

Noomakhia Lecture 9. Serbian Logos - Alexander Dugin (Serbia 2018)

So, let us concentrate on the thermal locks. First of all, there is, absolutely, and that is sure and certain, there is such thing as Servant Dasein, or Servant Existential Horizon. And it's absolutely sure, because there is the Servant People.

And having Servant People, that means that there is such thing as Servant Dasein and Servant Existential Horizon. As long as I know, there is no one who has dedicated to describe fully Servant Dasein with Heideggerian categories, but it is, up to the same level, the technical task. If we understand what we have said about knowledge, about Dasein, about Existential Horizon, and knowing being and time of Heidegger, we could apply his categories, or he called that Existentials, Existentials, special categories to describe Dasein.

And it is technical task to apply that to Servant Dasein. In my book, in my second book on Heidegger, that is called Martin Heidegger, The Possibility of Russian Philosophy, I've made the same for Russian Dasein. And I have arrived at the conclusion that Daseins are different, different, because Russian Dasein had, appeared to have some different kind of Existential.

So, they're based on the different structure of Russian Existential Horizon, and that is very, a kind of example, you could use that, in order to repeat the same thing for the Servant Logos, or Servant Dasein. In order to explore the possibility of Servant Philosophy, as long as I know there is no such kind of Servant Philosophy as something clear, complete, there are Servant Philosophers, but there is no such kind of thing as Servant Philosophy, as well as Russian. There is no Russian Philosophy.

There are Russian Philosophers, very brilliant, or less brilliant, but there is no such kind as Russian Philosophy. We started to create something like that at the end of the 19th century, after, many years after existence of German, and French, and Latin, Greek Philosophers, thousand years after, and that was interrupted in our history with Communists that have finished this process, and now we try to come back to the moment where we have stopped, and that is not yet a success. We are still outside of, in Russian history, outside of the moment where the process of manifestation of Russian Religious Philosophy was interrupted.

So, comparing with Servant, maybe it could serve as an example. So, I am not sure whether there is such kind of serious effort to create Servant Philosophy. It is always possible, because there is Servant Dasein, but to reveal it, to put it in the form of logos, it is not a technical problem.

We could technically approach to that, but to do that, we need some genius, Servant genius, and I am sure that it belongs to the present and the future, not to the past. In the

past, we have a kind of ground, philosophical ground for that, an existential ground, historical ground. But we could make a kind of short preliminary analysis of what is Servant existential horizon.

First of all, the first fact of the Servant historical sequence is arrival of so-called unnamed prince to the Byzantines, where he was accepted by the Byzantine Emperor. The tradition says, at first, that this unnamed prince was from White Serbia, that is identified somewhere in the north of Eastern Europe. More or less, one of the versions, one of the theories that had something to do with Lusatia, with Serbs, with one of the Polaps tribes, one of the Polaps Slav tribes, and the last traces of it are at Lusatia, Lusatia Serbs, or Sorbs, Serbs and Sorbs with Pol.

That is one of the theories, and so there is a kind of motherland, Serbian motherland, that is situated not in the Balkans, but to the north of the Balkans. At the same time, there is the question of the Urheimat of Slavs, or foremotherland of Slavs, that is situated to the north of the Carpathian Mountains. So, that was not original Serbian place, but the proto-Slavs lived to the north of the Carpathian Mountains, in the space of the western Ukraine, actually, and there was as well situated White Croatia, and White Croats were near to that, and after expansion of the Slavs, the part of the Slavs migrated to the north of the Baltic states, and among the other Polap Slavs, they were the dominating population after 5th and 6th centuries of the coasts of the Baltic Sea, and one of these Polap tribes, Ljutiči, Bodriči, and Lužičani, are presumed to be Serbian ancestors.

So, living to the west of all the other Polap tribes, and from there, this point, the ancestors of Serbs arrived to the Balkans, and after first settling to the east of the Balkans, and after that, Byzantium granted the territories to the present day Serbia as a kind of territories, in order to defend Byzantium empire against Avar, Avar that have created their Khaganates in the Pannonia and the part of Romania and modern days Hungary. So, that is conventional history, there are alternative, many alternative versions, but let us take that as something kind of orientation. So, what is interesting, how was the name of the territory of Polap Slavs? That was called the European Sarmatia, Sarmatia, and that was dominated by the Sarmatian tribes.

