

Noomakhia Lecture 6. European Civilization - Alexander Dugin (Serbia 2018)

So, now the lecture number six that has as a topic European Civilization. So, now we put aside other Indo-European societies and we concentrate on European history and European cultures and European people. So, now it is clear that European civilization is based on this superposition of two geocentral horizons and has as its center, the main problem, the problem of Dionysus and its interpretation.

So, that European history is Titanomachia or No-Machia and the basic conditions of this Titanomachia was the fact of this coming of Turanian Indo-European cultures with Kurgan culture in the fields of the Great Mother, civilizations of the Great Mother. Speaking about Dionysus in the previous lecture, we have identified that Dionysus is the main problem of this civilization and that is the battlefield, battleground where there is the Titanomachia developing. And I have mentioned as well the case of Thracia, Thracian, the Thracian people, Thracian people was people of Turanian type, first of all, Indo-European people, that came to the Balkans before the Slavs, maybe 1200 years before Christ, maybe a little bit later, maybe earlier, that is difficult to say, but what is important, that was a kind of empire of the Thracian tribes, many tribes, Thracian tribes, they lived in the Balkans, in the Northern Balkans, but they occupied almost a huge part of the Eastern Europe.

And what is important, that the territories where the Thracian civilization was based, was expanded, these territories were the poles and the centers of the civilization of the Great Mother. So, Lepensky-Virvincha culture and Karanova-Gumenitsa culture, Tripoli-Gukuteni-Krish-Tisa culture and all other cultures were under existential horizon of Thracians. So, that is, we don't know and we could know, whether the Thracians were the first Indo-Europeans coming over these territories, but we don't know the more ancient groups of Indo-Europeans.

Maybe, and possibly, probably, there were the other waves of Thracian peoples coming there, maybe not, we could not say. But, Thracian culture was precisely the field, or special European culture, where this meeting between horizon of Apollo and Logos of Apollo and Logos of Cybele was accomplished. So, that was the culture of meeting, and Slavic tribes that came much later, in the Balkans, they have assimilated and included the Thracian elements inside of their structure.

So, Thracian, as well, there is very important aspect that Dionysus was considered by the Greeks to be Thracian god. Whether that was really Thracian, or pre-Thracian, or by some Indo-European people that preceded Thracian in the Balkans, we don't know. But, that is very important, that Dionysus came from the North, to Greece, from the Thracian, as well as Orpheus, as well as Bendis, Bendis, that was the name for a great mother in the Greeks, as well, Bendis, and Kokito, the other name, they were the other names of

Cybele.

So, Thracian tradition, as well, the Phrygians were Thracian, close to Thracians, and Phrygians, the civilization was the people where the Cybele cult was developed. So, that, as well, has something to do with Thracian world. That was, so, it is possible that Thracian tribes were more ancient than we know, than we presume, and maybe they were the first, maybe not, we could not affirm.

But they were, what is certain, Indo-European society, with very developed nomadic aspect, and more to the North, more nomadic they were, more to the Transylvania, to Romania, that was already steppes, Eurasian, Turanian space. But they, what is certain, that Thracians were here, around Danube river, and Basin, and Balkans, before Scythes and Sarmatians, long before. So, that is very ancient, very ancient Indo-European culture, that has assimilated and included the pre-Indo-European, Paleo-European tradition, or directly, or by intermediary, by some other, in the European society.

So, we could not say nothing affirmative here, but what is important, that regarding the Slav horizon of Eastern Europe, that dominated Eastern Europe as civilization, after 5th and 6th century, when Eastern Europe was invaded by Slavs, before the coming of Slavs, the Thracian civilization was here, and that was Indo-European, and maybe the meeting between Logos of Apollo and Logos of Cybele was precisely in Thracia. And the other important thing, that if so, European peasantry expanded from the same region, so the Balkan space was the motherland, or heimat, not only for Eastern European peasantry, but as well for all European peasantry, because the agricultural tradition was developed much earlier, precisely in the fertile territories of Balkans, where this matriarchal society existed, long before the coming of Thracian culture. So, Eastern Europe, that is considered to be a periphery, or border of Europe, or something marginal to the Greece, to the afterwards, to the Western Europe, maybe was central one.

So, we need to consider more this Eastern European space as existential space, we need to pay more attention to this Eastern European design, existential horizon of Eastern Europe. It is complicated, complex, with many tribes, many people, many levels of the culture, but what is very important, that is the Thracian origins of Dionysus and Orpheus. That, in the perspective that I have explained about the central role of the figure of Dionysus as a key to the historical sequence of European history, or to ontology of European history, that Eastern Europe obtains new dimension and new importance.

It was not in the reality periphery of the other Greek, Roman, later Western European civilization. That was something polar in Eastern Europe, in Balkans. That was a kind of center, a pole, but equality in the nature, the logical nature of this pole, we need to study more.

So, not to be only proud to be Balkanians, Slavs, living here after Thracians, but what is important is to understand the structure, the levels, the ontology of this space. And

because the problem of Dionysus is central and so important, as I have tried to explain, so the role of the Eastern Europe as well is growing. And we could deduce from that one important thing.

We could deduce that we know Eastern Europe, Thracian, Slavic, Balkanic space as a kind of continuation or result or periphery of the Western Europe and Eurasia, Russia or Turanian space. But there is absolutely new kinds, Dionysian kind of Eastern Europe, where this meeting that is key event in the ontological and semantical history of the Western Europe was produced. So, Eastern Europe is not the periphery, is in some way the center and the pole.

