

Noomakhia Lecture 8. Noological Analysis of Modernity - Alexander Dugin (Serbia 2018)

Let us continue. The lecture 8 is dedicated to Neological analysis of the modernity. I presume that now it is more or less easy to anticipate what will be the result of this analysis.

First of all, I would suggest the reading of the traditionalist school very important authors as René Guénon, Julius Evola, Titus Burckhardt, Frithjof Schuon, Michel Valizan, or Nasser, who have explained that the modernity is a special concept. So, that modernity is not something that has to do with contemporary. Because now, in contemporary, in actual moment, we could have modern society, pre-modern society, post-modern society, archaic society, society with religious, middle-aged type of society, but living in today worlds.

So, in contemporary, it doesn't mean modern. That is very important aspect, conceptual. So, modernity, when we are speaking about modernity, we don't speak about what exists now.

It is description of kind, of type, of society, of structure, of existential horizon, of civilization. That is a little bit atemporal. So, we could imagine modernity now.

We could imagine modernity belonging to the past or to the future. And that is already very important. So, if we consider the modernity not as a fate, or we have it now, and we will have it tomorrow, and so on.

So, we are obliged to be modern. And traditionalists affirmed that to be modern is decision. You can be modern, you can be not modern.

And they have created two concepts. The tradition, the tradition, and the modernity. Tradition and modernity.

So, modernity, it is not something actual. That is a kind of society, of civilization, of world vision, of picture of the reality. That is one thing.

And there is tradition. That is the picture of reality, the civilization, the culture, the society. That is different.

And between them, affirmed by traditionalists, there is antagonism. Antagonism. That is very important, because that gives us the possibility to study modernity not as something inevitable, but as something that is the product of concrete historical development, based on concrete sequence of decisions and choices.

And the modernity is artificial, I would say. It was artificially created. It is not something that went by itself.

So, modernity is not natural. Modernity was created, is supported, is defended, is adjusted, is developed. But there is a kind of free will behind the modernity.

That is not fatality. There is not mechanical law of modernity. Because we know many societies that are not modern.

For example, Islamic society, Indian society in some aspect, archaic society. They are not modern. They exist today.

And if we consider the majority of the mankind, of humanity, today, in 21st century, lives not in the modern society. The society, they belong to traditional society. So, modernity has nothing to do, has something to do with contemporary world.

But we could study, we should understand that separately from contemporary. And we could speak about structure of modernity. So, modernity is something structural, constructed.

And that could be deconstructed. It should be deconstructed. Postmodernist philosophy is based precisely on this.

On deconstruction of modernity. With their special aspect, but that is possible. And deconstruction of modernity, and that is crucial point, and knowledge could be made from two positions.

It could be made, deconstruction of modernity, with postmodernists, with their hyper-modern ethics. So, they are disappointed, postmodernists, majority of postmodernists are disappointed with the modernity, because the modernity didn't fulfill its promises, doesn't satisfy them, their hopes and anticipations. That is a kind of despair.

They are in despair that modernity couldn't accomplish the goal it declared. So, that is postmodernity in the sense that modernity is too small. It is not enough.

The modernity is not enough, and they try to deconstruct modernity in order to show that it should be overcome. In order to create what modernity wanted to do, but couldn't accomplish by inner limitations. In the eyes of postmodernists, the modernity was too traditional.

Too traditional. Excessively traditional. That modernity could not overcome tradition, but it should, and it shall, with the postmodernism.

That is a kind of deconstruction of modernity that shows that modernity is not so much modern as it needed, as it needed to be, in the eyes of postmodernists. But what is interesting in this method? They show the artificial doing that. They show artificial nature of modernity, that modernity is creation, that modernity is based on the decision.

So, if we could deconstruct something, that someone has constructed that. So, we can

use some methods of postmodernism precisely dealing with modernity. But what is much more important, that is the other possibility to deconstruct the modernity in a much more radical way than postmodernist criticism.

That is traditionalism, that regards the modernity as a kind of the type of the structure that was created against the tradition. So, that is consideration of modernity as anti-tradition. It could be represented as a kind of reversal of all traditional values.

And what was in traditional society with the sign plus and the modernity is with minus. So, that is a kind of reversal of the traditional state of thing. As well, that was based on decision, subversion, the will to destroy and to exchange the taxes with anti-taxes in some way.

So, modernity is anti-taxes for tradition. That is traditionalist position. And what is interesting, that if postmodernists, they agree with the goal of modernity.

So, they criticize modernity as something not enough, something not sufficient. But traditionalists criticize the modernity as something awful, as something completely negative, as nihilism, as destruction, as perversion, as subversion, as demonic design of reality, or as a kind of antichrist civilization created by the conscious partisans of the satan. So, the modernity in the eyes of traditionalists is conscious satanic creation.

So, there is traditional divine society, divine world, divine soul, and there is satanic tradition, satanic order, satanic of things, satanic cosmos, and so on. That is very interesting, because this kind of deconstruction of modernity exists as well, including in our world. And we could use both.

In order to deal with modernity, we could have deconstruction from the left, postmodern deconstruction, with elaborated methodology, with traditionalist deconstruction. So, I don't insist now on who is right. I try to show that there are two possibilities to deal with modernity outside of the pretensions of modernity.

Because modernity says, oh, that is necessary, this mechanical law of development, the progress, the man is good, the man is developing, the progress is inevitable, and so on. All that is questioned by postmodernity, and all this is questioned by traditionalism. And if we unite both criticisms, methodologically we obtain something completely new.

So, we see, joining both methodologies, we see at least one thing for certain, that we are dealing with something absolutely artificial. Because both criticisms show that with all the power of persuasion, of scientific approach, from different positions, and that is very, very important. So, we could regard the modernity as something conceptual, structural, and in some way eternal.

So, modernity exists not only in contemporary world, but it is structural. If we could describe the modernity with mathematical, for example, structure, values, anti-values,

plus, minus, if we could have the kind of formula of modernity, so it could not be contemporary. So, this formula could exist in different contexts.

