

Noomakhia Lecture 3. Logos of Indo-european civilization - Alexander Dugin (Serbia 2018) (2)

We are continuing our lectures dedicated to knowledge, philosophical discipline about consciousness, human mind and the thought. So, today we have two lectures. The third lecture has a name, a logos of Indo-European civilization.

So, now we are going to discuss, to apply the methodological principles explained in previous two lectures to concrete object, to concrete civilization. We have spoken about three logos theory and the concept of existential horizon and the historic. So, now we are going to apply that to Indo-European culture.

So, first of all, when we are speaking about existential space, we can apply this concept to the different, on the different scale, to the small communities, to the middle-sized communities or to the big communities, for example, united by the similar or the same linguistic origins. And now we are going to speak about Indo-European existential space. That's what is Indo-European existential space.

This is the largest, one of the largest forms of unity. That coincides, Indo-European existential space, coincides with the space, the world, where people speaking Indo-European languages live. So, what are Indo-European languages? That is Roman, Latin, Greek, German, Serb, Slav, Persian, Indian, Sanskrit and the other Prakrit languages, Hittite, Anatolian, Fregan, Thracian, Illyrian, the ancestors of Albanian or the Scythians, and Balts, more or less.

But it's interesting that Gypsies as well belong to this linguistic community, because the language of the Gypsy is also Indo-European. Their origins are uncertain, but they speak Indo-European languages, as well as Yiddish, a Jewish language. It is a German language, essentially, that belonged to the European family.

So, that is more or less the space populated by the people speaking these languages that enter in this Indo-European oikumene, in the European existential horizon. So, that is a huge amount of space, of peoples, of histories, very contradictory, very conflictual, but at the same time, that covers peoples speaking Indo-European languages. That is existential space.

So, we have spoken yesterday that we are defining culture, people, by existential horizon, space and the historical. So, we could speak about the history, Indo-European history, or Indo-European historical consequence, sequence of the events. So, we will see later what could be or what versions of this main general Indo-European historical sequence can be.

But now we are going to discuss what is the kind of main features of Indo-European existential horizon. What is Indo-European Dasein? So, first of all, we need to

concentrate on very important concepts. That is the concept of Turan.

Normally, we use the term Turan as a space where Turkish people lived. Also, because the term Turan is purely Iranian, and it is much more ancient than appearance of the first Turkish tribes in Central Asia or in Iranian steppes. So, that term belongs to Avestan, to the ancient Zoroastrian, Mazdenian religion, and was used in the Iranian tradition long before manifestation or creation of the first Turkish tribes.

So, that is Indo-European term Turan. And what is the meaning of Indo-European term? We know very well Ferdowsi, Persian poet of the Middle Ages that has created the kind of poetry about Iranian historical sequence. Called Shahnameh.

This Shahnameh is based on the duality taken from Avestan, from pre-Islamic sources, from the ancient sources about duality and dualism and the fight between Iran and Turan. Iran was a sedentary people of Iranian descent. So, Iranians, as we know them, lived in Persia, in the Media, in the north of the actual Persia, in the Caucasus, in the southern Caucasus, Media, that was called in the country.

But essential feature of Iran was sedentary. And Turan was the space where nomadic people lived. But what is the sense, the meaning of the word Turan? The original meaning of this root, of this Indo-European word was a tribe or the people.

So, it is the same as in the case of Deutschland, Deutschland, Deutschland, Turan, the same, or Tautos in Lithuanian, that is nation or people. So, that was the name for the people, for the people of these steppes. And the meaning of Turan was the space populated by the nomadic tribes.

And these tribes, in the western time, in the ancient time, when this term was used, these peoples were absolutely Indo-European as well. So, we are dealing with very interesting duality, dualism, cultural and civilisation. Iran and Turan signified, means in the original time, two kinds, two versions of Indo-European societies.

Iran was the same as sedentary in the European society and Turan was the name for nomadic in the European society. That is very important because that has to do with the origins of the Indo-European peoples. And when we try and when we start to explore what from Iran and Turan, what kind of civilisation or society was more ancient, we come to the absolute conclusion, that is the main position of 80 historians, that Turan-Indo-European tribes were first.

So, the Iranians that were at the origin, at the source of sedentary Iranian culture, were the ex-nomadic tribes that turned into sedentary tribes. So, they came from the same Turanian space. That is main position.

There are many, many debates and quarrels where exactly was the centre of this Indo-European, pre-Indo-European, proto-Indo-European culture. Where in Turan? But

everybody agrees, almost everybody, that that was Turan. Somewhere in Turan, there is position that was far to the east or to the south of the Ural mountains or in the Caspian area or to the north of the Black Sea.

But somewhere from Danau delta up to the southern Siberia. That was the large area. But somewhere there was so-called motherland or Urheimat, to use the German word, initial, original motherland of the European people.

So, that is Urheimat, in Russian, прародина. Something not motherland, but pre-motherland. So, that is more or less the common position that somewhere there.

That is the main principle of the origins of the European civilization. Second moment. We have location.

Somewhere in Turan, the second principle of the Indo-European origins is that the first Indo-European cultures were nomadic. So, strictly linked to the pastoralism. They were pastoralist, nomadic Turanian tribes.