And regardless of such, but in a very special way, not in any way, but regardless of such, we need to concentrate more on the motherland of Dionysus, because it is precisely the motherland of Dionysus. And the factor of Thracian language and Thracian culture and the only pure Thracian god, Zalmoxis, that is known, we need to pay more attention to this figure. And there are many parallels, many common aspects between Zalmoxis and Dionysus.

So, Mircea Eliade and Romanian tradition paid great attention to the figure of Zalmoxis and its role in the Thracian horizon. So, Thracian culture, as well as matriarchal culture before Thracians, of the civilization of Eastern European great mother, didn't disappear. It has entered into the peasant tradition, Eastern European, and expanded with the peasantry through all Europe.

So, that is very interesting, where we have the peasants in Europe, we have the continuator, the descendants from the Balkanian motherlands. So, we could speak about peasant Dasein, special kind of third function that conserved cultural lines of pre-Indo-European tradition, and one of the first in the European society that has integrated these elements were Thracians, and after them, all the other. Maybe we should pay special attention to Illyrians as well, because they lived here in the Western Balkans with Thracians, and according to some historians, the space of Illyrians reached to the Baltic Sea.

So, maybe Illyrians lived as well far to the north, before Slavs came there. But we know too little about these two people, but we could deduce some things, starting interpreting correctly South Slavic tradition, because there is continuity, cultural continuity. Because all the peasants we know, maybe after thousands of years of Indo-Europeanization, they were originally Balkanian.

So, peasantry is Balkanian, and peasant Dasein, peasant tradition is in the roots, in the depth Balkan. So, that is very important. So, now we could consider European space, and to say some words about different, lesser existential horizon of the great European space.

As we have said already, there is the huge Indo-European Turanian space, that includes almost all Eurasia, from the British Islands to India. And that is the greatest Indo-European existential horizon. There is European existential horizon, only West-Western, but European including, that includes as well Eastern Europe.

But we could as well change the scale of knowledge and geography, and try to consider the lesser scale. But now we know what we are seeking for. We are seeking how each society solved or is solving the problem of Dionysus.

So, now our search is much more concrete. Trying to understand or decipher or interpret, hermeneutically, one or other European culture, we are searching the neological balance and the movement of neomachia in any society. So, for example, starting with Greek tradition.

Greek tradition, it is based on the absolute victory of the Logos of Apollo. But this victory, as I have mentioned yesterday, was not immediate. So, Hellenistic tribes, Aeolians, Ionians, came to the Balkans and the Peloponnese in the waves, controlling or overcoming the existing matriarchal civilization.

But at the same time, there was exchange of the elements. And some Greek territories conserved this Indo-European vertical, three-functional, purely matriarchal structure. And some have lost it.

Or some elements. So, we had Minoan and Mycenaean cultures, where there was a mixture between patriarchy and matriarchy elements. And only the last wave of the Hellenic tribes, coming from the North, from Macedonia, Dorian, Dorian wave, the fourth tribe of Hellenic, brought with itself decisive Apollonism, decisive pastoralism, and destroyed Mycenaean culture and introduced the purely Turanian style.

That was very important. That is reflected in the Sparta, that is more Dorian than Ionian Athens. And the dualism of Greek culture between Sparta and Athens was Ionian, and Sparta was Dorian.

And that was, as well, a dualism of the balance of Mahomachia. Because in Sparta, the Logos of Apollo was clearer and more powerful, and in Ionia and Aeolia, in Athens, in the Anatolian Greek colonies, the power of this vertical Logos of Apollo was lesser. So, that is important, that in Greece, as well, there were the kind of differences of existential horizons.

And the dualism between Sparta and Athens, that is the key dualism in the geopolitics, as well has no logical and geosophysical interpretation and explanation. So, the next moment, Dionysus was a Greek god, as well, with Thracian origins, but it was purely Greek, because that was around him, that was Apollonian perspective, and very ancient Sibyllian. And in Greek culture, in the worship, in the religion of polytheistic religion, in

philosophy, we see this element very clearly.

I would like to mention that I have already said that that could be the Logos, all three of them could be reflected in the religion and the myth, but, as well, in the philosophy. And the Logos of Apollo is reflected in the perfect, almost absolute, the best way, in the Platonic philosophy. Platonic philosophy is the absolute version of the Logos of Apollo, as well as Logos of Aristotle, that was the disciple of Plato, and his part of his teaching of Aristotle, as well, we see in the Logos of Apollo, in the purest and formalized version.

There was the Logos of Dionysus in Heraclitus, that is dialectic, that is, as we have called that, the Dramatic Nocturne, that is Heraclitus' philosophy, that is based on the cycle, on the war, on the cycle, on this dialectic between eternal and what is in time. But that is not materialistic. So, Heraclitian belongs to the Dionysian aspect.

As well, the part of the teaching of Aristotle, physics and rhetoric, belong as well to Dionysian Logos. Because they are dealing with a paradox of two in one, of form and matter in one thing. The thing is double and is one.

So, that is not Apollonian. Apollonian is one is one. One that is that, and not the other.

If there is something that is that and other, we are dealing already with, we are shifting to Dionysus. So, that is the great error to consider the physics of Aristotle as the logic of Aristotle. But there is two visions in Aristotle.