So, that was the Slavs were very closely connected with Sarmatians, Iranian nomadic groups of population, that occupied almost all Eastern Europe, but not as population, but much more as ruling class, and from these Sarmatian, Sarmatian groups were created a kind of ruling class of Eastern European society, that was afterwards developed this idea in Poland, who traced the roots of their aristocracy to the Sarmats, the same for Balts, and it seems when we study the type of the society of Polabian Slavs, that they were Turanian in our sense, they were very very warrior, they had not so much developed peasantry, they had peasantry, but not so much developed, the major feature of the Polabian Slavs were precisely their warrior-like attitudes, they having the horses and

veneration of horses, and they were very very independent, they couldn't tolerate any power above them, so they were Sarmatian type, Turanian type, they spoke Slavic languages, but with many Sarmatian features, we could not say nothing for sure about the balance between Sarmatian aristocracy and Slavic population, but the type of Polabian Slavs was Sarmatian and Turanian, with serious amount of aristocracy, of noble men, warrior with horse, and that is Turanian type of society. What is interesting, that there was a difference between this Polabian type of Sarmatian Slavs and Sklavins, the other Slavic group coming to the Eastern Balkans with Avars, there dominated more peasantry, so the Serbs coming to Balkans were the bearers of this Sarmatian spirit, and that affected Serbian identity, and after the peasantry was developed, and Slavification of other Thracians and maybe pre-Thracians population was accomplished, because the territory where Serbs, first Serbs settled in the Balkans, belonged before them to Thracians, and Thracian society was mixed between Indo-European, three-functional Indo-European society, and the rests or traces of the pre-Indo-European peasantry belonging to the ancient civilization of great mother. So, Serbs settled over this existential horizons, assimilated, affected, and finally created a special Serbian people.

Serbian people with difference with Bulgarian peoples, precisely on Macedonians. The dominating concept identity of the early Serbs was precisely this warrior type of human being. So, peasantry was very secondary and wasn't dominated from in the beginning, and that is why a special Serbian character was formed, based on this Palabian Sarmatian type.

So, Serbs were considered as warrior first. So, that was a kind of pre-haiduk type. So, small Serb or big Serb, everybody was a knyaz.

Little knyaz, small knyaz, big knyaz, and that was a kind of nomadic Iranian tradition, not having the great Sandom, not letting the other rule over the other, and that was a kind of aristocratic society mixed with the previous population that was as well included in the Serbian society. So, but the balance, for example, in Russia. Russian society, peasant style, is absolutely dominating.

So, that was the peasant society, and the tales and the folklores, and the story about bogatyrs were based on the peasant figures, or they were of foreign origins. So, for example, in Eastern Slavs and above all in Russian society, there was not Slavic aristocracy. All Russian aristocracy was not of Slavic origins.

They were Germans, they were maybe as well Sarmatians, but not Slavic. In Serbian case, it's not the case. There was many aristocracy families from very beginning, not one, not only dynasty, but many other secondary, third ways.

So, up to a certain point, the Serbs were aristocracy, or considered themselves to be. The aristocracy is the image. If you are knyaz, so you behave like a knyaz, so prince.

So, that is the kind of attitude, and that was dominating attitude. A similar situation was with Polish people, that everybody pretended to be so that almost one-third of population was prince, aristocracy, and in Russia, for example, there was one, less than one percent of population belonging to the aristocracy, and in Poland, one-third. So, in Serbia, maybe like that, half of population were considered to be knyaz, small knyaz, aristocracy.

But that is very important, that is warrior tradition of Sarmatian time. So, that was a kind of very important starting point for studying Serbian identity, that we could identify, including in the 21st or 20th century. So, that is the very, very stable tradition of Serbian psychology.

And so, when we have this time of society for existential horizon, it's very difficult to construct the state, because nobody nobody wants to submit to the authority of the other. So, everybody is its own authority, and there is no other authority. That is a kind of aristocratic anarchy in this kind of existential horizon.

That is the constant feature of Serbian history. The next element was the influence of the Byzantium culture. So, Serbs were christianized, living under protection of Byzantium, and that was acceptance of the christianity in the eastern form.

That was not so clear in the early phases, because there was no split before. When Serbs were christianized, there was not clear difference between orthodox and Catholicism, there was unity that was split later. But nevertheless, the dominant influence over Serbs were exercised by Byzantium, and that's very important.

And that as well, we see that was in the beginning of the Balkan Serbian, and that is in the end, now. So, that is a very stable factor, christian orthodox Byzantium tradition. But we have spoken yesterday that Byzantium tradition, orthodoxy, is not only religious tradition, it is well cultural and political and social.

So, Serbs were integrated in the context of the Byzantium empire, with Catechum as the concept, and with the patriarch as the head of the church, and as well popular christianity that integrated pre-christian tradition of the holidays of the pre-christian figures in the context of christian saints, festivals, and so on. So, christian, popular, Slav, Serbian christianity was as well, was not so much exclusive in front of the pre-christian tradition, but inclusive. So, christian, Serbian christianity included many pre-christian type of tradition, the figures, Petak, Nedelya, the saint, the saint George, Ilya prophets, as the figure of new name or the saint Nicholas, as the new name and new archetypes for pre-christian Indo-European patriarchal figures, mostly.

So, if we want to know pre-christian Serbian tradition, it is not only folklore or folk songs or pagan myths that are conserved in a very small quantity, but the correct analysis of Serbian christian tradition could say as much more about pre-christian culture of Serbian

people than, for example, reconstruction, artificial reconstruction, post-modern reconstruction of paganism. So, if we want to understand what was before christianity, we need analyze christianity, Serbian christianity, and concentrate for the certain figures and festivals and tradition linked to the Serbian christian saints and special days of their calendar, calendary and so on, because that was inclusive. But what was included? Precisely, we have already made analysis that was the one level of Indo-European patriarchal tradition that was linked with pre-Serbian Thracian existential horizon, but reinforced as well by first Serbs.