And I would suggest the reading of Maria Gimbutas, Lithuanian author Maria Gimbutas, that have explained excellently, brilliantly, the kind of logic of this Indo-European expansion. The idea is that according to Maria Gimbutas and according to the many Russian scientists and archaeologists as well, the origin was of these Turanian Indo-European tribes. They were somewhere to the south of Europe and around Chelyabinsk city, where a very ancient city was recently discovered, Arkaim, called Arkaim, because that was the typical Turanian city of the nomadic Indo-European tribes.

So, you know that it is common wisdom, common scientific position, that the first bearers of Vedas, Indian Vedas, came as well from the north, from the same Turanian space. The ancestors of the Iranians came from the same Turanian space. The ancestors of the Hellenic, Roman, Latin, German, Celts, Slavs, Balts and Hittites, one of the first of the more ancient tribes, came to their places from the same Urheim, from the same Turanian space.

And they were, all of them, bearers of the nomadic pastoralist culture. So, we could... According to Maria Genbutas, these Indo-European tribes, there were many waves of them. And any wave brought with it new languages, new forms, new mixture of different dialects of Indo-European languages that was at the origin of the modern Indo-European languages.

But they were bearers of the Kurgan culture. Kurgan culture is very important for us. So, now we could reconstruct the kind of archaeological, historical sequence of the phases of the creation of the Indo-European societies in that way.

There was Urheim, there was a motherland, Indo-European motherland, somewhere, let's say, to the south of the world. I don't insist on this concrete location, but that is more or

less, as the majority or the serious part of the historians agree about it. What is important, but somewhere maybe to the east, maybe to the west, but somewhere there.

The second point, that is as well Kurganian hypothesis of Maria Genbutas, that every Indo-European people in the origin was nomadic and pastoralist. So, they were not farmers, not sedentary. And they created a kind of special city and they were warriors.

They have domesticated the horse for the first time. And that the horse, domestication of the horse, came from precisely this Turanian space, it's normal, they have domesticated horse and they moved through the steppes in order to conquer the other spaces. Going from this Urheim through India up to the Britannic islands.

They colonized Eurasia, starting from that point. That is normal Kurganian hypothesis. And that is the origin of all Indo-European languages.

So, there existed, there was, when ancestors of any Indo-European tribe and people, they spoke this Indo-European language, living in the Turanian space, being nomads and pastoralists and creating, elaborating a kind of culture. Culture that is at the origin of any Indo-European society and Indo-European civilization. So, we could speak about this proto-Indo-European culture and civilization and we could localize it, situate it in the Turan, identify it with the nomadic way of life, with the warrior type of being and ethic of the warrior, of the heroic, with domestication of the horse and very important moment, with the solar circle as the main symbol of this.

There is very interesting author, Leo Frobenius, German author, Leo Frobenius, that explained the stages of the culture in the following way. There is a first stage is fascination. If you are fascinated by something, you are possessed by spirit, by beauty, by God, by inner feeling, by something.

The second stage of the culture is the expression of this possession. So, you liberate yourself from this possession, trying to express in the images, in the forms, in the exterior forms, what possesses you, what fascinates you. So, that is second.

And after that, you apply the result of this expression technically. So, we could see in the ancient Indo-European Turanian stage all these three stages linked with the concept of the circle. So, first of all, that is the sun.

Sun as deity, sun as the day, sun as Apollo, the sign of Apollo. So, you are fascinated by the sun, fascination. So, you are possessed by the sun.

You worship the fire, the light, the sun, the heaven, and it is the center of your fascination. After that, you create the symbol of it. You create the sign of circle, and you worship that as something that possesses you, that is the kind of your inner concentration.

And after that, you apply this technically, third stages. And what is this? That is the wheel and chariot. And chariot created by the wheel.

And that is common wisdom as well, that first charioteers, first creators of chariots with the wheel and with the horses were Indo-European. And with the help of the chariots, they have conquered every space in Eurasia, from the Britannian islands up to India or Persia or Greek and Balkan. So, Europe and all European spaces was conquered by chariots with the horses and with this application of the sun circle to the technical aspect.

So, they were possessed by the sun, they worshipped the sun and they technically used the symbol of the sun in order to create the chariot. And with the chariot and with their inner dynamic, being like the sun, they have expanded the race of the sun through the Eurasian continent, from the Turanian Urkha motherland. That is more or less a prehistoric Indo-European, the historical sequence.

So, that is a kind of destiny, that is to be like the sun, to shine and to expand the fire, the light of the country from the starting point. So, that is very important in order to grasp what is Indo-European design. And that is reflected in all Indo-European languages and Indo-European cultures.

We all, all Indo-European peoples are heirs of this Indo-European design. Because we are speaking, we are thinking, we are defined, we are prefigured, we are predefined by this Indo-European solar design. Of this Turanian, Turanian, not Iranian, not yet Iranian, Iranian culture is the second phase, first stage, first phase is to be Indo-European, is to be Turanian, to be nomadic, warrior, tribe of the steppes.

And that was common origin of all Kurgan culture, type of this society. According to Maria Gebutas, to almost everybody else. Kurganese area, right? Yes, yes, Kurganese area.

