And modern idea of tolerance, that we need to tolerate him precisely as a hungry camel. As we need to tolerate him as something imperfect, something invalid, something on the way to be as ourselves.

That is completely racist. We don't recognize the other as complete and perfect human being, different than us. We think that they are going right way, our way.

And they are obliged to be, there is no other way. So, we have pity on them. And there is very, very nice film of Werner Herzog, *Where Green Arms Dream*.

He shows that people of Australia, they can not follow western example. They don't want to do that. They are going their own way, different from western.

And that is their decision. Decision of their culture. This clash of Anglo-Saxon racist version of the history.

And this averaging Australian vision of their own identity. They are not incapable. They are not the westerner of the second sort.

They are Australian of the first sort for themselves. And that is, I would say, ethical aspect of knowledge. Knowledge, it is a fight for the human dignity in any, for any society.

Without hierarchy and without this projection. It is the basis of anti-colonial metaphysics. And many, many teachings pretended historically to be anti-colonial.

Marxism, liberalism as well. But they are based on the universal version of the history. For Marxism, we need to develop African society in order to make them socialist.

And they will be equal. But destroying their values, their system, and regarding their as anti-developed and their natural state. The same for liberalism.

So, liberalism, communism are in the same way racist as racism of Hitlerism. That is main basis for political theory that we need to find some other way outside of three political ideologies. And knowledge is the metaphysical basis why it is so needed.

Because doing differently and treating the other people differently, we are projecting our racist approach. And we make, we are making equation between ours and normative and universal. And that is the violation of the truth.

It's pure colonialist struggle for power. And not understanding, not knowledge, not wisdom, not the truth. It's something completely different.

So, that is why knowledge is so important. It's the philosophical and metaphysical basis of multipolar world. And three logos, three logos, the concept of three logos shows the differences.

Shows the differences that could exist in combination and in different culture. Now, what these three logos are? Here we could remind Nietzschean concept of Apollo, the Greek god Apollo, and Dionysus, the Greek god Dionysus. So, Apollo, Dionysus.

Two Greek gods. But Nietzsche, Friedrich Nietzsche, has interpreted them not as the object of cult or worship. They were taken as metaphor, as a kind of symbols, figures.

So, you should not be worshipper of Apollo to be Apollonian. You should not be worshipper of Dionysus and participate in the orgies in order to be Dionysian. To be Dionysian or Apollonian for Nietzsche was completely different, had completely different meaning.

To be Apollonian, for them to be hierarchically, to belong to the logical way to understand the world, and to be Dionysian, to be irrational, intuitive understanding of the world, there is a kind of day way of thinking in Nietzsche. It is Apollonian, daily way of thinking. And there is night way of thinking.

In the night, in the dawn, dusk, that is Dionysian. So, Nietzsche divided the culture in Apollonian one and Dionysian one. So, the cultures for Nietzsche were of two kinds.

That was taken from Nietzsche and developed by many, many other authors. Now it is almost commonplace in the history and the study of culture, study Dionysian and Apollonian. We say Dionysian style, the Apollonian style, following Nietzsche, but going further.

And I accept that, and I think that we could affirm that there is the Logos of Apollo, and there is the Logos of Dionysus. Logos, so the nous, the mind, the thought, expresses itself through Apollonian or Dionysian Logos. That is very important.

That sounds like Nietzsche approach, and it is, because I am inspired by Nietzsche in

that way. I have, trying to discover, trying to discover Dionysian Logos more, I have written the kind of prequel for Neomachia theory that is called In the Search of the Dark Logos. My idea was to regard the history of philosophy, and not from Apollonian point of view that is prevailing, that is dominating, that is almost unique, we know, but from the other, from the second Logos.

So create a kind of, construct the history of philosophy basing of Dionysian reading. So how, for example, we know exactly, perfectly, how Apollonian reading of the history of philosophy is. That is, that coincides with the history of philosophy itself, always.

And when we, so we know how, what Apollo thought, because the history of philosophy is Apollonian thought, so Apollo thought precisely as a philosopher thought during the ages. And my idea was to discover how Dionysus would think the same topics, the same categories, the same opposition and relations, that was as well kind of invitation of Nietzsche, a little bit of Heidegger, and postmodern, many postmodern thinkers tried to do the same, tried to apply this Dionysian approach in order to decipher, to read the history of philosophy. So it is not so unique as well, but I tried by myself.

And working on this, on this search of dark Logos, and I have called it dark Logos because what is clear for me that Apollonian Logos is light one. It's common sense, I would say. So Apollo is light, Dionysus is night or shadow or darkness.