There is Apollonian side of Aristotle, that is logic, and that is Dionysian side of Aristotle, that is physics. And what is interesting, we are dealing with completely erroneous understanding of Aristotleism, because we are trying to apply logic to physics. But we are working with physical mathematical object.

There is not such object in the reality. There is mathematical object that is purely Apollonian, and there is physical object that is purely Dionysian. So, from that follows very important remark, that in order to study physical world, we need to apply not the logic to this world, but rhetoric.

And rhetoric will be more strict science and more precise science of the physics. We need to use Heraclitian concept. Dialectics, rhetorics.

Rhetorics, it is kind of violation of the law of the logic. In rhetoric, we are saying the things that don't correspond exactly to what we pronounce. That is irony.

Irony is the main figure of rhetorics. Irony. So, we are saying one thing, but we are meaning the other thing.

For Slavs, it is very clear. Our language is rhetoric, ironic. We are living in an ironical culture.

We never say what we mean. We say one thing, mean other, make third, and the result is fourth. Heterotelic.

That is classical rhetorical, ironical society. We are ironical people. All our speech is based on irony.

But irony is the main figure of the rhetorics. So, irony is violation of the laws of logic. For example, metonymy.

Metonymy is the figure that we say how many heads of cattle we have. For example, metonymy. But we mean cows, or bulls, or sheep, not the heads of them.

But we are using the part as a whole. It is rhetoric. But it is violation of the logic.

We are counting heads. And all rhetoric figures are such. For example, we are saying one thing, meaning something other.

Synecdoche, antiphrase, and all the other rhetoric figures. But they cover the physical reality exactly. But logically, we could not gain such precision just because the physical objects do not belong to the intellectual object, to mathematical.

There is not physical-mathematical. With logic, we could study mathematical and geometrical objects, but physical objects we should study with different rhetorical methods. And only this rhetorical method could be strict and precise enough in order to cover the dialectical structure of the object.

The thing is rhetorical and not logical. That is very important. And that is all.

That is Aristotle. I suggest you reading early texts of Heidegger about Aristotle, as well as Aristotle's studies of early Husserl and Brentano, because the phenomenological tradition and philosophy stressed this Aristotle aspect, ignored by the previous tradition. So, they have rediscovered, phenomenologists have rediscovered this Aristotle.

But there was, as well, in Greece, we are speaking now about Greece, Greek existential space, there was, as well, the third locus, the locus of Sybele, represented philosophically, not only in the Mystery of the Great Mother, and this philosophical tendency of ancient Greece was represented by Democritus, by Epicurus, and in Rome by Lucretius. These three authors were typically represented by ancient materialist and eminentist tradition, because for them there was no patriarchal principle, everything consists from atoms, so that was a kind of purely, as well, they professed, above all, Epicurus and Lucretius, progress, the concept of progress, that everything is going in a positive way, from the lesser to the better, from the evil to the good, so that was the concept that everything is growing from the bottom to the top. So, the concept of the progress, of evolution, is purely titanic, that was materialistic titanic version of the cosmos.

So, three locus were present in Greek philosophy, but, what is important, normative locus were considered to be locus of Apollo, Platonism, partly Aristotle, and Heraclitus. Dark locus, but as well accepted. And the Democritus and Epicurus, at the lesser scale, were rejected.

Platon suggested to burn the book of Democritus, because that was considered a very dangerous heresy. In philosophy, it could be, as well, heresy. That was the continuation, now we see that clear, of Indo-European Titanomachia, or Nomachia, and the moment of Greek culture of Nomachia was based over, on the victory, on the victory of the locus of Apollo with the friendship and alliance of locus of Apollonian Dionysus over this materialistic Sybilian locus.

So, but, that is, more or less, in some words, explanation of Greek tradition. And inner dualism was represented in the dualism Sparta and Athens. What is important, that is Hellenistic time.

Everything is changed, or many things were changed during Hellenistic times after the Alexander the Great. During Alexander the Great, the Greece has expanded its culture over completely new existential horizon, that was Iranian existential horizon, that was included in the Mediterranean and Greek culture, and that created the phenomenon of Hellenism. So, Hellenism, Hellenic is one thing, Hellenistic is other thing.

What, where lays the difference between two cultures, two existential horizons? Hellenic is Greek, as we have explained that, and Hellenistic is Greek, plus not Orient, not Eastern, not Asian, as we say, not Semitic, as we usually say, but precisely Iranian existential space. So, not vague, something Orientalistic. Hellenism is regarded as Greek plus something Oriental.

If we study correctly this phenomenon of Hellenistic civilization, we discover very important thing, that Hellenism is strictly Greece plus Iran. Not Greece plus Egyptian, Semitic, Eastern, Indian, in the general sense, Iranian. Because Iranian civilization was not only the culture of Iraq, that was culture of Achaemenid Empire, that included in itself as well Egypt, Semitic tradition, and transformed in its Iranian locus all these ancient cultures.

There was a common denominator in these Achaemenid cultural traditions, existential horizons, and all that I have explained in my book, *The Locus of Iran*, Iranian Locus, Iran has included all the previous cultures and transformed in the context of its own dominating Zoroastrian, Mazdaian concept. So, we are dealing with Egypt, with Semitic world, with Babylonia, after Achaemenid Empire, not directly, but through Iranian concept. So, they were Iranized, what we are calling Egyptian, Semitic, Babylonian, in the reality, were Iranized version of this tradition.