So, that opens to us the way to analyze the modernity as something that could be turned from the contemporary moment. So, that is very important. So, we could study modernity as we are studying, for example, Chinese culture or Roman culture, in the same way.

So, that's something that is accomplished, but that belongs to some eternal text. We could scale, to choose different scales. We could go closer, go further from modernity.

So, that is object. Modernity is the object of the study. And when we try to concretize in no logical, in no machia perspective, what is modernity, we have already spoken, that is the anti-Christianism.

Because we had in our European history, European history, we had tradition about which traditionalists speak in the form of Christian tradition. And we have shown in the previous lecture how this Christian tradition included in itself pre-Christian structures and European logos. So, tradition now, in this no logical version, is the same as Christianity, but at the same time is the same as the alliance between the Logos of Apollo with the Logos of Dionysus, in concrete historical Christian form.

So, that was and is tradition that we could identify and as well describe as type. So, if we have this concrete and positive description, of what is tradition, it is not something vague. It is concrete.

That is, Logos of Apollo is structures, is symmetry, verticality, with Logos of Dionysus, purified Dionysus, Apollonian Dionysus, in case of dialectic embedded in this version. So, everything is quite concrete. And we try, for example, to deny all that, to make a kind of reversal of that.

We receive the other type. No Apollo, no Dionysus, and now it is not only nihilism, or destruction, or parody, as tradition would say, but in our no logical analysis, we see clearly what is so-called positive content of modernity. So, the modernity is not only destruction, the chaos, the anti-anti-anti, against-against-against.

It is not nihilism. In the eyes of Logos of Apollo, there is no Logos of Cybele. There is nothing.

There is destruction, matter, or something. But in three Logos concepts, and no Mahe, there is a Logos of Cybele. There is a kind of structure that we could imagine, that we could describe, with positive inner relations.

That is why no Mahe analogy is so important now, because we, thanks to no Mahe, we have the key to deeper and better understanding on what is modernity. Because in that,

when traditionalists criticize the modernity, they use negative term. That is overthrow of the traditional values, negative nihilism.

That is conservative discourse. They belong to the tradition, they belong to Logos of Apollo and Dionysus, and they consider the end of this situation as the end of time. So, there is nihilism, negative terms.

And maybe that is the reason why they could not get the essence of modernity. Because the modernity is purely negative for them. It is purely positive for modernists.

They could as well, they could not understand the modernity, because it is for them, that's all. That's beauty, that's progress, that is something in the middle, that's nature, that's a casual sequence of the events, that we could not change, something predefined. They could not, modernists don't understand the modernity.

And traditionalists understand better than modernists, but in negative way. So, they as well, they understand not enough. And with no mafia, we could say, no, there is not only destruction, there is not only nihilism, there is not only chaotic transformation, that is new Logos.

Not new so much, there are other Logos, third one. And if we apply to the modernity this concept, we obtain completely new vision and perspective to understand the modernity. And modernity is in the reality ancient.

And that is not paradox. It is absolutely ancient, because it is precedent to the Indo-European, Turanian invasion. So, we are dealing not with something new, we are dealing in the modernity with something very, very old, that existed before Indo-European invasion, before Turanian Logos of Apollo.

So, in that case, the modernity is old, and in the European tradition Christianity is new, something new, because it was after, it came after. And the modernity is a return, return to the pre-Indo-European aspect of civilizations. That is extremely important remark, because now we are dealing not with something at the end of some natural construction.

There is nothing natural in human history. Everything is based on the Logos. So, modernity is a moment of Noamachia, that is, that came as the new attack of Titans against the gods.

And this one, that is successful attack. So, the modernity is the victory of the Titans, of Sibyl, of the Serpent, over God. That successful attack.

So, that is the moment of Noamachia, that existed in potential, potentially, as possibility, always. And when the power of light became too weak, too small, the Titans, they were liberated from the hell, from the chains. And they made interruption again in the realm of the Order.

And they have submitted the humanity to their rule. So, that is not purely negative description. There is event.

And we could speak about the Logos of modernity. So, the modernity has a Logos. In order to trace the modernity, we could come to the event, or the time, when modernity started.

That was the end of Middle Ages, and Renaissance time was the border time. So, that was precisely the moment where this Noamachia and Titanomachia reached the critical stage in Renaissance. That is the name for the special battle between the Logos of Apollo against the Logos of Sibyl, where the battle was lost by the gods.

The battle was lost by Indo-European tradition. The battle was lost by this patriarchal, patriarchy, existential horizon in favor of this alternative Logos. And we see multiple aspects of that.

That is the beginning of capitalism, of bourgeoisie, of national state. That was the beginning of secularization of the state and the society, the end of Christianity. And that was reflected in the science, because the modern science is a kind of necessary aspect of the modernity.

So, we are living in the world where our understanding of the reality is based on the science. And this science, modern science, it is called modern science, to make a difference with Middle Ages science, this science is very special. We could consider its structure.

When we begin to read the first texts of authors of modern science, we see a very special feature. They criticized Aristotle. Aristotle, that was a kind of dogmatic scientific concept of Middle Ages, and that was scholastic, that was Christian, and in orthodox context, Aristotle's teaching was adapted by John Damaskin to orthodox Christianity, orthodox doctrine.

And the Western Christianity, that was scholastic tradition, based on combination between Platonic and Aristotle concept. And Aristotle and the second, the lesser scale Platonism were overthrown in the beginning of the scientific world vision. And we could trace what concretely was attacked.

How this titan and magia were developed in the fields of the scientific theorists. I have dedicated my first thesis to the concept of creation and appearance of modern science. First of all, there was the criticism against a natural places theory of Aristotle.

A natural or anisotropic version of the space. Anisotropic version of the space, or understanding of the space, or the natural places Aristotelean theory, was based on the concept of what is movement. According to Aristotle, everything has its own goal.

It's out until here. And the goal is the final reason. So, that is equivalent with natural space.