They were bearers of the same pattern, of the same vertical structure, and in Greek Byzantium tradition they have encountered, they have met with a very similar concept. In Thracian tradition, very similar. In Roman tradition, in Hellenistic tradition, that was around Platonism that was all created.

In pre-christian Serbian, christian Serbian, Thracians, Byzantians, Romans, so that was a kind of Indo-European level, but at the same time, there was a pre-Indo-European, Paleo-European tradition and existential horizon that was very powerful here. More powerful than in the north of Europe. So, in the north of Europe, in the Palabian, White Serbia and the motherland of Serbs, there were lesser elements of the matriarchal type, but they could exist from Tripoli and Cucuteni culture as the traces as well to the north and to the east, but in the lesser scale than in Balkans.

So, there was a kind of matriarchal dimension that was as well embedded in the newly created Serbian identity. So, that was the motherland of the great, of the matriarchal civilization here in Balkans that was very, very strong and that explains partly what Gasparini, Italian author, called Slavic matriarchy. There was no such kind of Slavic matriarchy, but influence of matriarchy in the Balkans was very strong and embedded in the Serbian tradition that was reflected in the villas, history, in some gestalt, in some images or feminine images of the folk songs and folk tradition, or in the very ancient song of Skadar, of creation of Skadar when the woman was blocked in the wall.

So, that was a region of the creation of the city, it is purely Sibelian story about creation of the city of Skadar. Very tragic, very romantic, but matriarchal. And that was not so much Sarmatian, white Serbian, that was Balkanic.

And we have the exact, exactly the same pattern in Romanian culture, Mastro Manoli, with putting in the wall of the most beautiful church created in the Adzis, in the Carpathian mountain, by Mastro Manoli, who was obliged to put there his wife, his wife that was as well pregnant as in the history of Skadar, in the song of Skadar. So, the idea is that some matriarchal aspects of very ancient Balkanic matriarchal civilization, as well where these elements were embedded in the existential horizon of Serbs, and we need to measure this influence. We could not say for sure how deep this influence was.

So, it is certainly that there was such influence, it was reflected, mirrored in the Serbian

peasantry, peasant tradition, on the some level, not in the whole tradition, because that was male tradition, that was based on the heavy flow, that could be managed only by male laborers, but there were many, many traditions that linked women with the earth, with the crop, with laboring earth, that we need to identify more in order to have a concrete picture or image of this deepest level of Serbian identity. So, that was a kind of preliminary analysis of the Serbian Dasein, but the new new edition of this Dasein begins with Nemanja dynasty. That was a kind, as well, as well, Christianization was made in the context of the great Moravia and serial and methodical tradition.

So, that was already something Slavic in all that. So, you have received, Serbian have received Christian tradition in the Cyrillic, in the Slavic way, and that was very important step, because that was, in the religion sense, linked to Bulgarian initiative to organize the special kind of Slavic Christian church, so-called Sixth Patriarchy, declared by the Bulgarians in order to have independence and autonomy for Slavic Christianity, and that was the claim to create first Slavic Patriarchy, independent in the first Bulgarian after Christianization. So, Serbs were in the same field, conceptual field, acceptance of the orthodoxy of Christianity, but in the Slavic form, with Church Slavonic, that was unique Bulgarian language, that was elaborated in the great Moravia, accepted in Bulgaria, and in Russia.

So, Church Slavonic language is not Russian, not Serbian, it's much more Bulgarian, or it is considered to be the one of the special South Slavic language, Church Slavonic. But what is important? So, Serbs were integrated in the Christian society, not only with Byzantium, domination, but as well in the Slavic context, and that was fully developed with Nemanja dynasty. So, that was a kind of idea, that now it is a time, and that was an event in Serbian history, now it is a time with Nemanja to create Serbian Kingdom, Kingdom in the full Byzantium sense, repeating up to the same time Bulgarian example, because the Bulgarians were the first to claim Slavic Kingdom and Slavic Special Autonomous Church.

So, that was the kind of heritage of Bulgarian heritage, in the competition a little bit with Bulgarians, but at the same time, it's something that is continuation of the same. The great Moravia was lost for orthodoxy and for Slavic special tradition, and the time of Russia didn't come, or Romania, so there were two pretenders to create some independent Slavic Christianity in Byzantium sense, and now it appears clearly, how important the concept of Kingdom and all that was, because Byzantium means a kind of empire, so they should be based on that symphony, a symphonic relation between the king, sacred king, and the patriarch, or the head of the church. So, that was first made by Bulgarians, in the first and the second Bulgarian Kingdom, but with Nemanja and with Saint Sava, that was repeated in the Serbian case.