So, I distinguish, I suggest to distinguish Iranian and Iranistic, as we are distinguishing

Hellenic and Hellenistic. So, Achaemenid Empire was not purely Iranian, but that was not exclusively Iranian, that was inclusively Iranian, that included the other traditions, but transformed semantically in the context of Iranian locus. So, in Hellenism, that was a kind of heir, and Alexander Macedonian has received the heritage of this Iranism in full scale, because the empire of Alexander, Hellenistic Empire, was the same as Achaemenid Empire plus Greece.

But that heritage is almost always ignored. So, they say, Alexander Macedonian has received Oriental heritage, not Iranian, because we consider this acquisition of the new territories, conquests of Alexander the Great, with Greek eyes. In that sense, we are all Greeks, we consider, we European, Russian, Serbian, French, German, we are Greek, because for us, Greek history is our history, Iranian history is the history of father.

Never we consider Iranian history as our history. So, that was conquest of us against them. And they were not so clearly distinguished, so we should overcome them, include their cultures, but we don't go into the details of what we have acquired.

They were conquered cultures, but if we consider that in the perspective of Iranians, everything changed. There was a kind of Iranian locus, and what was the essence of Iranian locus that we should include in our understanding of what is European civilization, because of Hellenism. And I will explain why it's so important, why Hellenism is so important.

So, Iranian locus is based on the main principles. First of all, that is the war of light. So, that is radical dualistic, as we have said yesterday, dualistic Platonism.

So, the locus of Apollo against the locus of Cybele, but recognizing the power and the substance and the autonomous nature of this second locus. So, that is not only as in Advaita Platonism, as non-dualist Platonism, that darkness is the absence of light. No, the darkness in Iranian concept is living thing, is powerful thing, is winning thing.

For Plato to suggest that the evil can win the good is absurd. It's absolutely impossible, because in the world of Apollo, the locus of Apollo, there is the eternal victory of the light over darkness. Darkness doesn't exist.

In dualist Iranian version, darkness exists. Darkness is God, but the other God. So, the night is.

The night is powerful and night can win. So, there is, and the fight between them is for the first time, comparing to the Platonist and the locus of Apollo, is serious. And something dramatic.

Something that you can lose. So, that is completely different attitude towards life. That is Apollonist, Apollonium.

So, to be Iranian is to be the bearer of light for Iranians. So, there is no other definition of Iranian. Iranian is the sun of light put into the field of the darkness in order to fight.

So, there is extremely dramatic version of the locus of Apollo with recognition of the substance, the reality and the power of the locus of Sibyl. So, it is Iran, purely. And in Iranian self-consciousness, Iranian identity is based on the concept that only Iranians are pure, the people of light.

And all the rest, including Turanians, are people of darkness. So, that is a kind of metaphysical racism in Iranian tradition. Purity.

And that was the situation of the permission of the incest. Incest is strictly prohibited in any kind of culture. In any.

In primitive, in developed, not in the Iranian. Because the concern to conserve the purity of the Iranian soul, Iranian body, Iranian blood was so great that outweighed the prohibition of the incest and the marriage between the sister and brother or son and mother. That's almost incredible in archaic society and developed society.

But in Iranian society that was permitted. And that was almost obligation in order to save this purity of the son of light. So, that is extreme version of the locus of Apollo.

But that is Iran, Iranian tradition. But Iranism included Egyptian, Semitic, Babylonian and other people. So, that was not so much exclusive as Iranian.

Iranism is a kind of symbolical transfer of this quality of son of light, not from the direct Iranian bodily, concrete, material in some way, understanding of what is the light and what is the son of the light, as a kind of metaphoric son of light. So, Iranism is not Iranian. It is not so exclusive that it embeds in itself the other tradition.

So, the concept of war of light is accepted in the broader sense. After that, the other concept of Iranian tradition that wasn't known by the Greek society is idea of time and idea of history. Because in the Platonic version there is no history.

There is no time as something important. There is always the same, just the same. The cycle of the birth and the death of the same.

That is eternal return of the thing that is purely Platonic with no reason, with no development, with no progress, with no regress. There is completely different time. You come from the origin, from the source, you return to the source, that's all.

And what is going on in this sublunar cycles has no matter, no logic, no sense, no direction, no time, no history. So, there is eternity, the history of eternity. The Platonic history is the history of eternity and the time is the reflection of eternity.

So, it doesn't exist in the sense that is common to us. But only in Iranian tradition the

time obtains meaning. Because Iranian tradition affirms that in the beginning there was light over darkness.

And the second stage of Iranian historical sequence, the darkness has interrupted, has invaded the realm and the field of light. And began to destroy and deviate and pervert the world of light. And in the next moment the darkness will overcome the light, will win the light.

And at the end of the rule of the darkness there will be the great restoration, resurrection and appearance of the chosen one that will be the king and the saviour of the humanity. So, there appears the time, because now the time matters. In Platonic, Plato, the time doesn't matter.

It's nothing. There is no logic. And here appears the history, here appears the time and eschatology, here appears messianism, the Messiah, here appears the last king of the world that should appear and restore the realm and the kingdom of light as the last result of the fight of the war of light.

And there is resurrection. Resurrection of the lost perfection of the creation of light. That is Iranism.

But we are dealing with that as something completely close to us. But all that was completely unknown to the Greek. So, it is purely Iranian influence.