So, everything has its natural space. And the movement of the thing, it is moving towards this natural place. When the thing reaches its natural space, the movement ends.

So, the movement is because all the things are not in their natural space. They are moving towards them, but they prevent each other to get there. And that defines the nature of movement.

So, everything strives to reach its natural space. And because it is a little chaotic under the sphere of Moon, according to Aristotle, there is chaotic movement. So, everybody hurts the other.

So, nobody is in its own space. Only God has reached from the beginning. Internally, He is in His space, natural space.

Everything other is out. And that is why everything is living. Everything is moving.

That's the explanation of the nature of kinetic movement. But that creates the special space with the center. Absolute center.

And absolute center for each thing. The absolute center for each thing is its natural place. So, everything is striving somewhere.

Somewhere that is more important and more natural for things than other place. So, you could be at home. The concept of home is very important.

The home is natural place. We are going home. And everything is going home.

It is return. It is return to the God. But only God is in His own place.

That is immovable mover. It is something that moves everything, but is not moved by anything. That's the concept.

So, the space or the cosmos is theocentric. The space is theocentric. And there is a kind of sacred geography.

With special sacred centers. With special points of cults. And all cosmos has the meaning, the structure and reason.

So, there is a center. The main attack of Galileo Galilei, Copernicus and others was again this concept of the natural place. Therefore, there is no natural place.

And there is no final reason. There is only casual reason. So, there is the reason of movement if something makes impact on another thing.

So, there is casual reason, but final reason doesn't exist. Because there is no goal. There is no teleology of the movement.

And there is no center. Absolute center. Everything is related.

Everything is moving chaotically. As in the Aristotelian version. But with no plan, with no goal.

And everything is defined by the previous cause. So, the cause belongs to the past. And there is no cause of the future.

There is no eschatology, no goal. Everything is casual. And there is no center.

There is no center in space. Everything is related. So, there is no anisotropic space.

There is isotropic space. Isotropic space, so you go anyway with the same possibility, because there is no natural space for it. So, everything is absolutely relative.

And that was destruction of Apollonian structure of space, and time, and thing, and destiny, and history. Everything is destroyed with that. And that was so-called scientific discovery.

Postmodernist show, that was publicity. That was the war of the school of laboratory. Everything in Galileo Galilei was a kind of trick, organized in order to convince the audience that he is great.

But his personal motivations we could put aside. But what was the meaning of Galileo Galilei and the other founding father of modernity? They destroyed Logos of Apollo, represented in Plato and Aristotle, by the Logos of Sibyl. And the Logos of Sibyl was not their discovery.

That was returned to the third form of ancient Greek pre-Socratic philosophy, represented by Democritus, and later by Epicurus and Lucretius. They were put aside in the Christian version. Christian world vision was based on Plato and Aristotle.

And Democritus, and Epicurus, and Lucretius were put aside, were forgotten. They were purged, I would say, by Logos of Apollo. Because they belonged to the other vision, atomistic vision, to the materialistic vision, that was already in the ancient time, before Plato, they were anti-Indo-European, and they belonged to the context of Logos of Sibyl.

And they reappeared in the Renaissance. So, that is not new. That was something that was denied, that was put off, that was prohibited, I would say.

That is some prohibited knowledge that reappeared as a dominating one. So, postmodernists show that there was nothing convincing in the new ideas. And they won not because they were more true.

They have won because they won. Because there was something changed in the mind of the Renaissance man, that has opened the way to Logos of Sibyl to return with scientific premises. There was atomism.

Atomism belonged to the past. Atomism was rejected by Christian version of structure of cosmos, but by Christian cosmology, and it returned with Boyle, with Newton, with Gassendi, with Hobbes, with Descartes. So, that was a kind... and that was not the chance that Marx has dedicated his doctorate to relations between Epicurus and Democritus.

So, the most modern philosopher of the 19th century dealt in his doctorate with a very old problem of the matter, of the atomism, of the evolution. Because evolution of almost Darwinian type, we see Lucretius. Lucretius in his poem, that was the idea of the evolution of the species.

So, everything in the beginning, the species were confused, and little by little they developed into the creatures we know. And that was by the Venus, by the Holy Mother, that was produced. And in Lucretius there is purely civilian topics with purely scientific.

So, in this Lucretius concept there are as well black gods in the Democritus. Democritus said that the gods as well have bodies and diamonds as well. So, that was atomic.

So, they live more than the body of human, but they as well die. So, dying gods of Democritus, black gods or diamonds. So, there was a mixture between scientific and mythological topics.

But what kind of mythology was that? That was purely materialistic, Ktonian, and civilian mythology. So, at the same time, destruction of verticality, of old order, of old Middle Ages doctrine, and Christian teaching, destruction that was replacement by new world vision, based on civilian ideology, we could say. Civilian ideology is strictly materialist and immanentist.

There is no heaven. There is no transcendental God. There is substance, and everything grows from this substance.

And the growth has reason as cause, but has no final reason. Because this growth is something that kind of fuses. It is kind of grows as such, with no reason.

So, that is a kind of immanent process. And there is no attractor. There is no point to which this growth leads, because that is the huge immanent substance that has the goal in itself.

So, the reason is, the cause is, the final reason is not. So, that was reflected in the cosmology of Copernicus. That is not the shift from geocentric to heliocentric doctrine, but the reason of Copernican revolution was there is no center at all.

Everything is related. So, the earth was not the center, was not natural place of incarnation of God. It is something casual.

The earth is something casual. It is some ball that is revolving around some other fireball and so on. In the context of the other balls in the infinite, disordered, chaotic, atomic tradition.

But it is important that according to Democritus, atom could be small, invisible or great. So, that is something like very modern concept of the body. The heavenly body of the particle and so on.

So, that was reflected in the scientific vision. And what is considered today to be scientific, it is the same as civilian. Civilian is scientific.