So, creation of Serbian Kingdom and Serbian Patriarchy in Pech, was the same event as acceptance of the Catechonic mission. So, first the claim to be Catechon was made by

Bulgarians and Macedonians, the same space, and with Nemanja there was second claim. So, the creation of Serbian state was preparation to take the heritage of the Byzantines, of the Byzantines, and replace the mission of Catechon from universality of Byzantine empire to Slavic world.

And there was the Bulgarian pretenders to it, and Serbian. In certain moment, Bulgarians were dominating, and Serbs, the Serbs were in the periphery of this, and with Nemanja there is a kind of growth and rise of this Serbian Catechonic tradition, that has affected absolutely Serbian identity in the next period. But this Catechonic tradition, based on the symphony of between Serbian Tsar, Serbian King, and Serbian Patriarch, with 7th Patriarchy, Serbian at this time, that was claim of Byzantine heritage.

So, we could say that Russia and the rise of Russia was a kind of third row. Before that was Veliki Ternov, and the second Bulgarian, and Veliki Preslav, third row, and now it is Russia's third row. It was second claim in the Slavic space, existential space, to receive Byzantine Orthodox mission.

So, that was the concept Serbs, Serbian state, Serbian Church, Serbian Patriarchy as Catechon. It is completely, that was a kind already, of form of Serbian locus, because tradition, all Christian tradition, and links and ties of Saint Sava with Mount Athos, with all the monks' tradition, and metaphysical tradition of spiritual, mystical Orthodoxy, was brought to Serbia, and was put in the center of the Enlightenment, Serbian Christian Orthodox Catechonic Enlightenment, linked with the concept of the Kingdom, Sacred Serbian Kingdom. It was considered, in the Mnemonius' time already, as Proto-Empire, Serbian Empire, that should include the world in it, because the Catechonic tradition is a fight, as we have explained, against Antichrist.

So, that was the mission, Apollonian-Dionysian mission of the Tsar, but by extension of the people. So, Tsar, Church, and people formed the Catechonic unity, and a kind of logical tool, philosophical tool for that, was a Byzantine tradition, that included as Christianity the pre-Christian way of thinking, and that was organization of the first, and I would say, greatest form of Serbian locus. So, with Mnemonia, Saint Sava, Patriarchy of Peć, that were laid the foundation of Serbian locus.

That is Serbian identity, where existential horizon and Serbian design has reached its height. So, we could not imagine nothing comparable, nothing similar, nothing similar in all Serbian history. So, that was a kind of highest point.

So, where the imminent Serbian design has created a Serbian locus in the state, in the Serbian religious tradition with Saint Sava, and Serbian people, as Catechonic people, with the mission to fight against darkness, with Tsar, with Kings, with, in the favor of Christianity, and that Serbian mission was formed. So, Serbs, essentially, are this. Serbs are bearers of that Serbian locus, formed and explicitly manifested in the time of Mnemonia dynasty, from very beginning, from very beginning, and that was the claim as

well, that opposed Serbian messianic and Catechonic expectations to Bulgarians.

Bulgarians, because that was not opposition, they were kind of competition, competitors, because they had very similar post-Byzantine, as well Slavic, as well Orthodox, as well Catechonic identity. So, that was the roots of competition of two greatest Balkanic-Slavic people, two versions of Catechonic society, with the independent from Byzantium kingdom and political state, and independent up to the certain point of church organization. That was prefiguration of Great Russia, of Third Rome, because there were two examples of something that was repeated in the 4th century of Russia, but that was made before us.

So, the claim of Bulgarians and Serbs to be Catechonic-Slavic people with eschatological mission in the fight or in the war of light against the forces of darkness, defending Catechum, that was much earlier than a Russian claim of the same. The Russian maybe made more spectacular success in that, coming to the world power, but ideology was very, very similar or just the same. So, Russia-Third Rome.

Russia-Third Rome is the concept of translation of empire. Repetition of Bulgarian example, but at the end of the Byzantine history, in the 15th century, there appeared a kind of hate of this process, highest point, and that was Dushan the Strong. Dushan the Strong created the real empire that controlled almost all Balkans territory, the major part of Greece, and that was special and political space, where this mission has obtained its concrete limits.

So, that was the greater Serbian empire that was made. It didn't last too long, but that was including the Mount Athos that was under the control of Serbian kings. So, in the time of Dushan the Strong, there was a kind of concrete realization of this messianic tradition with the Raska in the center and with very weak, at that time, Bulgarian.

So, Bulgaria wasn't a kind of alternative to that. So, that was the highest point, the rise of Nemanja and the highest point of this locus. So, the locus was formed in the intellectual, spiritual, religious time, in the beginning of Nemanja, and has reached its full, special manifestation with the space and the concrete reality in the politics in the time of Dushan the Strong.

So, all that, all this Nemanja period, was the period of the birth and development and the maturation of the Serbian locus. So, the real Serbians lived in that period. That is a kind of archetype.

So, to be Serb is to belong to this point of history. As for us, to be Russian, that means to belong to even the terrible time. So, that was the height of our historical, spiritual, and political, and cultural achievement.