And the sign of that was the hill over the tomb. Kurgan is tomb, tomb, tomb. The Kurgan is a kind of hill, artificial hill over tomb.

And that is very important, because it is a kind of verticality, a creation of this vertical society. And as well the second sign is to put the weapon in the tomb. Because in other culture there was no... And the horse, horse, weapon and hill.

Three signs, three traits of this Kurganian, Kurgan type of culture. So, that is Indo-European design. What is interesting? So, we could trace how from the point of Turan, somewhere in Turan, maybe, because the first wheels were discovered precisely to the south of the Ural mountains.

And first traces of domestication of the horse at the same, more or less the same space. So, we could presume, that would be logical to presume that the center of Turan was

somewhere, was situated somewhere, somewhere there. In the Kazakh-Russian steppes.

Actually, Russian, before that was Indo-European. That was the heart of Turan. And from this point, that was a kind of expansion.

Expansion, not only the expansion physical. And the search of the new field to feed the horse and the cows. But, as well, that was a kind of imitation of the sun.

So, the earthly sun was situated somewhere there in Turan. And from this point, there was a kind of expansion of the race. So, we could presume that that was not only inertia or something casual, but that was idea that there is the center somewhere in Turan.

For example, in the Ural mountains, to the south of the Ural mountains, in the steppes. Where there was a kind of sacred motherland of Indo-European tradition, the center, the pole of Indo-European tradition. From this pole, there was expansion in all possible directions.

And the main bearers of this Kurgan culture were nomads, Indo-European tribes. And they have colonized almost all Eurasian continent. From the west to the India.

And through the India to the Indian Ocean. Expanding Buddhism as a kind of product of Indian culture was, as well, continuation of the same cultural influence projected to Chinese culture. So, we have a kind of race everywhere.

But the most interesting conclusion from that, that the pure type of this Indo-European culture, we need to search, we need to seek in the nomad Indo-European tribes. As an Afghanian or Ossetian. Actual Afghanian, Ustuns.

Or some Pakistani tribes, nomadic as Belugi in Iran and Pakistan. Or actual Ossetians, Ossets. The direct descendants from Sarmatian tribes.

They turned into a sedentary very recently. And they were a continuator of this Turanian type of culture. So, and Iranians were secondary and Turanians were first.

And their conflict, Turan against Iran, was very, very secondary aspect of this history of the first stage of the Indo-European history. So, we could identify, that was as well position, that was as well idea of the late Oswald Spengler theorist. There is posthumous writings of Oswald Spengler, recently published, unfinished book, about, that was called Epic of Men.

Epic of Men, that was unfinished. Only parts were written by Oswald Spengler, the author of the decline of the West, of the Europe. Where in this Epic of Men, he developed this concept, that existed, according to Spengler, there existed three pre-civilizations.

Atlantic, with megalithic culture. Cushitic, with Afro-Asian, Afro-Asiatic, covered Northern Africa and Near East, ancient civilization. And the third was precisely named Turanian

civilization by Spengler.

So, that fits well with Maria Dumbuto's concept, and with archaeologist, with his Corgan hypothesis, and with studies in Indo-European past. Because Indo-European past unity of all Indo-European languages points out, more or less, to the same area, where the Indo-European peoples lived before being separated in the actual known Indo-European languages and peoples. So, Spengler, Dumbuto's linguistics, everything, archaeology, points on that area.

So, what is important, how we could evaluate, what we could say about the structure or the topology of this Indo-European, Proto-Indo-European society, Turanian society. Here, there is an author, that helps us very much, that is called Georges Dumézy. Georges, Georges Dumézy.

French author. I highly recommend his works. I don't know whether they are published in Serbian.

In Russia, we have published one book about Latin religion. There are other about Indo-European gods. Georges Dumézy is French historian, that has dedicated all his life to the brilliant exploration of the Indo-European culture.

Indo-European, comparing all kind of mythologies, religions, tales, folk songs and so on, symbolism in the written or oral traditions of Indo-European culture. He has written many books. I could recommend, he has written very important text, that is called Indo-European Ideology.

That is a kind of summary of his extensive book, with many, many thousands and thousands of pages, comparing carefully, with details, different mythologies of Indo-European peoples. And what is the result, the summary of the studies of Indo-European structure of Dumézy? That is three-functional theory. He has arrived at the conclusion, that all types of Indo-European cultures, ancient or modern, were based on the concept of the three-functional society.

Society consisted, any Indo-European society consisted from three castes. First caste was priests. They were kings and priests, sacred kings.

They were considered to belong to the heaven. They were divine. They were considered to be deities.

Not men, but divine beings. Or the sacred kings and sacred priests. Their traits were Brahman and Brahman in the caste system.

The second function, and they had their own ethic, their own metaphysics. The idea that they possessed the special kind of soul consisted from the light. And the rule of the priests and the sacred kings was based on the same idea of the sun.

Because they were the earthly sun. They were fire. They were lights.

And they represented light as the sun of God. These priests of Brahman were considered to be the sun of God, of heaven God. Second caste was warrior or kshatriya in the India system.

Ratayashta in the Iran system and Ratayashta staying on the chariot as well. So the warrior on the chariot. Because the chariot with the wheels was the main symbol of expansion throughout Iranian space of these Indo-European tribes.