So going into the field of this dark Logos and trying to read with the eyes of dark Logos, Hegel, Heidegger, Kant, Plato, Aristotle, Schelling and the other, and all that is described more or less in my book In the Search of Dark Logos, that is free book, but zero volume of my book. In the kind of field research in the metaphysics, not with the kind of idea that I had before, but working with this, with task to kind of, to imagine the alternative history of philosophy based on Dionysian approach, I have discovered in the practical way very important and key moment, that was basis of all my work. There are some phenomena including in culture, in religion, in philosophy, in history of philosophy, in science, in art, in human psychology, in unconsciousness, that could not be, that could not enter in the field of Dionysian Logos.

So something fits, but there is new field that is outside, that could not fit into the Apollonian Logos, clearly, but that could not fit as well into the Dionysian Logos. That was a kind of practical discovery, empirical discovery, I would say, in the field of metaphysics, because there were some conceptual field, for example, the philosophy of Heraclitus, or Democritus, atomic theory, or the theory of modern science, they are not Apollonian, absolutely, and they are not Dionysian in no way. They are not absolutely Dionysian.

And searching Dark Logos, I arrived to the point, that there is something outside of this Apollonian Logos, there is the third one. So, behind the Logos of Dionysus, Dionysus, was hidden something else. Something that was in the shadow of Dionysus, if Dionysus is the

shadow of Apollo, but there is the other shadow of the shadow, and that I have called, in my studies, the Logos of Cybele.

Cybele, Cybele, it is the name for ancient, very ancient Anatolian goddess, Cybele. The same as Rhea, Rhea, Greek Rhea, Cybele, that was the name of mother goddess of Anatolia, ancient Anatolia. It was before Hattids, Hatt.

Before Hattids, there was a very special pre-Indo-European people, Hatt. And Hattids, in the European language, has taken this goddess and integrated it there, in our religious context, and after that, the Phrygians, they have as well developed the cult of Cybele. And that was very interesting circle of the concept, based on the ritual castration of the man, and the rule of the great mother.

So, the priests of Cybele were castrated, and turned into the elno. So, that was the emasculation of the man. And that was the part of the great, great vision of matriarchy.

When the position of the man is completely different than we know, it is completely different than Dionysian position. Because Dionysus, in his cult, is the center of attraction of the backhounds, of the women, but as well of the men. But that is a kind of, that is the presence of the men in the center of the human existence.

What is Dionysus? He is not transcendental, Dionysus. He is immanent, but he is man. That is immanence of the man.

A man-god. God as a man. Man, not human.

And this presence, it is kind of immanent presence of transcendence. So, that is not the darkness. Dionysus is not darkness.

It is not black locus. It is the presence of the light in the darkness. So, that is the kind of sun of the night.

That is Dionysus. That is immanent, the man, inside, in the middle of the immanent, tectonic, feminine existence. So, that is the male point in female reality.

That is the kind of ray of the sun that goes through the darkness and that comes to the center of the darkness in order to create new dawn. So, that is Dionysus. And it could not be identified with darkness, with chaos, and all the orgies and all the rites and worships and all the topics linked to Dionysus were not so easy to interpret.

That is not reversal of the normal Apollonian order. That was not kind of revolution. Dionysus, it is the same as Apollo, but coming not in the day, but in the night.

That was the male in the night. The light in the darkness, but in the darkness. So, that is the kind of sun that comes down in the evening in order to appear anew in the morning.

But when he passes the moment of midnight, he is invisible, he is hidden. There is no sun in the middle of the night. But the sun is.

If he will be absolutely absent, there will be no morning, no dawn. It is not the day, but it is the sun of the night. Not the sun of the day.

The sun of the day is the same as Apollo or Helios. But the sun, where is the sun? There is no sun. Where is the heaven when there is no heaven? Where is the male when there is no male? No man.

Only darkness, the earth, immanence, and matter. And female person. So, but he is hidden.

But he is. That is Dionysian laws. It's very special.

He creates a new kind of vision, dynamic vision. A kind of balance of the genders and of metaphysics. The balance of the transcendence and immanence of the heaven and the earth.

It is the heaven in the earth. And that is heavenly earth. The earth in the heaven.

So, that is the combination of oppositions. That is dialectics. That is Dionysian laws.

So, but in order to understand correctly what is the locus of Dionysus, we need to introduce third locus. And that is something that changes completely all the other concepts and theories that existed before. And that are principles or tools of modern culture.

The history of cultures and culturology. So, the third locus, I have discovered it. And that is new.

That is absolutely new. That is the kind of essential feature of neology. And there is the third locus.

The black one. The locus of Cybele. The locus of Cybele is... And why it was discovered so late? Why everybody before didn't speak about the same, about the locus that was so logical? But when I started to try to understand, to solve this problem, the physical problem, I have discovered very interesting thing.