What is not civilian, what for example insists on the existence of natural place, is not scientific, is mythological. But there is the change of the locus, but it was not immediately. The locus of civilian in scientific world vision appropriated some aspect of Apollonian rationalism, of logic, of dialectic, Dionysian dialectic, but everything was put under this sign of civility.

So, that was a kind of post-Apollonian culture and that was different with pre-Apollonian kingdom or civilization of Lepensky Vir or Vinča or Čatalgu Juk. So, the civilization of great mother was pre-Apollonian and modernity is the same civilization with the same structure, with the same locus, but post-Apollonian. So, that was appropriation of methods, of logic, of philosophy and put under control of this materialistic, atomistic, immanentistic, substantialist domination.

That was reflected in the politics. Very interesting. That was destruction of empire.

That was the essence of modern politics. Because empire, as we have seen, was the normative organization of Christian political space. In Byzantine sense, but as well in the Western Catholic sense.

So, the concept of modern state and concept of nation were two concepts directed against empire. So, that was atomic vision of the state. The state of social, political atom.

With no reason, and the difference between modern state and the empire, there is no reason, final reason, there is no natural space, there is no function or mission of katechon. That was the national statehood is directed against katechonic mission. So, it is directed against the sacredness of empire and mission of empire.

Modern state, by definition of Jean Badin or Thomas Hobbes, is created from below as a kind of social contract. And that is Leviathan in Hobbes. That modern state is not reflection of the heavenly paradigm.

It is created that has no reason, has no final reason. It has reason as cause. The reason of this modern state is social contract.

So, it is created by the people, by the individuals, in order to prevent them from the other individuals. So, that is completely different concept of politics. It is a revelation that Hobbes has called the Leviathan, the serpent, that modern state.

Modern state is serpent, is a dragon, that is mechanically organized from below, in order to destroy everything that is sacred. The modern state is directed against the empire and its region. And that appeared precisely in the Renaissance with scientific vision, with this completely new understanding of the religion.

And the modern state should be secular. Secular, so, with no religious sense. It could have church, Protestant or Catholic or Orthodox, but church should be separated and existed outside of politics.

So, the modern state is titanic. And modern national state is anti-Christian, anti-traditional, anti-European, anti-Apollonian and Dionysian. It is purely titanic.

It is serpent and dragon. And as such it was introduced as Leviathan in the beginning of the modernity. So, we have... What is nation? Nation, as well, that is concept, that appeared precisely, in modern meaning, in the Renaissance.

Nation is the people or population, better, population, living inside of national state. So, nation is absolutely artificial. And that is the community of citizens.

Citizens, who are those, who have created the social contract. So, the citizens are participating in social contracts. And citizens can redefine, concluding, the other social contracts, the state.

For example, the citizens could conclude that they don't want to live anymore in Belgium and they want to have Flemish state or Apollonian state. They have all the right, because the Belgium has no reason. It is not reflection of something that is transcendental.

It is the result of social contracts. So, the people can create Yugoslavia, can destroy Yugoslavia, if they want. They want, because there is no Yugoslavia.

There is no France, there is no Belgium, there is no Germany. They could easily create one, or destroy it, if they think that is better for them. So, that is absolutely imminent concept of the politics.

And it could be reflected in the vertical structure of state as a tradition, of pre-Siberian Indo-European tradition. But it is from the beginning titanic. That is, the new kind of hierarchy, titanic bureaucracy, with new type of dominating figure.

This type we should regard and describe carefully. Because in modern state there are

not the priests. It is clear that secularism put the priests outside of the government.

So, they could exist as cultural institution on the margin. For example, as cults, or funerals, or weddings. Something like, not so important, but less and less important.

Because the marginalization of the church is the process of the modernity, political modernity. And church should be put more and more outside of the political scenario. In the case of the warriors, warriors that were noble class, aristocracy of the traditional state, they should be marginalized as well.

They should be a kind of mercenary by state. They could not have their arms with them. They should, because the arm was a symbol, a possession of arm, a symbol of warrior.

They take the arm from the state. And when the state thinks that it is enough for them to fight, the state takes the arms back. And it is difficult with sword, but it is easy with cannon or tank.

So, development of the state weapon, or nuclear weapon, you could not possess it, being aristocratic warrior with little nuclear missile, with private ownership. But if you have no weapon, you are not autonomous warrior. You are just hired mercenary that serves as a servant with something that is given to you by the state and that is decided bureaucratically.

So, warrior is not the type that decides. Priests are not the type who decides. And who decides? And there appears new figure, bourgeois.

We are calling that capitalist system. We are calling this bourgeois system. And bourgeois is a normative figure in the modernity and political way.

And now we should regard or make kind of structural analysis of what is it. What is it? It is conventional wisdom that bourgeois belongs to the third state. Tiersita.

Third state. That is third function. There you are.

First priest, second warrior, and bourgeois third. And it is called tiersita in French. Tiersita.

Третье сословие in Russian. But here lays misunderstanding. Very interesting misunderstanding.

Because it is represented by the man that lives in the city, bourgeois, and is occupying with the commerce. He is commercial. That is bourgeois.

So, but this figure was absent in the Turanian society that was nomadic and was very marginal in the traditional sedentary European and Indo-European society where existed third function. Third function. Pastoralists and cattlers in one case and peasants in the

other case.

But they were not bourgeois. So, third function in the classical Indo-European society was or peasant or cattler. And not the merchant living in the city.

So, bourgeois is something new. It was as nomadic. We could not say that that is traditional third function that overcome first and second.

It is not tiersita in the Indo-European sense. There is something else. And bourgeois and merchant living in the city is not cattler.

He has nothing to do with cows, with sheep, with goats. And he has nothing to do with lumbering earth. So, he is not peasant.

He is turned from that. But who that is? Who is bourgeois? He is something that is between warrior and peasant. That is very lazy peasant that doesn't want to work on the earth.

And it is coward as warrior because he could not afford that. He is middle. So, lazy peasant and coward warrior.

So, it is slave. It is kind of in Russian language there is holob. The name holob.

Holob is slave of the master. So, he helps to master to live good. So, it is not servant we could say.