And the third caste were the simple pastoralists or masters of the animals, of the cows, of the horses. And all society represented a kind of army. Army going through the space in order to fight, to die, because there was no death in our understanding.

There was a kind of elevation. Every soul was considered to be the heaven sparks coming down to the earth in order to return. So the quicker the better.

If you die young that is good because it is normal. To die young, to die in the fight, to die killing the enemies. Not to survive, but to die was the goal of the warrior.

And to be wise and not to live long was the task and the goal of the priests. To be pure, to purify himself and everybody else. And to be loyal, to be brave and to spread, to have many horses and cows was the task of this third function.

And there was hierarchy, absolutely vertical hierarchy, with the priests on the top, the warriors in the middle, and the pastoralists, simply pastoralists at the bottom. Because the simply pastoralists dealt with the material aspect of the cows, of the horses, of the sheep. So they were considered less pure and less perfect.

But they strived to be the same, to be wise as priests and kings and to be brave as warriors. So the value system was based not on the simply pastoralists and their goals, but in the center was the concept of the priests and warriors. And they defined as well the ethics of the third caste.

But everything was absolutely vertical. And we could see that here, in that situation, pure version of Logos of Apollo in our logical understanding. That is the most brilliant, most expressive, most clear Logos of Apollo, vertical, because all the living was considered a kind of coming down of the light, of the sun, into the sacred kings and priests, expanding, going through the warriors and finishing with the pastoralists.

In order to return, to return to the heaven. And what is interesting, that is the quality of the earth in the steppe, in the Turan. The earth was hard.

It was not designed to put the seeds, to plant something there. That was a kind of space in order to get to and to return back. There was no under-earth dimension in that vision,

in the steppe.

The most demonic, most devilish, most negative creature, symbolical, was mouse living under the surface of the space. That was the only little hole of the mouse was considered to be something as a hell. And that was the symbol of Satan in their tradition.

Or the snake living under surface of the Turanian steppes. But not deeper. So, under surface.

That is tradition with no roots. That is society with no roots. Because the roots are in heaven.

So, that was completely different version. That is not something growing from the earth, but something growing from the sky, expanding its branches on the earth, precisely as in the European tribes and returning to the roots. But return to the roots is to return to the gods, to the fire.

And that is cremation rite. To put the body of the dead man into the fire in order to return through the fire. Through the fire to the sun, to fire and to heaven.

So, everything was quite opposite that we are habituated. That was purely nomadic in the European tradition. That was as well pure type of Apollonian locust.

Pure type. And that is in the European, according to Dumézil, what is in the European? It is Apollonian, we could say. That is exactly the same as locust of Apollon.

And any kind of normal, known by us in the European society, from Celtic, German, Latin, Illyrian, Thracian, Hellenic, Greek, Hittite, Iranian, Indian, Scythian, Sarmatian, Slavs, Baltic, every kind of Indo-European culture was based originally on this locust of Apollon. The name was given by the Greeks, but the same we could identify easily in Veda, in Avesta, in German Odin myths, in Celtic legends and myths. And Georges Dumézil has put together all this, all this type of mythologies in order to compare them.

And he, that was clear when we are reading book after one after the other, that that is absolutely founded. That is almost common sense. There is nothing absolutely new, that is a kind of clear manner to put all that, to explain that in a very transparent way.

That is his result of his writings. That was the school as well, founded by him and continued by Emil Benveniste, one of the best linguistical authority of the 20th century. Emil Benveniste, that has created a kind of dictionary of Indo-European economical terms that shows the correctness of Dumézilian, of the concept theory.

That is now accepted and the second important thing in Dumézil is that what he calls Indo-European ideology. So, Indo-European ideology, it is a structure, structure that is unchangeable, that is everlasting. And that is represented in the language, in the

culture, in the symbols, in the way of thinking of Indo-European people.

That is strictly the same in the time of Urheim and modern Indo-European minds. So, there are the constant principles, they affect us in our understanding of the cosmos, of the political society, of the history. That, this ideology is reading.

Gris de lecture. Interpretation of scale. Through this reading, we decipher, we interpret what is going on.

We consider the society. There is philosophers or intelligentsia, there is military and there is all the rest of the population. That is vertical, hierarchical vision with the president or leader as a kind of ancient sacred king.

Military or administrative groups and population. It is unconscious in us, but any Indo-European society is based around these axes. These three functional axes.

Modern or ancient. Christian or pagan. Eastern, in India, Iran or Western.

Celtic, German, Slav, French, Latin. So, that is very interesting. According to Dumézil, nothing changes as that.

More than that. Through this ideology, we interpret the history. The history of founding of Rome, the history of founding of any country, of any Indo-European state.

There is always some messenger of God or some sacred king coming from outside. Because the foundation of the kingdom was from outside, from Turan. Coming, these nomads, somewhere.

And finding there the city. But the city was a kind of fortress. That was not continuation of the village.

That was something created from outside. With the kind of military men coming somewhere and creating the fortress. In order to... In order to defend this military position.

So, military conquest. With some heroes or sacred heroes, leaders coming from outside. That was the main scenario.

And after that, there was a kind of these three functions. And relations, sometimes conflictual relations between priests and warriors. Their basic interests and the mass of population.