That for the locus of, dominating locus of Apollo, this locus cannot exist. Because seeing the situation from the purely Apollonian point of view, that could not be the other locus beyond the Apollonian one. Because the Apollonian concept is exclusivist, male purely, and based on a kind of equivalence.

The man, the man as male, is a man. A man is human. So, there is man, and to be man and to be human is the same.

So, and everything that doesn't fit into this concept has no right to pretend to be called locus. So, locus is Apollo, man and human. And everything that is not male, female for example, that is not logical, doesn't belong to locus, doesn't belong to human, that is a kind of beast or something or object, not the subject.

Subject could be only Apollonian. So, and the Nietzschean idea to enlarge the concept of locus and to give the status of locus to Dionysus was already revolution. Because that was, that has shown that it could be different, different approach to the locus.

So, that was crucial, absolutely. And with Dionysus, we have discovered that there could be Apollonian approach and that could be other approach. But together, Apollonian approach and Dionysian approach, they could not let the third locus to be, because both of them, they are male.

Open as Apollonian or kind of a bit hidden as Dionysian. Exclusive as Apollonian or inclusive as Dionysian. But they are male locuses.

And the locus of Siberia is not male. And from the male prevailing point of view, it could not be locus. So, it passed without being remarked.

So, it is a kind of something, a kind of noise. It is not word. That is not speech.

For the males, metaphysical males, ears, what the woman says is noise. It's not speech. Something else, the sound of the nature, for example.

Beautiful, less beautiful, that depends. So, but that is idea that in Apollonian and Platonic, for example, Platonism is purely Apollonian philosophy. There are ideas, they are above.

There is images, icons, they are below. So, there is practicality, there is that father, that is eternal example. Paradise, there is the son, that is a kind of phenomenological imitation of the father.

And nothing, horror, matter, that has no quality. And the most important definition of Apollonian approach to the locus, that beyond the locus, nothing. Beyond father, or son, or matter that has no quality.

So, nothing, not being, darkness. Without quality, not locus. But what is important, not locus.

There is the locus of the father, that is Apollonian. There is the locus of the son, immanent, that is the locus of Dionysus. And there is no locus.

Because we are completely machist. We are patriarchal tradition. So, we don't let the other part of the reality to have locus.

So, we deny that. And that is why it was so hidden. And only starting to apply, or to create, to describe, a kind of approach to Dionysian history of philosophy, we discovered there is something below, that lower, lower border of Dionysian, because Dionysian approach is not the castration, it is not the kind of dissolution of the great mother.

It is the reach, the depth of the hell, in order to resurrect Dionysian idea. To descend in order to ascend. To go down in order to go back to the heaven.

So, it is the sacrifice, it is the death, but in order to be resurrected. It is completely different. It is going from the top to the bottom in order to return to the top.

So, Dionysus, it is the extreme version of Mazalian locus. That is different completely. It creates different kind of structure.

So, that is the other inclination of nous. Maybe the nous is the same, but the form is completely different. But starting to work with Dionysian locus seriously, I have discovered that there is something else.

And that was a kind of discovery, metaphysical discovery. That, first of all, that was a kind of illumination, revelation, in a philosophical sense. But after thinking about that, I have arrived to the point that we could instrumentalize that.

So, we could go beyond the Apollonian and Dionysian border and recognize this attitude as the locus. As the third form of the nous, or the third locus. The locus of Sybille.

The locus of Sybille. And after that, everything comes into the harmony. So, after that we have a complete explanation of all the possible versions of cultures, of philosophy, of religions, and relations between them.

So, we could imagine how the nous is divided in three rays. In the three rays and three locus. And these three locus, each one of them, creates a world for the worlds by itself.

So, we could live in many Apollonian worlds, in many Dionysian worlds, and we could live in many Sybillian worlds. There is not only one world. There are multitudes, multiplicity, plurality of Apollonian worlds, Dionysian worlds, and Sybillian worlds.

And they are embedded in each other. They are merged in each other. And they represent so rich content of the cultures, of the thought, of the art, of the history, that we discover immediately the spiritual treasure of the human mind.

But it is not the chaos that is a kind of inner relations between them. Because we could describe a pure form. Pure forms of these three locus.

For example, what is the universe of Apollo? It is idea that everything is created from the top to the bottom. Top, bottom, line. Everything is a kind of descending process.

Platonic philosophy is so actual, and was always absolutely actual, because it is the most perfect form to express this Apollonian locus. Platonism is the same as Apollonian locus. So, in any kind of locus of Apollo, in any culture, having the context with Greek Platonism, or having no kind of context with Platonism, will create the same Apollonian version.

I have discovered, for example, that in the Saharian, Nilo-Saharan people of Africa, with no links with Greece, in the very archaic tradition. So, locus of Apollo. But they did exactly the same idea.