So, Serbian locus is located there, in time and in space. So, there is the Serbian, greater

Serbian space, and there is greater Serbian time, because the locus in Byzantine and Slavic-Christian historical situation was formed. So, everything we have there and then is purely Serbian in any sense.

Everything that existed before Nemanja was a kind of introduction. Everything that existed after Dushan the Strong was a kind of echo, resounding, resounding of that. So, continuation, the kind of consequences.

So, that is the center of Serbian history and the highest point of Serbian locus. After that was the very quick decline of that and the growth of Ottoman Empire. And the next point was the Kosovo battle, where the future of Catechon was decided.

And the song of Kosovo battle, the song of King Lazar, in the Vukardzic text book, is very revealing. So, I remind, you know better than everybody else, that that was a kind of choice in front of King Lazar, or to have Tsarstvo Nebesko, heavenly kingdom, or to win in the Kosovo battle and to have Tsarstvo Zemecko, earthly kingdom. In both cases, he should fight.

In both cases, the Serbs should come to the Kosovo battle and should participate. And every, every family that declined to be there, abandoned them. That was the damnation of the King Lazar.

So, everybody should defend the locus, but decision and the choice was, or to lose the earthly battle and to win the battle of light, but fighting strongly and dying at the Kosovo field, or to have the victory, but to lose the fight for the light. That is Iranian tradition, that the force and the army of light is weak. Because sometimes there is a time to light to win and darkness to overcome.

And the light, the army of light has special limitations. It could not accept the weapon of the darkness. It could not betray its holy nature and holy essence.

And that are limitations, because the devil and the darkness has no rule. It could easily overcome the measure. It is hubris, titanic forces.

And the army of light has its rule. So, you could not win at the price, at the end price. You should stay with Christ, with verticality up to the end.

And that was the choice of the King Lazar. And decision was made. I will go to fight against the Ottomans.

I accept the loss and I am sacrificing myself and my people in order to have heavenly kingdom. So, that was decision of the hero of light. That was a kind of transcendentalization of the Nemanja kingdom and empire and obtaining post-human, post-mortem dimension of the Serbian laws.

So, that was the pure martyrdom and pure sacrifice of all Serbian people in order to come to heavenly kingdom. So, that was not the loss. That was the greatest victory that was reflection of traditional Sarmatian ethics.

To die in the battle in order to be immortal. To die in order to be immortal. To die in order to win.

It is better to be defeated with Christ than to win with the Satan. That was the main lesson of Kosovo battle. And everybody at the same time, when we read, it is absolutely amazing, when we are reading the song of the Kosovo battle, there was not glorification only of humility of Serbs, but the greatest braveness.

So, they fought up to the end. They destroyed everything they could, including the chief of the Ottoman army. So, that was heroic battle.

The battle was very serious, but the decision was made beforehand. That was purely Christian, purely Sarmatian, purely Indo-European decision. Decision and not something casual.

Not defeat in front of the material force and power. So, that is the kind of assumption of Serbia and passing from the earthly Serbia to heavenly Serbia. And that was accomplishing of catechonical mission.

So, that was defined against Antichrist and that was defeat. And there came the end. So, after that, that spirit of Serbian history was to be in hell.

And to conserve identity in hell. Not betrayed, not coming, not converting in Islam, not accepting the rules of dominating power, but conserve its memory identity, its profound identity, its Christian Orthodox Slavic identity with all the suffering. That was the history of suffering, being in the historical hell for centuries.

So, that is very dramatic. But that, what is important, that was not meaningless. That was continuation of the consequence of the greatest, the spirit of greatness, a new test, divine test for Serbian people, creation of the introduction of resurrection.

That was a dying process in order to resurrect. That was not meaningless suffering. That was meaningful, completely meaningful suffering.

That was eschatological test in order to resurrect, but resurrection of Serbian lovers. The next moment in the Serbian lovers was precisely the moment when the opportunity to liberate Serbian people from Ottoman control came. That was new, new challenge to Serbian lovers.

And what Serbs did in that situation? There was one part of tradition, there was a kind of monarchistic, imperial, orthodox, Serbian patriotic, archaic. So, there was, they

conserved the elements of the real and profound Serbian lovers. That was in direct connection with the Serbian design itself, the core of its design, because there was a kind of orthodox, Serbian, conservative, imperialist tradition, imperial tradition, that continued to be present in the end of the Ottoman rule.

And that was a very great inspiration. That was in all the Serbian people. And in the path of Serbian aristocracy, there appeared Obrenovic and Karadjordjevic trying to manifest, to incorporate these spirits and this identity in order to restore Serbian kingdom, greater Serbia with orthodox Serb identity, with logos, following pneumonia example as kind of resurrection, resurrection of the Serbian logos after dramatical period of suffering.

But the time where this appears, where the Ottoman Empire was destroyed, that was very special. That was modern time, where the Serbian logos dominated. And where the West already was under full domination of this modern world vision, where there was no place for such kind as Apollonian logos, Christian tradition, empire, kingdom, warrior heroic values.