All three functions were described in many, many ways. Through the chronicles, histories, myths, religious tales, folklore, songs and so on. So, that is the main content of Indo-European tradition.

To establish this verticality. That is an interesting idea of the gender relation in this Turanian society. Very important.

So, when we study the relations between the sexes in the nomadic Indo-European society, we see a very interesting idea. Gimbutas, on other occasions, has proposed the terms of kind of equivalence between men and women, but in the matriarchal society. She proposed the concept of gelania.

Gelania. It's not domination of women over men, but a kind of friendship. But under the main concept of the domination of matriarchy.

That gelania, that was friendship and equality between men and women, but seen from the female position. I proposed the opposite term, neologism. Anileginia.

That is the same, the kind of friendship between men and women, but from the male point of view. From Turanian, Indo-European point of view. There are two neologisms.

Gelania, anileginia. Gelania. Anileginia.

Gine, Greek, woman. Andros, men. That's the same.

But Gimbutas puts a woman first. And in the Turanian male patriarchal society, male first. Anileginia.

Andros. But there was not submission of the woman to the man, but the friendship. Based on the concept that this solar warrior and celestial sky concept is the domination.

So, men and women were the friends based on the domination of this solar concept of the man nature. And that was very interesting, because men always were in the war. And the women with children cannot go to the war normally.

And they were left in the camps, in the fortress. But that was not peaceful living, because everywhere were as well the same type of societies. Very, very aggressive, very expensive.

And women were obliged to defend their cities. So, they should be heroic. They should be warriors as well.

Otherwise, they will be conquered by the other. And they didn't want that. So, they were as well the other type of warrior with the same values as the men.

So, that was reflected in many Turanian traditions in the nomadic society. Before the marriage, there was a battle between the girl and the boy. And if the boy could not overcome the girl, the marriage could not be concluded.

He should testify his force, his power, over her power. And there was a kind of

competition in the fight. But in order to fight, the girls should be as well warriors.

And that is reflected in Brunhilde's complex in the psychoanalysis. So, when on the bed of marriage, there was a continuation of the fight between man and woman. And woman can overcome and kill the man before the marriage is made.

That is the kind of trace of this military friendship based on the recognition of the normative values of patriarchy. So, Amazonian type of society was not feminist or not female. Amazonians were absolutely patriarchy.

Because that was a kind of projection of masculine, male type of culture and values over female society. So, that was a kind of purity and braveness and force and power of the type of the society. Exactly as male type of society, but in the case of women.

So, that is not matriarchy, Amazonian. That was completely the last victory of patriarchy, Amazonian society. Because the women accepted all kind of male type of behavior.

So, that is analogy. We could say that is extreme case, Amazonian society. But that is Turanian type of society with powerful and very strong and independent women.

That could represent not only a kind of possession of men. They were absolutely the citizens of these Turanian tribes. That could defend themselves against possible aggression.

That is very important. That is the pure patriarchy. And there was not so much goddesses in this mythology.

Or, when they were present, they were as men, as Athens, Greek Athos. That was virgin, she was wise as a priest and she was brave as warrior. And she was virgin.

That was not the mother type of women. That was the warrior and priest and virgin type of women. That is purely Turanian.

So, Athens, Greek Athens, is the reflection of the male values. So, wisdom, it is the most important male feature of the first caste, first function in the Mycelian version. And the braveness and heroic spirit and fight, all the attributes of Athens were as well wisdom and warrior charisma.

And no motherhood, no purely earthly destiny of a woman. No children. So, that is a very important concept of the Turanian society.

And that is the sources of Apollonik, the logos of Apollo. Here we can as well remember, remind ourselves Plato. Because we are in Plato.

Plato, as I have already said, is a purely Indo-European figure. He is the best known, best possible representative of the logos of Apollo. He was considered to be incarnation of

God Apollo by the followers.

So, in his three dialects of Plato, we see the clear images of this tripartite, tri-functional cosmos, universe of purely Turanian and Indo-European type. In time, there was the cosmology, Platonic cosmology, based on three species, three genus. First, the example, or paradigm, the father.

The second, that was the image, icon, the son or child. And the third, that was very, not clearly defined concept of the matter or horror, of the space. Not the matter in our understanding, nor the substance, but space.

It is horror, the third concept, third principle of timing, of Plato dialect, timing. Chora is the space. So, there is origin, paradigm, father.

There is the son, as the reflection of the father. And there is a kind of space, where it is no more. That was called not so much mother, but the woman that nurtures, that nourishes, that is the figure that gives the place in order to happen this reflection act.

So, there are three levels of the reality in Plato. And the last one, chora, is only, that is country or space and nothing more. That is not mother that gave, that gives birth to something.

It is something that accepts the influence from the top of the hierarchy, from paradigm, accepts and gives back. So, that is purely in the European version of cosmology. And that is very, very clearly defined, so we could regard that as pure type of Apollonian cosmology.

That was accepted as such, in Christianity, in Middle Ages, in Roman culture. So, Platonic timing version of cosmology is normative for any Indo-European tradition. We could compare that with Vedas.

In Vedas, more or less the same, in Iranian version, more or less the same. So, there is a kind of three worlds. The highest, the middle, and the next, very poorly defined.