It is not free or not free peasant working in its field. Maybe paying taxes or giving something else. He doesn't participate in the battle.

So, he is between people and aristocracy. Between second and first functions and third. Because the cities in the European cities were created, founded by warriors.

In order to be kind of fortress in their military strategic relations with the space and with the people. So, they were a kind of secondary worker serving these warriors. And that was artificial class that has grown with the growth of the commercial commerce in this city.

So, their appearance as an important class begins precisely in the same moment when begins the Sibelian Revenge. So, they are special form of new type, sociological type, living in the city, busy with the commerce. And that is important that the symbol of Sibili, traditional symbol, that the Sibeli has the town as the crown.

The crown in form of town. So, there is something bourgeois in that crown of town. And there is something perverted in the commerce.

So, to be busy with commerce, in our traditional Christian and Indo-European logic, we

have no pattern, we have no example, we have no place for that. Because it is not war, it is not walk, it is not rites, religious rites. It is something that has no place in the traditional society.

But it could exist in the margin of the society in order to facilitate some technical aspect. But that never was a kind of class or function that never had its own mythology, its own ethic, its own tradition. And we see in bourgeois something completely unnatural for our tradition.

And bourgeois dealing with the commerce, with the exchange, they say mild commerce, it is not war, because they are covert. They could not take away, as the warrior make, or they could peacefully work for their fields. Embedded in the traditional society with many cultural traditions concerning any step in life.

That is the peasant life. That is the peasant turn from the tradition. That is warrior that could not fight.

So, that is perversion. The bourgeois is the ill type. It is completely sick, sociological sickness, representation of perversion in our traditional way.

So, the majority of bourgeois were peasants. But the peasants turn from their natural state. And when the peasant, that by some reason has lost its possibility, its field, its possibility, its place in the village, its normal place, in its natural place of peasant, when it loses it, it comes to town.

But who is the peasant in town? Nobody. He is idiot. Idiot in Greek sense that the person with no collective identity.

So, that is something individual, that is atomic. And the atom was the basis of the new materialistic science of Renaissance. So, there is new and old figure, but that had no place in the traditional society.

So, that is something that was regarded with pity maybe in traditional society. It is ill peasant, because lazy or too arrogant. And it is covert warrior that didn't want to fight.

So, that is perversion. It could always be underclass being. So, bourgeois is underclass.

Bourgeoisie is underclass. The group of sick, mad, perverted, antinormal human being that are idiotical by semantic definition. So, they have no organic relations with collective identity.

The identity is artificially constructed. So, they didn't belong to the traditional warrior or agricultural societies. And they were devoid of any organic collective qualities.

So, they came to the city and they tried to find their way. And that is not the case that bourgeois were some from other places or other ethnic group. Because they were

individuals put in the city and not belonging to the traditional corporation and form.

And they began to grow in number. And they began to define the normative vision of the social type, normative type. They have dethroned warriors.

They have dethroned priests. And they have as well misrepresented third state. Because they hated, bourgeois hates peasants.

Because it exploits him. He don't let him to sell his things openly because he buy it by itself. And they make a speculation.

They are speculators. They don't produce nothing. And they make a kind of balls of money in order to manipulate with production.

So, they are unproductive. Bourgeois is unproductive. Peasants are unproductive.

But at the same time, bourgeois were partly peasants. Because they came to town from where? Some part from other ethnic groups or some marginal groups. They became bourgeois.

But the majority, the growth of bourgeois state was from peasants. But now we see the real logical mystery. But who were the peasants? European peasants.

They were the member of civilization of Sibeli under control in the European horizon. And when they returned from this controlled structure, the origins of the Sibelian origins of the peasantry could be revealed. So, that is a kind of liberation of the deepest level of peasant European identity that taking from the special Christian and traditional aristocracy, feudal, vertical society was liberated.

So, they were bearers of some very ancient archetypes of ancient collective unconsciousness that was reanimated precisely in the moment of the end of the Middle Ages. So, we see that modernity and all political theory that were developed in the later phases of modernity dealt with this bourgeois organization. The pure and the most important glorification of bourgeois is liberalism.

So, it is dealing with ideals. Ideals in semantical sense. Because the man devoid of any kind of collective identity is ideal in Greek sense.

So, liberalism is from the beginning idealism. So, that is glorification of ideals. The individuals devoid of any kind of collective identity is clear.

But communism is dealing with the same concept. Because communists hated as well peasants. They think that everything is developing in the city.

And the poor bourgeois are proletarian. The rich bourgeois are bourgeois. But both of them are purely modern in the conceptual sense, industrial figures living in the city.

Not outside of the city. So, communism was idea that poor bourgeois should overcome rich bourgeois. And create the society where proletariat should dominate over bourgeois.

But who are proletariat? That were ex-peasants coming to city with poor ex-peasants. And these ex-peasants were devoid precisely in the communist conception from relations with the traditional society. And that was positive in the eyes of communists.

So, they were not more peasants and being no more peasants in communist eyes was the same as having no relations with religion, with the cult, with the culture, with the language, with the traditions and so on. They were as well a kind of the other form of ideals. They were rich ideals or more or less easy ideals.

Bourgeois is basic figure of liberalism. And poor ideals were proletarians. But they should be cut from tradition, from traditional state, priests, warriors or peasants.

And they should be put in the artificial commercial structure, commercial spaces of the modern bourgeois city. That was one of the ideas of communism. And that was good.

If we read Marxist manifest, the first, the majority of it, it dedicated what communism is not. Marxist communism. And Marxism, Marx and Engels, they stressed that it is not enough to be anti-bourgeois to be communist.

It is necessary to be post-bourgeois and not pre-bourgeois. And the criticism of the first part of the manifest of the communist party was directed against so-called aristocracy, anti-bourgeois, anti-capitalist traditions that were as well anti-bourgeois, but pretending to restore some pre-bourgeois traditions. So, communism said, no, in comparison with feudal or traditional society, communists should be on the side of bourgeois, of capitalism.