All that was discredited and destroyed in the West. So, the Western power fighting against Ottoman tried to use this will of the Serbian people to restore its identity as a tool in order to destroy Ottoman Empire that was traditional, to destroy Austrian Empire and to block Russian expansion in the back. So, they tried to use, they have organized Masonic structure in Serbia.

They made education of the Serbian nationalist and the republican spirit. And they tried as well to enter in this process of liberation in order to propose their vision. Nationalist vision, third political theory, liberal vision, first political theory, and after with Tito and the other, second political theory.

All three political theories were a kind of the network, mreza, or such network, put over Serbian identity, but with no connection. That was the kind of suffocating, suffocating network in order not to reveal it in a proper sense and to deviate Serbian energy and catechonic revival in the other sense. But there was a kind of many logos in that Serbian liberation.

There was inner, profound, pneumonia, catechonic identity, the pure Serbian logos. There was Western European influence. There was Russian, pragmatic, or orthodox in file logos, very friendly, by maybe pragmatic reasons, by other, by some affinity of Third Rome and Russia, Moscow, Third Rome, Russia, Third Rome, with the same opposition against the Western power.

There was a kind of different form of what I'm calling archeomodernity. So, archeomodernity is not modernity as in the West. In the West, there was tradition, and the diminishing of tradition was the growth of modernity.

So, or modernity, or tradition. But archeomodernity, it is where tradition and modernity coexisted in the very bad and sick way. So, logical, or you have something, or you have something opposite, or for tradition, or for modernity.

That was the case for the Western Europe. But for Russia, for example, or for Serbia, there was archeomodernity. You are in the same time for modernity, modernization, and at the same time for archaic growth.

So, that created a kind of schizophrenic society, purely. The Russian type is, after Peter the Great, is purely archeomodern and schizophrenic. And I presume that something like that was produced here.

So, Serbian Logos was after the end, to the end of the Ottoman Empire, was schizophrenic, archeomodern, where legitimate claim to restore Serbian Logos were mixed with modernist, republican, liberal, socialist, and nationalist tradition. They block both, because there are two Logos. Modernity is the Logos of Sibeli, and inner Serbian Logos is the Logos of Apollo, and the Logos of Dionysus.

So, that was neological, deep neological contradiction that wasn't remarked, wasn't accepted as such, wasn't due, and that created Sikh society, because archeomodern is Sikh society. That is the case for many other societies, but the difference between the Western society and the archeomodern society precisely is that in Europe, modernity entered in the society in the logical way, in the following Aristotelian logic. Or modernity, or tradition.

If you have something modern in that place, you shouldn't have something traditional. So, you destroy, for example, monarchy, you install republic. And that was or church or atheism.

In archeomodern society, atheism and church, republic and the kingdom, tradition and modernity coexist in a very bad way, without remarking each other. That creates a double, double interpretational reading. So, everything is double.

It is purely bipolar disease, because you see something, you interpret it in two contradictory ways at the same time. So, there is, is democracy or no democracy? Democracy and dictatorship is the same. So, that is a kind, not of Dionysian, that is what we have called, according to Gilles Verduran, mystical nocturne.

So, you see one thing, you call it completely with different name. So, that is schizophrenic attitude, because that is split of personality. And in Western Europe, there was a clear personality.

Or you accept modernity, or you accept tradition. In our society, it was archeomodernity. So, you accept both.

Serbian logos and liberalism or communism or nationalism, that belong to completely different context, without noticing it. That's very important. Without noticing it.

It is not conscious lie. It is unconscious lie. Consciously, we are lying, when we know the truth, and we hide the truth.

But unconscious lie, when we don't know the truth, and don't care about it. So, we are lying, just because not having any interest to the truth at all. So, that is archeomodernity.

And I presume that to the end of the Ottoman Empire, in the beginning of the independence of modern day Serbia, was precisely this element, this mixture between Chetniks, between communists, between liberals, between Masons, between traditionalists, between orthodox popes, and all that, all that, this mixture of completely archeomodern, with no clearly defined line of division. But that was creating of the Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia had two contradictory readings in the same.

First Yugoslavia. Serbs, majority of the Serbs have seen in that restoration of the great of Serbia, and that was to the end of the Karageorgievic rule, that has produced the reactions of everybody else, above all, a reaction of Croatians, Croats, because that was a kind of how the Serbs saw the Yugoslavia. That was the rule of Serbs, the recreation of the greater Serbia, and return to the Dushanbe-Sinli situation.

But at the same time, that was republic, with completely modernist ideology, with balance of the interests, and bourgeois type in the center. So the materialistic and commercial and egoistic elements were dominated in the nationalist or liberal sense. That was the archeomodern mixture of the society, and that was the reason of misunderstanding of the components of the Yugoslavia.