So, the last third world is a kind of surface of the earth, where begins return. In the Neo-Platonic tradition, that was idea of the provenance and return. So, everything comes from the sky, Heavenly Father, comes down, and that is epistrophe, return, to the same.

So, there is a cycle, vertical cycle. The life is moment of the return, and the death is not the end, it is the stage of return. So, when we are unmanifested in the earth, we exist in the better conditions than in the earth.

It is the lowest point of the descent from our inner paradigmatic position, from our own spirit, Atman, from our immortal soul. So, our soul descends in order to ascend, in order to come back, in order to go to the source, exactly. But the source is on the top, above.

In other dialogue, in Republic of Plato, there are three types of ideal state. Philosophers, that is equivalent of the priests, traditional, warriors, and all the others. And philosophers should rule, because they are dedicated to the highest contemplation of the sources, of the principles.

Because they go from the cave out to see the unity, to see the sun, to see the stars, the heavenly lights. And he returns and has the right to rule, because he is linked to the sky. So, that is the idea in Plato's Republic.

So, the state should be as such. The philosophers, Brahmins, or sacred kings, contemplating the source of heavenly lights and fire, should govern over the other. The warriors should follow them, and the other involved in material matters should obey to the philosophers and to the warriors.

We have three functional concepts in Plato. And, the same Plato, in the Phaedrus dialogue... In the Phaedrus, in the Serbian dialogue, there is a description of the soul. The soul has three parts, according to Plato.

There is a black horse, that is epitome, epitomeia, in Greek, that is a kind of desire. Desire in the more bodily sense, desire of something material. Of sexual relations, of the nourishment, kind of eating, and so on.

So, that is kind of tendency to the bottom, to the more material aspect. That is black horse. There is white horse, that is called thumos in Greek.

That is desire of the glory. That is purely warrior's value. So, it is not the material things, but to be known, to have the fame, to be famous, to have glory.

That was very important for Greek culture. That is purely kshatriya, kshatriya's value. And there was a kind of charity of this two horse, black and white.

That is represented by the noose, or by locus, in man. So, that is thought, that is priest in man, in human soul, that is thinking principle, the center of the soul. And what is interesting, we see in this metaphor, in Fedor and Phaedrus, once more, chariot.

Chariot, horses, purely in the European science. And the soul is the same. It consists from three parts, hierarchically, vertically organized.

Where chariot is the main, is the Brahman, is the priest. The white horse is glorious warrior. And there is a material inclination of the black horse, that is the worst, by the definition of Plato.

So, the soul, the political system, and the universe, and cosmos, the world around us, all of them, cosmology, polythology, and psychology, are based on the same Indo-European pattern. And that is not the case, as I said, that all the European philosophy is only Marx,

or the margin of Plato. So, Plato is the philosopher par excellence.

It is the absolute philosopher. So, everything is around Plato. Or criticism of Plato, or development of Plato, or kind of debates with Plato, as in case of Aristotle.

But Plato is the center. And if we now consider the structure, what is in the European structure? We could call it in our Platonism. So, Platonism is based on the concept of the Eternity.

So, it could not be too old. It could not become too old, because Eternity is not the past. Eternity, it is the past, the present, and the future.

So, there is a Platonism of the past, there could be, it should be Platonism of the present, and there could be Platonism of the future. Because it is based on the belief, strong belief in the Eternity. It is based on our Indo-European design.

So, being Indo-European, we are Platonists. And we are following, and that was not only the past, it is as well our present design. We are Indo-European, using Indo-European languages, living in our history, being Platonists.

It is very important. Because in that Indo-European version of the Logos, there is no modern understanding of time. There is vertical time in Platonism.

The time is the reflection, the mirror of the Eternity, says Plato. So, that is more or less Indo-European attitude. There is vertical time, we are going here in order to go back.

And that is not, we are not developing in the Earth. So, in the Earth, we are the witnesses of the glory of God, that will come. And in our Christian tradition, everything is present, everything.

It is pure Platonism in any sense. So, that is very important. What we could add here? We could add some considerations, first of all.

In Indo-European cultures, there is not only one form of this vertical Logos of Apollo. Logos of Apollo can manifest itself in different way. And there are many types of this Logos of Apollo.

We could, for example, compare two main forms of it. In one form, there is a kind of absolute domination of the light. And that is Platonic version.

So, there is no problematic. There is the light that goes from the surface, reaches the darkest point, the more distant point, the Earth, the bottom line, and peacefully, joyfully returns to the surface. There is nothing that could oppose the light.

There is nothing that could fight seriously against the sky, against God, against the Sun. There are some powers of the below, of the Earth, that would try not to let Sun go back,

return, or try to keep us on the Earth, not to let us go back, not let us die, not let us return. But, in the Platonic understanding, that is something that is not so much important.

So, we could easily overcome that, following discipline, ascetic tradition, following the orders, to integrate in the heroic society, to have a kind of paideia in Greek, education, that teaches us how to return. All the educational system in Platonic society is not only to obey formally, but accept the order, integrate the order inside, and following this help of the state, of the Church, of the tradition, to become the real Indo-European man and woman, in order to follow this straight line of return. So, it is, we could, and that's optic.