There is the Father God that has created everything, and the people are the sons of the Father God, and we are descending from the heaven, and we are returning to death. There is no Earth dimension of that. The Earth is the lowest, lowest line of all these going down, in order to get back.

So, there is, with a pure patriarchal attitude, everything is based on the honor, on the fight, the fight against the death, the darkness, that every man is a light man, that is a kind of hierarchy inside of society, based through this line. So, that is Platonic, European, Feodal, traditional Serbian, Russian vision of the society. By the Shilouk, by the Nuer, by the Dinka, tribes of Nilo-Saharan people, or, for example, the other African people of Western Africa, and Yoruba people, we have the same Platonist vision, purely Platonist, sometimes with the same kind, there are the kind of examples existing in the stars, and all they were dealing with are the reflections, or the phenomenological mirrors of what is going on among the stars.

So, there is Platonism, that is not only in the texts or dialogues of Platonism. There is Apollonian Logos. They had no contact with Platon.

It's impossible. They have, for example, Pharaonic tradition of Egypt, that was as well the sun, the sun from above, from the top, and that got us down, and created the kind of this pyramidal version of the world. So, there is everything, the basis is square, and the top is unity.

So, there is purely Apollonian building, pyramids. That is why the fire was presented in Plato as pyramids. So, fire, it's fire in Greek.

So, it is a kind of fire that got us to the top. That is, and the fire, so fire is sacred, and light is sacred, and we are sons of the light, and from this point, the patriarchy, the absolute domination of male principle, and submission of the female principle, and all Apollonian things. So, the Logos of Apollo is not people who read Plato, and people who have applied the texts of Plato to their society.

Partly, that was the case, but we could not explain any Apollonian society with reading of Plato. Plato was the path. I will explain in the future lectures how, what was concretely

the Plato philosophy, but what is important now, that Apollonian Logos is Logos.

It is not Platonic. Plato is reflection or mirror of this Logos. It is excellent form to express it.

It is perfect art or revelation of this Logos in the most complete form. So, it is the best introduction of the Apollonian Logos, but that is not creation of Plato. It is creation of nous.

It is the way how the Apollonian Logos in nous works, and how it reveals, manifests itself. That is very important. There is no artificial creation of some human mind.

Human mind can be, following the Apollo's line, can be Platonic. And Platonic is something... We are burned with Platonism. So, we could be inner-burned Platonists.

If we are... This Logos dominates in us, in our culture, in our religion, in our system of values. So, there is something that we could... And that defines our world. We see the heights, and we regard the heaven more than earth.

So, we are light. We are not... We have no weight. We worship the winged creatures and angels, for example, or birds, or... Our gods are transparent.

They live in the air, or in the heaven, or in the clouds. So, that is completely, for us, traditional. Christian in the European tradition is Apollonic.

And Plato was a part of this culture. All the Greek culture, almost all, was before Plato and after Plato, and not only Greek, and Roman, and Iranian, and Indian, and Slavic tradition. All these traditions were Apollonic.

And for us, it's so clear, that we think that the world is such. There is no other world. But we are living in the Apollonian world.

Our tradition is based on Apollonian vision. And the discovery of the logos of the dynasties is already spiritual metaphysical revolution. It could be different.

We could live in different worlds, with different symmetry, with different organization, not based on the worship of the transcendence. We could see this sacredness in the immanence. So, Dionysian world is organized differently, with different meaning of the same words, of the same figure, of the same gods.

This Dionysian aspect in Christian tradition, we will speak about that more, is the figure of Christ. That is the God and the man. He is transcendental, transcendent, and he is immanent.

He is eternal, as in Apollonian world, everything is eternal, in essence. And he is historic. So, he came into the time.

So, if we regard in this way, so, we don't oppose Apollonian Christianity, or to, for example, to Dionysian paganism. We understand better, that in the same tradition of Christianity, we could, we have both figures. Transcendence of the Trinity, of the God, and the immanence of the Christ.

So, we have Apollonian and Dionysian aspects, in very special situation. In other traditions, we discover the same. There are many other, in different traditions, the figure as Dionysus.

Not with the same name, but with the same function, with some ecstatic liberation, because the name of Dionysus in Roman culture was Liber, liberation, liberation, freedom. So, this liberation from the weight of the matter, from this tonic aspect of human presence, and that is the kind of leap, leap into the freedom of God. It is to leap from the human to divine, from the time into the eternity.

That is the essence of Dionysian cult. It is a kind of a heresy in our Christian tradition. So, we are in time, and with violence, we are coming into touch with the eternal, that is God.

This is a kind of metaphysical, anthropological, archaeological leap. So, that is the essence of Dionysian tradition, and that is not the case, that your heresy in our church is made with wine, with the blood of God, and with the grain, because the bread and wine were two symbols of Yelodin mystery, where Dionysus and Demetra were in the center of that. That is a continuation of the special symbolical tradition based on Dionysus and Apollo.