So, history, time, resurrection, eschatology, the meaning of the time. In Greek, Platonic world, the time has no meaning at all. The only return to the origin has meaning.

So, the time, the history, that's nothing. Only the example of the past of the heroes in order to repeat them. So, the heroes of the past, they are functioning as paradigms, as ideas.

And here appears the history. Here appears the history. Here manifests itself a completely new perspective, Iranian perspective.

And after conquests of Alexander the Great, that spiritual, philosophical and metaphysical heritage entered into the Mediterranean Greek culture. That was outside, became inside, inner. There is a kind of idea that the time, the Mesianism, the history, all that were brought by Jews, by Semitic, by the Bible.

But we know the Bible only after Babylonian captivity. So, Babylonian captivity and the end of Babylonian captivity, that was the Achaemenid Empire. Achaemenid Empire that distributed these Iranian logos, including among the Jews.

So, the late Judaism that we know, and that is linked with the concept of Messiah, of the end of time, resurrection, is some Iranian reduction of the purely Semitic original

Judaism. So, the time, the history was Iranian and was Hellenistic. So, Hellenism is so important for European culture, for any European existential horizon, because it is precisely based on two pillars, two conceptual pillars, not on one.

It is not the Greek-Hellenic culture and something Oriental or Semitic. There is Greek and Iranian. Hellenism is Iranism at the same time.

And Hellenistic culture and Hellenistic world was precisely the space, existential space, that created Hellenistic design. Hellenistic design was the basis of European culture of the next stage. What is important? First of all, this Hellenistic space and design has changed the ruling poet.

That was the shift from the Greek domination to the Roman domination. But the ancient Rome was as well something like Logos of Apollo in Italy. But the conquests of Rome, of the Mediterranean space, was the conquest of the Hellenistic world.

And that was as well the shift from the Roman to Roman Empire on the late Republic as well, because that started long before the Empire. After the victory over Greek, there was the beginning of the change of the Roman culture. And the Roman culture, we know, is Hellenistic Rome.

But Hellenism, it is Greek plus Iranian. So, Mithraism, Roman Mithraism, and many other aspects were taken from these Hellenistic sources. And this Hellenism, Greco-Roman-Iranian, we always should remember Greco-Roman-Iranian Hellenism, in Roman version, was expanded to the Northern Western Europe, to the Balkans, and Roman conquests, in cultural way, in cultural dimension, were Hellenistic.

That was the Roman soldiers brought Hellenism everywhere they go. So, important aspect of... And what was Hellenism? Hellenism, once more, was Logos of Apollo in Greek Platonic tradition, Logos of Dionysus in Greek Mysteriosophic, as well, Heraclitian tradition, Logos of Apollo in Iranian version, in Hellenistic version, with time, with concept of War of Light, with Messiah's Cathology, and no Logos of Sibyl. The Logos of Sibyl was present in the depth of this existential space, but was not represented clearly.

Only, maybe, in some Pergam, in some history of the Sibyl's prophecy, in order to overcome Carthago, to put the black stone of Sibyl from Phrygia to Rome, but that was more or less marginal. There was a kind of matriarchal cult in Roman Hellenistic Empire, but they were not dominating. The dominating culture was Apollonian, Greek Apollonian, Iranian Apollonian, and Greek Dionysian.

But precisely this Hellenism was Roman Empire culture. And that was Christianity, because the Christianity was constructed over this space. And that has continuation, logical continuation of the same culture, crystallization of the Hellenism in Roman Greek version.

And Iranian aspect in Christianity was crucial. That's important. Tomorrow we will develop this point.

But now we see this Roman Hellenism with domination of Logos of Apollo. That was conserved with some aspect of Dionysian culture up to modernity. The Latin Logos, the Logos of Roman Logos, Roman Empire Logos, is Hellenistic, is Roman in its deepest aspect, but Hellenistic and so Greco-Iranian in the next level.

And that was with some aspect of dualism. That is, Roman culture was more stressed, accentuated than Byzantium Christianity. So, Saint Augustine was Manichaean in his youth, and Manichaeism is the form of Iranism.

Iranism is dualism and so on. So, there is something Manichaean and Iranistic in Rome, a little more than in Byzantium, where there is balance much more Dionysian, not so, or not dualistic Platonism in Byzantium, and dualistic Platonism in Rome, in the Latin, in Catholicism, comparing with Orthodoxy. But, nevertheless, Roman Catholic Empire was based on the Logos of Apollo, was more dualistic, maybe less Dionysian, but at the same time purely Indo-European.

And that was the destiny of Italy up to the last time. So, to conserve this Logos of Apollo was a kind of moment of Naumachia for Italy, to be the place where the Rome was, to be the center of the Roman Empire, to be invaded by the, as well, German and the European tribes, to create a new state, but stay true to be this Christian, in Catholic version, source to this kind of Christianized Hellenism up to the end. And the last form of this, in the very modernized and perverted way, was the Italian Fascism.

That was continuation of this Apollonian attitude, vertical hierarchy in the modern version, but that was the kind of straight line. So, the Italian Fascism was the last sound of the city. Before that was the Trident Council, where the Catholicism refused to go in the Protestant way.

So, defense of this Catholic identity, or Apollonian Roman identity, that was the kind of destiny of the Italian existential horizon. And that is very, what is interesting, that was not only caricature in the Fascism. There was a caricature aspect of Roman tradition in Fascism, absolutely, as everything in modernity is caricature.