But they should not only destroy traditional society, but they should help to destroy traditional society. But after the poor citizen of the city, bourgeois it is as well, the bourgeois, someone who lives in the bourg, in the city, in town, poor citizen should overcome rich citizen. After destroying any kind of traditional society.

So, proletarians, as bourgeois, are absolutely untraditional. There are two concepts, two ideotic, semantically, ideotic concepts. Because there is rich ideot and poor ideot.

And poor ideots and communist vision should win rich ideots, take richness from them and distribute among the ideots. And where is business in this situation? That should be transformed in proletariat. They should be proud to the cities.

That is the concept of how to merge the villages with the city. The village was the enemy of Marxism, of communism. So, village should be destroyed and transformed in the city.

And the peasant should be transformed in the worker. And workers should be normally industrial workers, living in the city, working in the fabric. So, that is as well mechanical vision.

So, that was materialistic as well as liberalism. And that is the second political theory. The third political theory was as well absolutely Sibyllian.

That is maybe difficult for Sergeant with patriotic feeling. But the idea that modern state is artificial creation. Modern state is based on destruction of empire.

Modern state is based on the social contract. And nation is artificial creation of bourgeois. Nation is bourgeois concept.

Purely bourgeois concept. It is not organic community with the state, with warriors, priests and peasants. The nation is the concept in center of which is the chauvinistic, egoistic citizen of the city.

And the state is created as the city. Not as empire. And the peasants as well were considered to be secondary.

So, they live between one city and the other. They have no space, proper space. They were considered as citizen, but the term citizen.

City is town. Peasant is not citizen. He is villager.

So, in the normative concept of political nationalism, peasants were included. We should speak citizens and villagers, for example. But we are speaking only about citizens.

Because we consider peasants to be the citizens, the towners of the second sort. So, they were subhuman in some way. Politically subhuman in nationalist, communist and as well liberal concept.

So, that was the split in the third function in the beginning of modernity. The split between Indo-European peasantry, traditional and this ex-peasantry. Ex-peasants coming to town and becoming bourgeois or proletarian or nationalist.

So, that is why all three political theories. Communism, liberalism and nationalism are in absolutely CBLM. Because modern nationalism is modern.

It is based on the bourgeois concept. So, that is artificial unity of the citizens. That accentuate not only the freedom of commerce, but most the defense of their own commercial interest by nation or bureaucracy or state.

So, we have... Now, we could apply that to geography of Europe. Where started the modernity? The modernity started partly in Italy, partly in the northern part of Europe. But the most clear and most bright examples of modernity was Great Britain.

That began creation of this bourgeois version. That was not revolutionary bourgeois, but evolutionary bourgeois history. They tried to introduce more and more bourgeois elements in the government.

So, Hobbes was one of English politician theorists, political theorists. But with Cromwell and with Protestantism, with revolution, that was the bourgeois revolution. And the killing of the tsar, of the monarch, that was a kind of symbolical action of the strongmen of the traditional Indo-European locus.

And Protestantism was, as well as we have seen, a kind of titanism inside of Christianity. And all these elements, the development of bourgeois, the rigid seat, the killing of monarch, and Protestantism, that was the England that was in the center. And the fight of Englishmen against Celt-Catholic was in a drama, because the modernity was on the side of Anglo-Protestants.

And tradition, in their case, in this bipolarity case of English culture, tradition and continuity was on the side of the Celts. That is why the Celts were, in that sense, defenders, the last defenders of more or less traditional society in front of purely modernist, Sibelian, English society. It is very interesting that there was a traditional concept of four empires in Christian culture.

The first empire was Assyrian, the second empire was Achaemenid, the third empire was Greek, and the fourth empire was Roman. And that was considered, that was put in the context with Daniel, prophet Daniel's vision of the giant. Giant with the gold head, with silver breast, with copper meat, metal, bronze, and thighs, and iron foot.

And that was, iron foot represented Roman empire, most radical but traditional empire. And so, this tradition had some ties with Catechon, that was transition of Catechon. And the Roman empire was considered to be the last one, where Christ was born.

So, we had normal concept of four empires, and the fourth empire was Roman. Roman, Byzantine, the same, Roman. Including all the continuation, with third Rome, and so on, with Russia, and Bulgarian kingdoms, and so on.

And the idea that in the English-Britain revolution, there was the concept of the fifth empire. Fifth empire, that was called fifth monarchism, that was tendency that that should be the other empire, beyond Roman one. Beyond, that was considered, beyond the Rome as Catholic.

So, that was a kind modern secular Protestant empire, and that was called fifth monarchism. And there were two versions of it, that was interesting in Dutch, in Holland. There was Jewish version of it, that the fifth empire should be Jewish one.

That was among the Jews of the circle of Spinoza, of the philosopher Spinoza. And that was Anglo-Saxon concept of fifth monarchism. And they were linked with the same

circles of Protestant, English-Protestant living in Holland, and coming back to England to give the status of fifth monarch to Cromwell.

So, but in the story of this giant, that is the symbol of this fourth empire, there is agile concept, that in the feet, iron feet of giant, there are something as sand, we could say. And this sand is the fifth element in giant. And thanks to this sand, the giant will fall.

So, there is a kind of symbol of anti-Christian, post-Christian, post-traditional element, fifth element, the sand, that makes all this empire not stable. So, the fifth empire is precisely the end of empire, the destruction of empire, destruction of traditional order. Because it has to do with sand, the fifth element in the vision of Daniel.

And that is the concept of fifth empire, of fifth monarchy, that was British empire. British empire was anti-empire, that was based on bourgeois concept, on nationalism, liberalism, socialism was absent. That was the first and the third political theory represented in this British empire.

So, British empire was the first modern empire, that was anti-traditional empire, and that was one of the main sources, philosophical as well, with the philosophy of common sense. Common sense philosophy is absolutization of the little individual with idiotic scale of thought, with no great revelations, some mediocrity, the absolutized mediocrity, represented by Reid, by Ferguson. And that was the basic of North American society, because these Scotland philosophers of common sense, they were considered to be philosophical fathers of North American society.