There was not internationalism, there was not purely liberalism, there was not empire, there was not confederation, that was something archeomodern, and any pole in early Yugoslavia had its own reading of what is going on. So for the Serbs, that was the victory, and as well, for the maybe radical Chetniks, that was the kind of return to the roots, that was the kind of accomplishment of the mission, of catechonic tradition, of catechonic mission. For the other, that was the conventional, purely multi-national confederation, organized by purely pragmatism, materialistic, bourgeois reasons.

So there was the multiplicity of the reading of the Yugoslavia, there was the West German occupation, and the fight of two powers, communists, partisans, and Chetniks, and monarchists, partisans. That was where the future of Yugoslavia after the Second World War defined in this fight, and the victory of the Soviet Union over the Nazi regime, was the reason why the Second Political Theory dominated in Eastern Europe and in the part of Yugoslavia. So the new Yugoslavia was based on the Second Political Theory, but at the same time, that was the new reading of what is Yugoslavia, with the Marxism,

completely strange to the concrete development of rural, peasant, Serbian society, with archaic tradition, with partly modernized cities, and that was the new kind of archaeomodernity.

Where the pure form of the Serbian logist was prohibited. So that was put out, that was considered to be dissident, and Chetniks were persecuted as counter-revolutionary tendencies. So the pure orthodox version of Serbian logist was prohibited, there was a kind of domination of the Second Political Theory, Marxism, absolutely civilian, and that was a kind of new Yugoslavia.

But when the Second Political Theory began to shake in the Soviet Union, that was as well that affected Yugoslavia, and with Milosevic has reappeared Serbian version, reading of Yugoslavia. So that was a kind of nationalistic reaction, not clear philosophically, not explained, but intuitively, that was the fight, Serbian fight for Yugoslavia, was the fight for this catechonic reading of Serbian state. That was as well the last greatness of fight of the Serbs for Republika Srpska, for Srpska Krajina, Kninska Krajina, Slavonia, Barania, and Western Srem, and all these, and the last moment, the fight for Kosovo against Albanians.

So there was the Serbs with Milosevic considered Yugoslavia as catechonic entity, unconsciously, without saying this clearly, without explaining that, but in saying that with a very awkward language, trying to adjust this to communist, to nationalist agenda, to western liberals, so that was actually a modern version of Serbian logos, and that was defeated. And this time, but as any defeat of this kind of logos, that has something positive inside. So as the Kosovo, the fight of Kosovo, that is the fight for the light, and any Serbian hero that has given his life to defense of Yugoslavia, that they have sacrificed their life for the case of this logos of light, for the deeply catechonic mission.

In their case, there was no convention, there was a mistake, that was the clear breakthrough to the reality of the Serbian identity. So they have invested the blood and life in this Serbian identity, and that could not vanish without the trace. That was continuation of the Kosovo battle, that was continuation of the Serbian ways through the history, and that was preparation for the future, for real eschatological, catechonical, Serbian future.

After that, with the betrayal of Russia, that has betrayed itself in the 90s and afterwards, there was a kind of actual moment of Serbian state, that was defeat recognized by society, by state, by Serbian people. But, so Russia could not be a kind of real alternative to modernization, to westernization. There is the first political theory that dominates now, in purely civilian sense, it's clear.

But where is now the Serbian logos? I presume that he is here. He is in Serbian people, in Serbian identity, in Serbian space, in Serbian culture. And having received this defeat, this defeat should be first of all understood, and deciphered, should be interpreted

correctly, in order to go further in the Serbian history, because now the problem that we are facing with Serbian logos is almost the same that we have with the other form of Apollonian logos and Dionysian, in Apollonian-Dionysian sense.

So, there is the huge planetarian fight, that is lost almost by everybody. Maybe we, Russians, have the image that we resist still, or Syrians, or Iranians still resist, or some other form. But, domination of the force that has overcome Serbian fight, it is not only the West, or United States, something deeper.

So, and in that situation, it is not, I would say, it should not be reason for despair, because the force of the Sibyl, or return of the Great Mother, is a kind of coming of Antichrist, or liberation of the Satan from the abyss. And that was planned, that was let to happen by God. And that is the final, final test.

And I think that, concerning Serbian logos, now is the moment not to blame the state, or the society, or Russian, or Western, to do what they do, but to concentrate precisely on the cultivation of these logos, instead of everything. Because it is planned test, maybe last one, maybe not, maybe there will be, maybe there will be one more test, one more fight, one more chance, as you have, as Serbs, two chances, creation of First Yugoslavia, and fight of Milosevic. So, and nationalist revealed, both chances were lost, both, but maybe there will be a new one.

And if there is the living tradition, if there is living Serbian design, it could make a kind of, kind of analysis of why that was lost, why, how we shouldn't repeat the error of the other, how defend the pure form of Serbian logos against this attack, because nothing has ended yet. So, when the Serbs are, there is Serbian design, there is Serbian state, that's already something, maybe it's a little bit awkward, it's an actual situation, but it is, and that is very important, that is already something to see as opportunity, not as response, not as an answer, but as something that is positive, as positive Serbian value, Serbian people, Serbian tradition, Serbian culture, Serbian heritage, Serbian state, Serbian church, Serbian Christian church, so we have many things now, and because there is a spiritual fight, not material, it has no comparison with material, material aspects, all that is secondary. If we fight the spiritual battle, we win everything.