And when we see the world through the locus of Dionysus, we have one world. If we see the world in the locus of Apollo, we are dealing with different world. And there are different symmetries, different metaphysics.

For example, Dionysus is the cycle. It is a kind of cycle around the point of eternity. And Apollonian locus is eternity itself.

It is eternity. So, we are going from eternity and are returning to eternity. That is what is most important in the Apollonian idea.

From then, in everlasting law, the tradition, that something should not be changed. The eternity of the ethic, of the cult, that is the belief in the eternity, that pretends to be eternal itself. So, that is something internal, that is outside of the process of the time.

And the time is not important. The only time of the return is important. So, the only time that is important in the case of the Apollonian is the return to the eternity, because the time itself is a reflection, as Plato says, it is a reflection, a mirror of eternity.

So, the ethics of the Apollonian locus is to return the reflection to the reflected object. That is the idea, that is the archetype, paradigm, or eternity. And the world we are living

in, we define by Apollo, the locus of Apollo, is precisely based on some consumption, on some idea, for example.

That we are using, for example, the words in our speech as if the essence of them were eternal. So, we don't name any time the different but similar things with new names. We say this book, this book, all that are books, and books exist, books as concepts, exist eternally.

That is eternal books, and in our religion it is a kind of pure projection. There is the Bible as eternal book that was created, written in the eternity. Everything is eternal.

Everything in the book, in the book is eternal. So, every name we mention is eternal in itself. It always existed and existed in the time of Adam.

So, that is a kind of Apollonian world that is very famous for us. It is the Apollonian world. We think the world is Apollonian in our traditional education.

We are educated in the Apollonian culture. We are dealing with logos, with logic. But logic of Aristotle is based precisely on the laws of the eternity.

He says, A is A, or if there is no A, there is a second law, or A, or not A, third law of logic. But in the world around us there is no such things. Everything is double.

Something exists and not exists, dies and is born. So, in the physics there is no logic. Logic is something that describes Apollonian world.

The world that we take for granted, we are dealing with, but that doesn't exist. It is kind of revelation. Logic is a revelation.

The A is A. Only God is God. Everything is half created by God, half nothing. So, everything, there is no point in the universe where the A is A. A is equal to the A. Never, nowhere.

So, only God is God. That was logic. It is something that is for us so natural.

It is something absolutely transcendental. It is the essence of Apollonian logos that is working inside of our brain because it is working inside of our culture forming the semantical axis, the paradigm of our way of thinking. That is the logos of Apollo.

So, what is the logos of Dionysus? That is interesting. When we stay in Aristotle, we are coming to the other branches of his description of the sciences. We discover that, for example, dealing with physics, Aristotle, Aristotle says that everything, thing, he didn't use the word thing as a verb in Latin.

He used the concept on, something that is being, essence. So, this is double. So, it has form and matter.

And that is an ideological concept that unity is double. Something that is unique is always everything that exists is double. You see one thing, but in the reality, there are two things in one thing, matter and form.

And if you separate them, there is nothing. So, you could not... That is Aristotle in physics. That is completely different Dionysian approach to the world.

And it is described not by the logic. But it is described by rhetoric. Because it is one, but not exactly one.

Not as in the logic one. Because there is double. There is two things in one thing.

The form and the matter. And Dionysian way of thinking, Dionysian locus is manifested by the capacity to think dialectically. To conceive one thing as two things at the same time.

One and two. But in the logic or one or two. But in Dionysian world, no.

One and two. There is not here man, here woman. One and one, two.

No, there is androgyne. Androgyne is something that is not a kind of sum of man and woman. It is not addition.

We are taking man, we are adding woman, there is androgyne. No. There is something that precedes in Dionysian locus to existence of male and female.

The androgyne is not the result of combination. That is the source of the gender. And that is not Apollonian.

Apollonian way to think, that's Dionysian way. Androgyne is the figure of Dionysus. There is two in one before there is two.

There is in the middle, in the center, before there are poles. For example, in Apollonian world, there is one pole, there is other pole. And what is between is a secondary.

It's defined by limits, by poles. And Dionysian world is something completely different. There is what is between.

And its projections create poles. So, and we could live in the world, in the culture, in the religion of dialectical, Dionysian approach. The two nature in Christ.

They are God and man. It is something that is irrational for the Dionysian version. Or how it could be the same and not the same, for example, in the Holy Trinity.

So, there are kind of dialectical approach that creates completely new symmetry in religion, in art, in the philosophy. And this Dionysian locus is possible, but it is presented much more than in the philosophy, in poetry, in sacrament, in art, in language. Not in the

mathematical language, but in the human language, in rhetoric.