That was glorification of idiotic mind, with very narrow interest, with pragmatism, with little concern as development of Protestant titanism and positivism. I'm calling that positive subject, that is second man in the three-man theory of Tauler, of German mystic. So, that was evolutionary bourgeois, but at the same time in France, there was preparation of revolutionary bourgeois concept, that culmination was French revolution, with the concept of purely anti-Christian motivation, with Scarlet Woman as the symbol of the freedom of the new, with the killing of monarch.

So, that was as well the other revolutionary form, with socialism already, with the concept of preparing socialism, social democracy, idea of absolutely immanent, anti-Christian, openly, not in the Protestant way, but purely atheistic, materialistic, and enlightenment theory was a kind of culmination of all this modernity. And so, modernity started with that, with the revenge of Sibeli, and all the history of modernity was a kind of purification of this neological pattern. So, the civilization of Sibeli became more and more and more Sibelian.

So, that was all traces of the previous in the European traditional society were purged, were cleaned. So, that was a kind of creation from more and more perfect neologus of Sibeli, and because, for example, that was revolutionary 300 years ago, after that it was

considered conservative. So, there were new stages, but that was the construction of Babel, that was the construction of very ancient type of civilization, and when we are dealing with modern feminism, that is the finalization of the process, it is not the beginning of something.

So, when now Sibeli appears as it is, this March of Madonna in New York against Trump, with thousands and hundreds of thousands of women with roses, cats, disguised in order to kill Trump, that is a kind of call for castration, for castration of the male figure, that they try to sacrifice Trump as a symbol of patriarchy. So, he is macho, male, complete, he is a symbol of the previous stage of civilization. So, modern feminism, and politics, and minds in education, and social norms, and this juridical acceptance of homosexuality, that was the part of the Sibelian procession.

Homosexuality was a kind of part of typically Sibelian cult. They participate in the procession as special type of priests. The homosexuals are priests of Sibeli.

So, now everything comes back to the pure image of that. But feminism didn't start yesterday, or doesn't start today. Feminism started with Titanism.

The modernity was metaphysically feminist, because materialist, because orientated against this heroic type of patriarchy in the European culture. Bourgeois is feminist class already, because it is not warrior, it is not worker, it is parasitic class. And that is the worst form of feminine nature.

It is not Indo-European or Christian concept of femininity. It is something completely different. It is Sibelian femininity.

And Werner Zomberg has said that capitalism began with the mistresses. Because when the people had wives, so they were not so obliged to have more and more money. But having mistresses, they were obliged to participate in the speculations more and more, because they needed excessive amount of money.

And mistresses were parasites that demanded more and more, with no work and so on. According to Werner Zomberg, that was a kind of motivation of capitalist development, of capitalist society. But it is anecdotal, sociological anecdote.

But all our science is feminist, because it is materialist, it is Sibelian. And we are living in the world of Sibelian modernity. And now we are, and we will speak about that later, tomorrow, in the last session of this lecture.

But we are living inside this kind of civilization. So, the moment of no-mafia we are living in, it is the moment of revenge of pre-Indo-European existential horizon, artificially with bourgeois, organic, but very ancient with our world vision, scientific world vision, based on this lowest level of the peasants' identity, of European peasantry. So, we have a kind of special image now of modernity that is explained as well with Christian vision.

That is the end of Catechon. The Catechon has fallen. The Catechon was the king, the tsar, the emperor that defended traditional society, and that was defeated by modern political system with all those democracies, national states, globalization today.

And that was the fate, the same fate for Christian faith. That was the fate for traditional, all three traditional functions, because there is less and less peasants. So, we have no peasants in Europe, we are losing them.

Everybody is citizen, everybody is bourgeois, or poor bourgeois, proletarian, or rich bourgeois. And we are living precisely in the post-Catechonian cycle. So, that is when Satan is liberated, when there is a kind of intrusion of underground tendency that we see around us.

So, everything fits well in this logical analysis. Now we see that this knowledge that could appear a little bit abstract, a little bit too metaphysical, has to do with the reality we are living in. So, we are inside of this normative, we are part of this fight and the battle of the locus.

And we could not be free from that. We are defined absolutely, everything in us is defined by this moment of normative. We consider the reality as we are taught, as it is imposed.

We could not deal with reality as such. We are dealing with reality through a kind of reading, the type of reading, through paradigm. And this paradigm is defined now by locus of civility.

But the knowledge that there are two other locus help us to see relativity of modernity. And to put the modernity in the context of knowledge and to define it, well, geosocial place we are in. So, if French and England were first in order to promote this in the geosocial of Europe, Latin worlds and Austrian Empire resisted against that.

Russia resisted more than others. Ottoman Empire resisted, because that was a well-traditional society. But when traditional empires have fallen, new modern states appeared.

And being modern, they were doomed, if we think that they could transmit traditional spirit. Modernity and traditional are incompatible. Creating national state instead of traditional kingdom, we are already doomed.

The creation of modern state, Russian or Serbian, is the end of Russian and Serbian. That will be the state, modern, but not Russian and not Serbian. What is modern could not be really Serbian or Russian or German.

It is already simulacrum. It is already something Sibelian. So, that is why, maybe, that could explain as well, I'm anticipating the next lecture, maybe that could explain as well

some aspect of modern Serbian history, on Yugoslavia, Serbia, because after liberating from Ottoman Empire, that was traditional, that was the chance to revival.

And the chance was lost, because of many reasons. But that's the next lecture. We will, maybe, openly discuss that, some concept.

But, in order to finish, I think that knowledge and geography now gives us the key to interpret the world we live in. Please. So, I would just like to run this bio in the anticipation of the lesson tomorrow, kind of the same way.

And I would argue that Serbs are actually the chosen children of Sibeli, if we look at our history. So, we were liberated, as peasants, from the Ottoman Empire, which was a catechum in its very essence. The sultan is the caliph, he is the ruler of Islam, against Abu'l-Habib, which is the realm of the Satan, or Shaytan.