There is no evil. The evil, as Platonists say, it is diminution of the good. That is only form of diminishing good.

There is not evil as nature. There could not exist something like evil in this version, because the good is the sun, is the region, the good is the heaven, the God, and distance from the God is necessary test, for example, for Saul. It is not evil in such.

So, any kind of evil, it's only test, experience, that try to put obstacles in our way to return to ourselves. And in Indian, there is a Platonist version. But there is as well much more developed Indian Vedic Advaita metaphysics, where there is this concept, Advaita Vedanta, Indian Vedic metaphysics, that stresses this point, that we go from the reality and truth into the world of the illusion, in order to overcome illusion and to return to ourselves, because the essence of ourselves is God.

So, we are gods, but we have forgotten about that, Indian says. So, there is no problematic. There is Advaita Vedanta, non-dualistic version of Apollonian Logos.

So, everything that is not God, is as well God, but not knowing it. So, there is no darkness. Darkness is simply the absence of the light, and absolute darkness could not exist.

There is only relative darkness, that is the kind of darkening of the light. And darkening of the light, as we know, in our observation of the nature, is the first stage of the dawn, of the sunshine, sunrise. If there is no darkening, there is no lightening.

So, that is unproblematic. I'm calling that Advaita Platonism, sometimes. So, there is no Dvaita, no duality.

So, it could be in Platonic or in English. But there is the other formulation of Logos of Apollo, that is problematic. And we see that in Iranian tradition.

Iranian tradition is as well as Greek and Indian and Vedic, has the same sources, has the same origin, that came from the Turan, from Indo-European structure, from Indo-European design, and is a kind of form, type of this Indo-European design. But, it

considers the opposite force as something much more important. And there is, we could call that Dvaita Platonism.

So, there is a light and there is the darkness. The darkness in that version of Iranian dualistic tradition, darkness is not only kind of smallness of the light. Darkness is something much more serious.

And that creates a kind of intense Titanomachia, and idea of the ethos of the fight, of the light against the darkness. But this time the fight is something much more serious. If in Platonism, Advaita perspective, it is a kind of illusion.

We need to overcome illusion. And in Iranian version, we need to overcome the enemy. Because this time the evil is.

It is not only illusion. In the end of the day, it is illusion. But not when we are in the reality.

And that is a kind of much more serious and intense opposition of Logos of Apollo, against something other. So, in Platonic Advaita, in the European tradition, we have no opposition to that. Or the opposition is a kind of game.

And Plotinus has said once, the game is taken seriously only by puppets. Only puppets think that the game is something serious. The real gamers, the real players understand that all that is game.

It is not serious. But in the case of Dvaita Platonism or Iranian Judaism, that is not the game. That is a fight.

That is a war. And the war is serious. Because the power of the darkness, of something that is opposite to Apollo and Logos, this time is huge and is compatible with the power of light.

That is a completely new attitude, dualism. And we could see that here is something like approaching to the Logos of Sabella. The Logos purely, pure Logos of Apollo in the case of Dvaita, non-dualist Platonism or Hinduism, they don't know the Logos of Sibyl.

They don't consider it to be something important. It's only the surface of the Earth that is very hot. You come down in order to come back.

And you could not fit into the hole of the mouth. You are too big for that. You are too glorious for that.

It is the fate to be like the snake. Nobody can imagine that as a fate, to come down to the Earth, to come into the Earth, to be in the hole, to build something, to have something common with the snake or mouse. So Apollo is represented in a very archaic version, staying over the mouse.

Apollo is staying over the figure of the mouse. Or mole. The mole is Saturn in this version.

Because he is blind. He could not see the light. But mole, the mouse, has a mole.

Krot in Russian. And here appears something other. But in order to go further, go to this dualist version of Indo-European structure and Indo-European society, we need to consider more what happens when these Turanian nomadic tribes become sedentary.

Because there is a kind of shift. Some tribes that rest in the same state, including up to now, there are Kalash population, there are Nuristan population or Pushtun population in Afghanistan, in Pakistan. They are continuing to be nomadic Indo-European tribes.

So there are Scythes and Sarmans, who were of the same type, and Alans, and Yazigi or Zygis, and the other Sarmans tribes or Sossets were continuators of this nomadic tradition. But what happens when the Indo-European tribes come to the sedentary society, conquer them, and become as well sedentary? So we will explore that in the next lecture. And now I suggest a little break in order to follow this kind of detective story about Indo-European design and Indo-European existential horizon.

Professor, do you recognize Albanians as direct descendants to the Illyrians? So that is, linguistically, it's almost proven. Linguistically. But now I'm exactly in the ninth volume of Noa Mahia, already 20th, because I have split one volume into two parts, that this volume, 19th, should be dedicated to Eastern Europe.

And it happened that it could not fit into one volume, so I have already finished 19th volume, dedicated only to Slavs in Eastern Europe, only to Serbs, Bulgarians, Polish, Macedonians, and Czechs, Slovaks, Croats. And that was so important that I have decided not to mix the non-Slavic people in that volume, because everything, that was great, because I have discovered that in some period all Eastern Europe was Slavic, all, including Hungary, everything. We have reached, Slavs have reached to the Peloponnesus.