Not in the logic. Logic is Apollonian, rhetoric is Dionysian. Because the rhetoric is precisely violation of the laws of the logic.

What is rhetoric? When we use some rhetorical formula. We try to violate, for example, to give the path as a whole, it is metonymy, and the other. All the figures of rhetoric are based on this Dionysian locus.

And that is why literature, art, poetry, and the other mythology, rather than philosophy, is the privileged field of the Dionysian locus. And that is not the lesser locus. What is important? Plato has said, let's put all the poets out of our ideal state.

Because it is Apollonian understanding of what is Dionysian. Apollo thinks that Dionysus is a kind of sub-Apollo. Something that would be Apollo.

Something incomplete. It is a little bit Apollonian ethnocentric, Apollonian racist. He thinks that he himself is the whole, and all the rest is parts of himself, or kind of images, sometimes perverted.

So, Plato said, let's put poets and mythologists out of our purely philosophical Apollonian state. Because they belong to the world of Dionysus. And they have no place in the Apollo Republic.

Plato's Republic. It's Apollo's Republic. They should be put out.

And because they are considered to be impure, impure because they are rhetoric. They are dealing with inclination. Not with a straight line, but with curves.

They are dealing with combination of the structured elements in a very, very fantastic way. And that is the kind of creative spirit of the art that is Dionysian. But as well we could find in in art Apollonian line, but the majority of the art and the poetry is purely Dionysian.

And that is the real of the immanence and of rhetoric. And there could be the philosophy of Dionysian style in the modern philosophy. Phenomenology is purely Dionysian.

And Heidegger tried, and I have discovered finally studying many, many years Heidegger, that Heidegger tried to create Dionysian philosophy. He tried and he succeeded in that. He developed this phenomenological aspect and his concept of design is purely Dionysian.

His immanence is a kind of immanence that is before. It should be regarded not as a kind of in Apollonian way, a kind of projection of design of the being. The being, it's Apollonian.

But design, T slash here being or in Serbian tu bice tu bice design in Serbian. But what is interesting that in German da it is not there, tu damo. It's not da is not here, not there.

Neither tu nor tamo. But in between. Da is in between.

Not here, not there. In between. And in old Slavonic language, there was for that is conserved in present Serbia.

Ovde, ovde bice. Ovde neither tu nor tamo. Ovde, between.

So, design is being not there, not here. But in between. In between because there and here, we could strictly define without us.

But between, it is precisely the point where the dynasys is. Dynasys is in between. Ovde.

He is not there, he is not here, as something imminent. He is in between. Always in between, in the middle.

So, design is very dynasian term in itself. Ovde bice. Neither tamo bice nor tu bice.

Ovde. In Russian, we have lost ovde, of this third form of this grammatical form. And that is, maybe it's kind of luck that in Serbian you have conserved of this this name in your language.

In order to understand better Heidegger. In order to understand better this dynasian possibility of philosophy. To think not from the top, not from the bottom, neither from the bottom, but from the middle.

Nor from the two poles and after there is something in the center. No. Thinking from the center, from between.

And trying to express the idea of Heidegger in English. Sometime, the philosopher translate that as such. T slash here being.

Not there, not here. Because they have no of. English have no of.

As your research. So, the idea is that third locus and more fascinating is third locus. I think that already to compare two locus Apollo and Dionysus in full measure will solve relating for create not one history of philosophy but two.

So, you could consult not only Apollonian but as well Dionysus. And if we apply this method we could not we will be not obliged to create to write all these volumes a new but we could make a kind of combination of existent works, of existent philosophical and religious tradition and to reorganize our intellectual space to rebuild, to reshape our understanding of the history of the philosophy and the history of philosophy is the history of our society and history of humanity. So, next point of knowledge is that we

could find the locus of Apollo and the locus of Dionysus in any culture as well.

So, every people, every culture knows all to this these two locus. It's very important. So, there is no people of Apollo and people of Dionysus.

There are locus of Apollo and Dionysus in any human culture. But if we remark their relations they are not so good relations because Apollo thinks in one he creates this world with practicality with this symmetry patriarchal symmetry and, for example, he put out poets for Dionysus who there is a kind of fight between two locus. One nous, two locus and they fight against each other.

We are approaching by neomachia because neomachia it is the fight of the nous or the fight inside of the nous. But the really dramatical aspect all this obtains when we come to the third locus. Because there is the third new world creates not from the top to the bottom not from the center but from the bottom to the top.

New symmetry this is lost locus. Locus lost and denied by both by locus of Apollo and locus of in the lesser scale by the locus of Dionysus. And what could be such a universe such a world created on this symmetry on this locus of Sibeli.