But at the same time, there was something logical, continuation of this Roman tradition, in very special way, but continuation and get back. Next existential horizon of Europe, France. That is Celtic, Celtic tradition.

What is particularity of Celtic existential horizon? The power of the feminine principle, the power of mother. So, Celtic tradition has fresh roots of mother. So, Celtic Christianity was much more feminist friendly.

There are many legends and myths about the island of mothers, that death was

considered to be feminine. And maybe partly, the Middle Age, the tradition of knights of Middle Age, with the cult of amour, the love, was based on these Celtic traditions. There is Danilo Rojman, the author, very interesting, that tries to follow, to study the sources.

Danilo Rojman, he has written the book that is called *The Love and the West, L'amour et l'Occident*, where he studied the sources and the roots of the tradition of glorifying love in the knights' culture, the culture of knights in the Middle Ages. So, that was as well Celtic influence with very strong presence of great mother. I gave the name for the book on French culture, French Logos, Orpheus and Melusina.

Melusine, that was the name for the fairy. The fairy, that was a dragon, a feminine dragon, a woman dragon in Celtic mythology. So, that was, and Orpheus as well was the figure, Thracian by origins, very important for French culture and Celtic culture, because the idea to go down to the center of the hell in order to save, or to meet with a feminine principle that resides in the center of the hell, that is a kind of destiny of the French culture, in the best aspect and the worst aspect.

So, that was the kind of journey to the center of the earth, in order to discover the femininity, the mother. So, German Logos was quite different from Celtic. It was heroic, it was warrior, it was Apollonic, and that was the fight, a little bit as in Iranian case, against the chthonic power.

So, that is an everlasting fight. To be German, it is the same as to fight. The Germans fight against the serpents, against dragons, against everybody else around.

So, that is a paranoid type, if you remember Gilbert Durand, a paranoid type of culture, but strongly patriarchal, with analogy and relations with Valkyrians. So, German women are more like German men, they are the same. So, they are fighting, they are Brünnhilders.

So, that is a kind of heroic society, and destiny, it is the fight against titans. But, when the Germans followed this destiny, their destiny, they fight so sincerely, that they could not remark the moment, where their fight becomes titanic itself. They fight so much, and so devotedly, to fight, that it overcomes some natural limits, and overcoming the natural limits is something titanic.

So, they begin to destroy themselves, to destroy everybody else around them. So, they, and Hitler, the titanic aspect of truly Germanic spirit is clear. That was a good idea to create Germany, but that was not so good idea to destroy everything, and afterwards Germany itself.

Over-measure. There is the Greek term hubris, very important, hubris, Greek term. That means absence of measure.

So, if, for example, you kill in the fight the enemy, that is good for heroic ethics. But if

you violate child, for example, his child, in order to continue this, that is hubris. That happens, but that is not considered to be heroic, too much heroic, or rape the women.

It is always the part of the war, but that is hubris. Maybe in the certain situation hubris, in other not, but there is the overcoming natural borders. So, and in the German case, we see this warrior spirit, purely Apollonian, that sometimes overcome its border, and the enemies of the titans become titans themselves.

So, they are trying to overcome the other, they change their roles in the history. So, being fighters of the sky against the earth, they begin to fight the earth in chthonic way. There was very important idea in Iranian tradition, that the army of light is weaker than army of darkness.

So, and the defeat of the army of light, it is necessary element of resurrection and the final victory. So, that is very metaphysical aspect. So, in order to win, you should undergo defeat with the light.

If the light should die, it is better to die with the light, than to win with the darkness. So, the force is not the last word, the last word is the truth, or the light. So, the idea is that when we pass over some measures, some borders, some limits, and if we fight too much, so we could destroy everything.

That is German destiny, and that is German Logos. And in case of Protestantism, that was in the beginning, that was very important idea, that Christ is something inner, not only outer, not only belonging to the cult, not only going from outside. Christ comes from within.

That was the original idea of Protestantism. And Platonism and German mystics of Master Eckhart were inside, were the center of the early Protestantism. But without measure, being brought to the hubris in titanic way, that becomes actually completely different.

Individualism, rationalism, absence of mystery, absence of humility in front of Gods, that was heroic. Arianism, a kind of return to the Arianism, that was the Protestantism, that was as well German, in the best and the worst aspect. So, Protestantism is titanic version of Christianity, because Catholicism and Orthodoxy, they are Apollonian version of Christianity, but modern Protestantism, Calvinism above all, and the radical version of Protestantism are not Christian, they are titanic versions.

So, England and the British horizon. When I studied the British history, the English history, I have arrived to the conclusion, that I could not name, call the book dedicated to the English, the English Logos, because I didn't find the English Logos. But I have discovered the profound duality of English culture.

There was the South Pole, represented by Welsh, by Ireland, by Scotland, that is part of

the South world and South existential horizon, so the part of France, in some way. With the same fascination of the feminine principle, of the same descent to hell, the same black romanticism and so on. And South part is not only Irish or Scottish, that was as well in Wales and inside of English society.

So, Stuart's dynasty was South, so the Celtic elements, they are inside of English identity, not outside. Outside are the radical aspects, in Ireland and Scotland and Wales, but the majority of the population of the British island were South. Germanized South.