The Austrian Empire was also a catechum, he protected the Catholic ecumenical from the Protestant heresy, and the Muslim invaders were Satan and that cosmos. We inadvertently led Russia into a war, because the Russian catechum, the Russian tsar, entered on our side. And we destroyed three empires as ourselves.

Now, when we created our state, it was, as Akhmetitchar, a historian said, a heaven for peasants. So, it was a peasant republic, in a sense. The king was chosen by parliament, eventually.

We also were full of regicide. We killed Gnaz Mikhail, we killed Kai Alexander, we killed Franz Ferdinand, the heir of the catechum of Austria. So, the raison d'etre of the Serbian state was to protect the Serbs, the Serbian people, from killing each other, via high dukes and mutual raids, etc., and to protect them from the Ottoman Empire, and eventually to protect the multitude of religious and ethnic identities inside Yugoslavia from each other.

And from evasion from Italy and Austria. So, it was a purely modernistic raison d'etre to exist as a state. We had a thing called Timochka Bruna, which was a rebel from peasants, because the state took their weapons away.

Because it needed to create them from free peasant warriors, in a sense, into servants of the state. We are, in a sense, since our second resurrection, after we were liberated from the Ottoman Empire, the children of Sibeli, and we have remained it ever since. Even though we think of ourselves as conservatives and religionists.

So, just a segue for tomorrow. Very interesting, very interesting. We are going to develop that.

But, in some sense, we are all children of Sibeli. Russians as well. And that is a special idea, but this tendency, matriarchal tendency, is almost prevailing in Russia.

We have constructed a completely Sibelian communist society, with domination of the Mother of Iran. So, there was nothing heroic in that. That was purely materialistic and matriarchal system.

And we had many matriarchal traditions in our peasant, absolutely peasant society. So, it is not political propaganda, so we could accept something that is not so pleasant, so valuing in a difficult time. And I agree, that fits very well in this description.

And what is going on now in Russia or in Serbia as well. But, in order to make correct description of what is going on, we need to understand the many levels of that. So, that is very important, that nothing is lost forever.

So, in this knowledge, eternity exists, eternity as possibility. So, if there is something that prevails today, that doesn't mean that this eternity is so. So, there is the other aspect.

So, alternative, in Logos, nomachia could not be closed, it continues. So, if it continues, that we have something other than you have described. And I am sure I could testify that there is in Serbian people something other.

Absolutely, and that is seen clearly in Russian as well, in other people. But, I agree, so I am very, very happy that you could manage the concept in some way in order to apply to concrete situation. That is precisely my idea, to give kind of tools in order to analysis.

And the results of analysis could be inexpectable for us, for myself. That is some of the tools, metaphysical tools. So, now, questions or something, or commentaries? Yes, please.

I have a question. When you mentioned the bourgeois class as a part of the peasant class, can you or could you explain the bourgeois class as a remnant of the hunter-gatherer society? As a gatherer part of the society. Because there are very similar things they do.

For example, they use as the main tool for survival, gathering stuff they didn't make. Interesting, interesting idea. Maybe I didn't think about that, but that is very interesting remark.

About bourgeois as well, there is interesting analysis of Marcel Mauss and Georges Bataille, concerning how this... But gatherer-hunter society was based on the balance. You take, maybe you don't produce what you take, but you give what you take. So, that is in the rites, in initiation.

So, you eat, you are eaten. So, the main rite of initiation is to be eaten. You kill the beasts, you are killed by the beasts.

So, there is a kind of you obtain, you lose. So, if you gather too much, you should destroy it in the orgy. That was based on the balance.

And bourgeois logic is a little bit more warrior-like. So, that is not balanced. So, you gather more and more, accumulate.

So, there is a kind of asymmetry. And you don't destroy that. So, that is the growth, because gatherer society is based on the balance.

And bourgeois consciousness is open, it's conflictual. So, they try to have all their richness, take, accumulate. And the growth of richness is the ideology of bourgeois class.

So, it is conflictual. So, it creates unbalance. That is the difference.

But maybe, methodologically, it could be some parallels. In a way, yes, that is true. But, when you accumulate enough as a gatherer or as a bourgeois, you become the target of the other.

And eventually, in the end, it's all taken away from you. You do not get to keep anything. But, yes, in hunter-gatherer system, there was the idea of patlage, of destruction of the extra products.

That is the main feature of gatherer society. So, not only when you become the target, but when you accumulate too much, you should destroy that. Or you will destroy it.

Not because they would like to take that. But that is illness. But bourgeois is illness, sickness.

They try to accumulate more and more. And all the construction of prevision of development of modern economy is based on limitless growth of the rich. So, they could not imagine the world when there is limited quantity of goods.

So, the goods should be produced more and more. Oligarchs should be more and more rich. And idea itself, that it could have limits, goes against the concept of bourgeoisie.

So, they could not stop by themselves. And they should kill everybody as a kind of wave of revenge. So, they gather... Because that is damned part in the bataille.

The concept of bataille is damned part. So, in order to keep the society economically, materially normal, balanced, you should destroy its damned part. It's your damnation.

But capitalism is accumulation of damnation. So, it is a kind of... They commit more and more crime and injustice in order to make this damned part grow. Maybe they are hunter-gatherers, but they are mad hunters and gatherers, bourgeois.

So, they follow some pattern that is conflictual. But the warriors deal with death openly,

heroically. They deal with unbalanced situation.

They are traumatically, to be warriors, to have the trauma. But bourgeois would like to have a trauma and not have a trauma. So, they are completely perverted type of men, bourgeois.

So, they would like to consume and not produce. They would like to have and not pay. They want to trick and not to be tricked.

So, they want eternal growth that will be recompensed by nothing. So, that is with no pay, with eternal life, artificial intelligence. That is pure pathology.

Bourgeois class modernity is pure pathology in any senses. But this is an interesting remark.