The world of Sibeli the locus of Sibeli it is the mother, great mother that creates everything from herself that is very important. That is absence of any male principle outside of the great mother. It's absolute inclusiveness.

So there is there is nobody but there is no god but the great mother there is nobody but the great mother there is only great mother earth that creates everything from herself and kills everything because she is at the same time the tomb and the cradle cradle and tomb so she is at the same time there is no two point of life there is one and the same point of death and life there is no for example the goddess of death and the goddess of life there is only one goddess only one mother that creates, gives life and kills so she creates the son the male principle from herself without father she uses it as a lover and she emasculates castrates and kills it and make it revival once more so that is Sibelian myth that is explained in many many forms in many cults but there is a kind of philosophy inside that is very interesting and very profound philosophy there is no transcendence at all there is no heaven the heaven are kind of mirror of the earth so all any kind of heaven are only reflection of the same of the matter and we are coming to absolute materialistic immanence because immanence of Dionysus was not materialistic was spiritual immanence that was almost always in the middle half spirit half matter and this half is before is not some but before before the matter and the spirit and the great mother is the idea that great mother creates and kills everything and it is not the eternity or the cycle it is something that is going in its way with the blind and absolute power so there is a kind of progress that is grows from the bottom to the top it is a kind as well in the apollonian way is titanic titanic battle of the titanian powers and forces directed against the heaven and the rule of the male logos of Apollo so Sibyllian logos is

completely the third creation of the new world that is titanic chthonic and feminist in some way not because there is equivalence between man and woman that is much more than Nisan but that is absolute domination of the mother over everything else so we will follow this later in order to conclude this first lecture what is important that three logos I have explained stay in the absolute fight because they create the world the system, the society the cultures, the religions the cults, the relations the values the political system that are based on completely different approaches they are in conflict and that is now magic there is already a kind of contradiction between Apollo and Dionysus but with Sibyll and Apollo, a contradiction reaches its utmost, the highest point because there is a serious titanamagia or gigantomagia between two versions of the vision because there are two logos fighting seriously the logos the titans the autoctonic sons of Sibyll try to stir the heaven and the gods, Apollonian gods try to defend and what is in a philosophical way it is Democrit with his idea it is purely Sibyllian philosophy, it is epicurus and that is the most important point in all that that is our scientific, modern European science of modernity, that is purely Sibyllian and that is a kind of revenge of the logos of Sibylla after the thousands of years of domination of Apollo with Dionysus so there is a kind of Sibyllian eschatology we are living in so if we consider now not our tradition, spiritual tradition, cultural tradition religious tradition, ethical tradition but our scientific vision it is purely atomistic, materialistic progressist and based on this symmetry from the bottom to the top so that Sibylla doesn't belong to the past to the archaic time the logos of Sibylla is something we are doing with so we are and this Sibyllian world vision we could find as well in the ancient time in our civilization in other civilization there is no Sibyllian civilization in any form of civilization we could find all three logos and they are fighting everywhere and we are living inside of this it is not something that is completely purely theoretical we are living that and this is going through us through our politics, through our culture through our science through our identity through our culture so and that is kind of the end of the first lecture and that is most important part and most important of principles what is neomachia as a basis of multi theory of multipolar world we could maybe kind of again is there no pathology within neology no because pathology that is kind of perversion of the norm and neology considers three logos to be three norms so we should if we are apollonian we say everything except our our vision is perversion or pathology so it is not neology cannot say this logos is better than that we try to describe the situation and describe not the norm and the pathology we try that neology is idea to describe three contradiction of norms and the process of their fight so it should not be pathology there is a problem within the noose so the problem in the noose is obvious because we are existing in the problem because our human history human philosophy is problem but it is noose it should not be solved this is very interesting question noose is a problem not only there is a problem in noose intellect is problem so noose is the problem we should not cure that we should not solve that we should not understand what we are and we are the problem mind that is ill or sick mind is sick relative relative maybe but what is important we need technology we need to give the right to exist and to recognize to all three laws to give