The other part, the other pole is German. So, the mixture of South and German elements didn't create new Logos, didn't create new existential horizon, they create English schizophrenia, so bipolarity. So, there is a kind of unbalanced mixture between German and South, that was not a kind of synthesis, that was a very ill mixture or confusion of contradictory elements.

They didn't create united Logos, they didn't create united identity, they create bipolar society. Very, very troubled inside. And there is the other example of the relations between South and German identity.

Switzerland, Belgium and all the heritage of Lothar, the third heritage of Charles the Great. And in Switzerland there is very, very thin balance between both identities. There is not so much synthesis, but there is harmonization.

And what we see in England, there is absolutely disharmony, absence of any harmony. There is very, very aggressive German part and very, very depressive South part. They don't form the whole, something holistic, something in trouble.

They form bipolar entity with deep, deep conflict inside, that could not be resolved innerly. So, it expanded as British Empire. So, it was expanded as a kind of explosion of these two contradictory identities.

They didn't create the Logos, they create a British Empire, capitalism, imperialism, liberalism. But all that, that is, it is not... For example, South Logos, French Logos, is much more Dionysian, with many aspects of the black Dionysus. If German Logos is Apollonian, with possibility to change the situation to the titanic aspect, English culture, English identity took the black Dionysus and titanic aspect of German Logos, united them in a very, very complex way and expanded over the planet.

So, that was the kind of, not colonialism, but colonization of illness, that wasn't cured inside and that couldn't be cured. And that is manifested in the main myth of England, the fight of two dragons, the red dragon and white dragon. That was the beginning of the England, the history of England, the fight of red and white dragons.

Red dragon represented South identity and white dragon represents German identity. And they are still fighting. They are still fighting, these two dragons.

And the explosion of British Empire didn't change anything, didn't cure English mind. So, English mind rests ill, bipolar, but now it is obliged to return to this fight, to fight that never ends. But that is a very interesting idea.

There is no Logos. In France we could identify the Logos. In Germany we could identify the Logos.

In Italy, in Greece, in other countries, not in England. So, there is a kind of American Logos, North American Logos. For example, South America is a continuation of the Latin Logos with Apollonian structure.

And that embedded pre-European population, not without the problems, but that was synthesis. And Anglo-Saxons brought to North America their illness. They began to destroy the Indians, not integrate them in their society.

And they created absolutely evil North American society as continuation of the same problem. But there is a kind of American Logos in pragmatic philosophy. There is a kind of solution for that.

And pragmatism is North American philosophy, the main trend in American philosophy. But what is pragmatism? It is idea that there is no normative knowledge about subject. There is no normative knowledge about object, but only there is interaction in practice.

If something works, it is. If something doesn't work, maybe next time. So, there is no concept of what subject or object should be.

What should be matter, the nature, the cosmos, or human soul. We could pretend to be everybody. Alice Presley, Martians, Anglo-Saxons, everybody.

So, if it works, so nice. If it doesn't work, it's bad for you. So, we could treat the world in any way we want.

So, that is kind of pragmatism. So, interaction. That is why American philosophers try to adapt Heidegger in their pragmatist way.

It's not Heidegger, but it's American reading of Heidegger. Precisely because they believe only in what is between, what is interaction, practical. If you could, for example, if you are constructing the time machine in order to return to the other time, you are free to do that, because doing that something could happen.

Maybe not return to the time, but you could discover some elements or some knowledge to sell something, or new bottle for Coca-Cola. So, you are completely free to do whatever you want, because there are no limits of object or subject. There is no inner, no outer.

It's only interaction. And interaction is practical, pragmatism. If it's good to you, that is

American locus, very special.

It's not Anglo-Saxon. It is another kind. And now, in globalist time, there is kind of loss of this locus, because America could not pretend to be colonialistic, because colonialism is the goal, is clearly defined goal.

So, now America is not anymore American. They are in the hands of some other groups. American locus is not so.

It is pragmatism that couldn't tolerate any goal. So, they could act, something happens, something doesn't happen, you could feel yourself happy or not, but you could try everything, you shouldn't prescribe. So, for example, to anybody nothing.

Political correctness is anti-American, anti-pragmatic. So, you should not say so. You should say, you can say everything, and act how you like, and make the monuments you prefer, or not have any monuments at all, because there is nothing inside or outside, only interaction.

So, that is pure American best or worst. But that is American pragmatist locus. Now America, North America is not such, it is different.

So, that is analysis, more or less, of the different existential horizons or cultural space of European civilization. And we could say, I have already said some words about Slavs. We are in the European society.

We, the last centuries, we are under great influence of the West. So, we partly, we share with Germans, with French, with Britains, with Greek, with Latins. They are problem.

Having some special features, we will dedicate to Serbian identity special lecture. So, I don't want to anticipate too much. But the idea that, what about our Slavic locus? It is possible, it has clearly, it is the part of Hellenistic cultural space, because all the other identities that I have described are kind of results of Hellenistic, Christian Hellenism in different combinations.

But what is well clear, that we have not such Slavic locus as something already made or something completed. So, it is the most interesting thing, that is challenge for us. That is open locus.

I have studied the possibility of the Russian philosophy, based on Heidegger and special book. I didn't yet written the last book of Maumachile, that will be dedicated to Russian locus, possible or not. But dealing with Eastern European Slavic tradition, I see clear, that the Slavic locus is possible.