We have invited, expanded from the Baltic Sea, from Denmark up to Peloponnesus, up to the Sparta. So everywhere were Slavs. We have invited Europe, and only Western and Southern Slavs have conquered all.

And we, descendants, our fathers, forefathers, Eastern Slavs, we have conquered the other parts. So we were almost universal in Eastern Europe. With small part, we have assimilated Thracians, Greeks, Illyrians, and almost all.

And Abbas have helped us to expand. And in time, the Thracians, Roman-speaking Thracians, and Illyrians, Albanians, were small, small community in the mountains, in the Carpathians, Thracians, and Illyrians, and the Albans, and the Northern Albanians were very, very small community. And after some periods, they began to expand.

Now I am precisely, I am writing 20th volume, where I am searching, I am studying non-Slavic populations of Eastern Europe, in order to have the other layer, other level of the Eastern European ethnology and existential horizon. And there is completely different picture from that. So the Thracian factor is very, very huge.

And Illyrian as well. But I didn't yet come to Albanian part. I will dedicate to Albanians part of this volume.

And as long as I know, they consider to be continuators of Illyrians, living then before Slavs. But in any situation, we need to study better. So I have no final decision about that.

I will try to read, to study the sources, the different opinions, Albanians, Northern Albanians. Because, for example, in the case of Thracians, that is the problem. Slavs have filled almost all Romania.

Transylvania, Romania, Pannonia, as well Moldova. Only Slavs. And after, there was Thracians, Roman-speaking, Romanian.

And after some moments, from nowhere, not from the south, but from the Carpathians, from the mountains, there came Roman-speaking Thracians, Daco-Romanians, expanding over the Slavs. So, they were the same or not, that is the problem. The problem, I think that they were the same, but conserved in the mountains of Carpathians.

Maybe the same case, I presume, I'm not sure. The same case was with Albanians. So, they were almost in the existing part of Illyrians, and after that, they began to expand from Albanian mountains over the Slavs.

I just want to say that there is other theories. Yes, yes, interesting. And also for Macedonians, which, for example, Illyrians today descendants are Serbs, Bosniaks, Bosnians, Montenegrins, and also for ancient Macedonians, Macedonian today, which came to mix with the Slavic population.

Yes, that's just another theory. Yes, yes, yes. We need to consider any.

In my writings, I try to mention at least different theories. I don't insist. Very interesting.

I will study it much more precisely. I wanted to ask, the concept you described, that concept of Indo-European heritage, it's not unique. So, for example, the god of sun or sun worshipping is spread all over the planet.

Even in Central America, in Egypt, in China, today, China, all of the civilizations that are different, they have the same concept. It's the worship of sun. And they describe it very similar.

And those proto-civilizations, they seem to have similar origin, except it's not geographical. Can you explain or elaborate on that? Thank you for that question, because I have forgotten to mention that in my lecture. That's very important.

That's part of the lecture. So, that Indo-European tradition was based on the solar cult, or the cult of the heaven, or these topics, that say almost all about Indo-European culture. But I have discovered the same Logos of Apollo in the cultures that had, for sure, no context with Indo-European.

But not in any culture. So, besides the Indo-European culture, there are some other existential horizons not connected with Turan, absolutely, not connected with Indo-European languages of history, that belong to the same Apollo time. They are not universal, but I could mention them.

First, there is in Africa Nile-Saharan tribes. They have the same structure of the society, but not Bantu, for example. Not Western European.

There is Yoruba in Western Africa. In Western Africa as well, there are some points of this solar vertical Logos of Apollo as in Yoruba tradition. But around Yoruba, there are completely different, with no, completely tectonic and Logos of Sibir.

There is exactly, as you've mentioned, Inca civilization, that is very different from Aztec and Mayan civilization. Aztec and Mayan civilization are Dionysian, and Inca civilization is purely Apollonian. So, without connection.

And in Oceania, there is Maori Apollonian civilization in the middle of very tectonic and matriarchy civilization of Melanesian and other Apollonians in Malaysia. So, it is exactly. So, we could say that in the center of Indo-European identity there is this verticality, but there are very similar traditions in different people with no connections.

So, that is not expansion of only these four. There are independent centers of exactly the same type of Logos. So, that is very important consideration that we should not explain everything within the Indo-European tradition.

That is precisely. Yesterday, I have discussed that that Logos, three Logos concept is universal. We could find Logos of Apollo in any culture.

But there are, for example, concerning Pharaon's tradition. Very interesting. In my book dedicated to Egypt and to Northern Africa, I have discovered that pre-Pharaonic tradition was purely matriarchal.

And Pharaon tradition was a kind of intrusion of some other Logos that was not invasion of some other Logos. That was not grown from the Egyptian tradition, Kushite tradition. That was imposed, but not by Indo-European.

Or at least we have no idea about that. We have no traces. But in Pharaonic tradition was so.

And pre-Pharaonic, around this Pharaon concept was completely different existential horizon. So, that is very interesting. And it's very important remark to this lecture.

Thank you for that question. Because I would like to stress that. That it is not ownership of Indo-European tradition this solar cult or verticality.

And we need to recognize that there are the other, not Indo-European culture, but not every culture has this dimension. There are cultures with domination of completely different Logos. And we will speak about them after the break.

Thank you.