the right to exist and not to cure not to blame but understand and if we only understand the richness of culture will appear not only in culture, in politics we could decipher, we could interpret with these tools everything that is going on we could open the journal or magazine and read the news and decipher interpret that what is the west actual modern west what they want from Serbia what they want from Russia why they blame Putin so everything is explained in this balance of logical process and all this is obviously reflection of the pathology and the conflict and the kind of problematism and that is the life and that is the human so even from artificial intelligence in the tenth lecture we will speak about the artificial intelligence as the form to cure cure human from ourselves it could be it could be considered a kind of monism but materialistic monism very special it is not the monism going from the gods as a spiritual essence it is a spinoza spinoza monism demonism and substantialism or Marxism that is a kind of self-developing matter the mother is self-developing matter and that is metaphysics that is purely immanent materialist metaphysics how to generate absolutely self-constructing self-constructing it is not just playing with numbers so for example discover the logos of Dionysus was a kind of fate of all the philosophical existence of Nietzsche for example it was a kind of the end of result of the biggest drama in the philosophical heart he has paid Nietzsche for discovering the logos of Dionysus all the health all the life he has sacrificed for discovering something like that all his all his being and discovering of the logos it is not only numbering no it is something that changed everything completely it is a kind of revelation so the idea that nous is unique it could be considered as a kind of common basis of three logos but it is not a fourth logos it is kind of I think that why we don't need three logos I've started my book and research of the dark logos with the premises with the idea that two logos are enough completely enough we need to explore more second logos and it will be enough it will be completely rearrangement of all the philosophical understanding but that is the kind of continuation of Heidegger, of phenomenology of some special postmodernism and I have discovered that is not enough not because I needed to imagine something new or add something new it was necessary because it was a kind of empirical fact so I have discovered this logos without thinking about it is absolutely not numerical play that is very important if we understand that it will be really metaphysical relation when we continue to deal with that as a kind of intellectual game, for example that position was kind of relativism it is of no use I have remarked that in the philosophy modern philosophy there is a kind of habit to try to imagine or construct new theory after the other without thinking sufficiently about existing one or overpass Heidegger overpass the other so without thinking in depth to understand them I think for example poststructuralism poststructuralism is shell structuralism is very very important we should not try to it is theologus, it is not my personal effort to create something original absolutely not, not at all it is no way I am trying to stay as much as possible close to what is necessary, not creating new entities, new methods if some method, for example geopolitics, I didn't imagine nothing I have applied existing methods to Russian situation that was the kind of new basis of Eurasian geopolitics with no imagining third and all efforts to imagine beyond earth and sea the

mountains the intermediate regions there are some, they are completely there are few games of mind but sea power and land power are enough to explain everything in geopolitics so I didn't imagine nothing in geopolitics, but here dealing with two logos only two logos, that was enough I have come to the conclusion that in the reality they are not enough and after that, everything that was already felt by Karl Kerényi describing Dionysus in his book Dionysus or Vyacheslav Ivanov that Russian writer that has dedicated to Dionysism the book that was called Dionysism and Pre-Dionysism that existed before that was exactly the logos of Sibelius Pre-Dionysism was the logos of Sibelius but that was not named as such by Kerényi or Ivanov but many Jung as well or Germain Durand they had in Tunisia something outside and Bakhovin could as well, find the differences between Matvey Arkad and Dionysus Dionysus but in order to put that in this methodological, knowledgeable concept, that was new step but intuitions and preparations of the field, conceptual field was made by the greatest master of myself much greater than myself that I am trying to stay as much as possible close to what is necessary and trying to follow the path of the great thinkers that already made always of everything so it is not a new artificial addition to the cultural logos or there is something in between, which is intuition so, when we are speaking about God, Devil, Man between, intuition, we are already operating in this logos for example, there is a kind of kind of symmetry between God and Devil in the Dionysian world but there is no symmetry in Apollonia, there is God and Devil is something it doesn't matter so we are all and we now, we are we are living in a very schizophrenic situation where our culture and tradition is Apollonian and Dionysian, but our science and our politics and our technology is Sibelian so, and that is a kind of our pathology our pathology is precisely not to give enough attention, that we are living at the same time in the contradictory worlds and these worlds become more and more contradictory contradictory so, there is for example, our and now, it is a kind of the final attack of Sibelian against with feminism, with artificial intelligence with democracies, globalization liberalism, everything is a kind of new attack of titans of Sibelian society in order to beautify modernity from all the rest of tradition of Apollonian law, now it is the fight against the men, not by the women, but by this great mother, resurrected, almost already resurrected the world government is not feminist government, but that is the government of titanic representatives of great mother, so, and they try to end with all the rest of the Apollonian world vision with Christianity with Indo-European tradition with traditional family, with everything so, that is so, it is not abstract things that we are speaking of we are speaking about what is going on in our moment in our little action in your, in our that is something that is decided in our heart in our mind it is not something given, for example some film that we are watching without, we are participating in this normality, in this fight we have decision, we can decide, we can choose we can act so so it is something that is something very alive in our mind we had the other day, Canadian prime minister who said to some question, someone asked him about mankind and he said, no, we cannot say mankind anymore, we have to say people kind so, this is information yes, yes, yes, yes, absolutely so, and we could understand the great changes in the modernity only

with special tools, and one of the tools but that is the part that unites all the other aspects everything is here history of religions, philosophy geopolitics, geostrategy politology, post-political theory, multiple world phenomenology, anthropology sociology, ethno-sociology and well so, we could make a kind of break and after that we will have the second lecture