Sometime in the history, we approached it. We were very close to it. In the Dushanbe, the great, the strong in Europe history, with the first and the second Bulgarian kingdom

in the history of Bulgarians.

We were close sometime in the Polish kingdom with Lithuanian, with great Moravia as well, with some philosophical tendency. But we have never achieved the final version of this locus in Eastern Europe as well in Russia. So, we didn't achieve the final version of locus of our existential horizon, because our existential horizon is not finished.

It hasn't received the last form. And that maybe is our challenge historically. And Slavophiles, Slavophile thinkers, they saw that we came to the history later than the other.

When there is already a huge building of German philosophy, and German political history, French philosophy, Roman philosophy, Greek philosophy, and as well the political history. We Slavs, we have arrived to this a little later. Not in the history, but to understanding of history, to locus of history, to our philosophy.

Our philosophy is a little bit childish, infantile. There is a great example, a great explosion of intellectual richness, of the precious thinkers as Negosh II metaphysically as well as Russian Dostoevsky. But all that is a kind of feeling of coming of our locus, not the locus itself.

We are living in the anticipation of the Slav locus. So, when we study the past, we see many heroic deeds, but we could not say that is our locus. No, that is something like that.

There is the Saint Sava in Serbia. That is anticipation of the Serbian mission, of the history, the creation of the Nemanja dynasty. Russian, the terrible, and other moments in our Slavic history are anticipation of locus, not the locus itself.

It is my personal opinion. It is more difficult to describe our locus than to study the locus of the other. Because it demands a very deep introspection, insight in our culture.

But nevertheless, and we should recognize that some centuries we were under influence of the other existential horizons, and they defined many things in our actual consciousness. But nevertheless, and that is always scientific truth, we have conserved our identity and the core of our existential horizon, Slavic horizon, in the same condition. Maybe it is buried in the depth, but it exists.

It is surely an example of the resistance to globalization. It is one of the examples. Yes, that was the defeat, but as well, Kosovo struggle was as well defeat.

But on this defeat is based the victory. On this defeat, on this capacity to resist, is based the future resurrection. That is not only the death as defeat.

That is heroic death, it is always promise of the resurrection. So, to say the truth, I

constate very pessimistic state in modern Slavic society. But at the same time, I am very optimistic concerning the possibility of this locus.

It is not yet done, it is not completed. But that is the challenge for new generations of Slavic intellectual elite. That should make, that should bring to the final point all the historical experience, all this historical, not historic, historical sequence of our ontological presence in the world.

So, I think that we should study the cultures of other European people. We should study deep in depth these existential horizons to understand where we are, who lives around us, with whom we have to deal, who are oppressors, who are saviors, friends and enemies. But most important is to understand who we are.

But without knowing who are the other, we could not define ourselves. We should know, knowing the other, we know ourselves. Knowing ourselves, we know the other.

So, in order to establish or re-establish or discover this Slavic locus, we need to study as well the locus and geography of European world, Indo-European world, and the other people. So, that is the importance of now my head. So, thank you.

Questions? You had questions, sorry. Please. So, you brought up an interesting point about German Logos, which is more of a, let's say, a colonial nature, but it's also, it can become titanic over time if there is no measure.

I would argue, if I may be so bold, that the German culture in Logos has become siberian in nature, after the defeat of Nazism, after that logical conclusion of titanic struggle. Because I was in Berlin a week ago, and nearly for two days, in Hult University, we had a project. And I visited the German History Museum.

In front of the museum you have, let's say, an ad, basically, where you have two leather-clad gay guys kissing, and the text says, in Berlin you can switch or choose to see as many landmarks as you can, as many partners as you can. So, you compare cultural artefacts with the number of people you can have intercourse with. And then you go to Sieg des Euler, which is the statue of the triumph over the French in the Franco-Prussian War in 1971.

And in the base of the tower you have an inscription which says, this was once a monument to militarism, Jingoism, German nationalism, and now it is a monument to tolerance and diversity. And it was once a place where military parades were held, now it's a place where gay parades and concerts are held. So, is this a case that the culture is becoming civilian in nature? Very, very, very important point.

We will, in the lecture eight, we will discuss, we will make a neological analysis of the modernity. Because now we are speaking about modern Germany, and to speak about modern Europe, we have spoken about Europe in general. When we will speak about the

phenomenon of modernity, of modern Europe, I am anticipating a little bit, there was the victory of Sibelius, total victory, in Germany, not only in Germany, in France.

And we will follow, we will trace how it occurred, by which stages, where, how, what was the place of Germany. But you are absolutely right, absolutely right, about German culture, and not only, about European culture. That is the victory of the Sibelius, accomplished, and almost irreversible.

And the feminism, not is the beginning of it, is the end of it. That is a kind of the final, final name, that was given to the phenomenon, that was already done. The kingship, the kingdom of the Sibelius, doesn't begin today.

It is finishing now, it is in the final stage. And Germany, after the Second World War, that was clearly Sibelian. You are absolutely right.

But the German National Socialism was the kind of preparation of that. Formally, that was completely opposite. But in Titanic, overpassing the measure, that was not so bad in the idea to defend German identity.

But that was perverted, I think. And it was hubris. When the hubris is in the situation of the defense of the patriarchy, with hubris, it changes a little bit its context.

And that is preparation of the Sibelius, that is ruling now. You are absolutely right. Absolutely right.

Thank you. So... Thank you.