If we could win one Serbian hut, we could win everything. The fight is over, and that is the victory. So, that is the fight for human, that is going in human, that is not material, atomic confrontation between the masses of matter.

There is a human spirit, and the fight is inside of us, and the logos is inside of us. It's not something that is imposed on us from outside. So, we are the logos, and logos acts through us, and Serbian logos acts and lives through Serbs as everlasting, or maybe not everlasting, lasting continuity up to the end of time.

So, I think that Serbian people was chosen in order to keep its identity up to the end of

time, and to reappear in the last moment of the history on the side of God, and Christ, and Logos of Apolda, and this verticality, in order to participate in the general, universal concept of battle, or create the universal empire of light, empire of Christ, whose prefiguration was the kingdom of Nemanja and Dusan the Strong. So, that is more or less my exposition of Serbian logos, and we could say as well that Yugoslavia and modern day Serbia were and are simulacrum of real Serbia, it's clear, but simulacrum is as archaeo-modernity, it's partly archaic and partly perverted and caricature. So, we need to solve the problem of simulacrum and restore the authenticity and the pure state on what is not simulacrum and that is hiding behind simulacrum.

So, we need to deduce the grain of truth from that. So, now we could make pitany or comments or some... What are the four political theories, what are the innovations in the four political theories that we would leave in me, the excitement that I would accept and that would be like that... In this case, Serbia, Macedonia, we are here in the Balkans, what are the innovations in the four political theories, what are the innovations that would change some things that are happening? First of all, the fourth political theory is the rejection of three political theories. It is very important, because when we try to criticize modernity or liberalism, we are falling immediately in communism, fascism, or communism and nationalism.

And the fourth political theory is the invitation to avoid this trap, not to fall into it. But at the same time, that is the criticism of modernity in politics. So, if we regard modernity in politics as something we reject, we put it over, we discover two dimensions, dimensions of the past, of the pre-modern.

So, we could use the pre-modern values as positive ones. Now, it is prohibited. For example, yesterday, Jean-Marie Le Pen, the French nationalist, has spoken in the interview in the French, very famous today in the social media, social network.

And he said, it hurts that France is not more French, there are no more French people, there are some other people. And for me, it's a tragedy. And the journalist says, maybe that is evolution.

Evolution. Maybe that is evolution. So, the modernity always uses that.

You say, something is going wrong, maybe that is evolution. We are losing our country, maybe that is evolution. Because it's new, it's new.

So, in all modern concepts, in all three political theories, that is the decisive argument. So, when we are still in the first, second and third political theory, if someone would demonstrate that that is evolution, that is iPhone 7 plus, so we are completely disarmed. Oh, we should accept that as the decisive argument.

That is new, that is evolution. Fourth political theory says, that is no argument at all. So,

that is no argument.

All three political theories, communism, liberalism, nationalism, they fight what is more modern, what is more effective, what is more technologically progressive. But, fourth political theory says, it is not an argument. If you say, that church belongs to the past, there is no argument, that we shouldn't defend the church.

So, we discover the values, that modernity thinks to be completely lost, belonging to the past. We say, no, they belong to eternity and that means to present. So, we discover something as existing, that we were obliged to think, that we have lost forever.

So, that is new dimension of the life, of the values, of the relations, that modernity obliges us to think as belonging or non-existing. Because, the past in the modernity, political modernity, doesn't exist. But, in the fourth political theory, the past exists.

Not all past, but what was being, what was authentic, exists. So, the church doesn't belong to the past, it belongs to the eternity. So, we strongly believe in the eternity of God and the church.

And, that opens new horizons, because we could deal with the traditional values, not of something, that we remember, but something, that we really find. It is completely new. At the same time, I think that, so, we could discover and deal with our logos, as if it is present.

And, that is absolutely new. So, that is not remembrance, that is not recall. And, I think that for Macedonia, for Bulgaria, for Serbia, fourth political theory is the only way to reaffirm its deep identity and to fight for the place in the future.

It is not the fight for the past, it is the fight for the future. Because, in the three political theories, and above all in the first political theory, we are doomed, because we will become the part of the globalist, liberal space with no identity. So, accepting liberalism, we accept our death.

Immediately. Theoretically and practically. When we say, yes to liberalism, and that is something, that is modernity, we accept, that we have no possibility to resurrect.

That is the death without resurrection, without hope. So, we are doomed immediately. But, when we start to react, we are falling into nationalism or communism.

Immediately. When we criticize liberalism, capitalism, the West, we say, oh, that Stalin was good, that Hitler was good, Milosevic was good, or nationalism was good, and so on. And so, we give them the tool to win us once more.

Because, we accept the rules of the modernity. And the first political theory invites to reject all the rules of modernity. So, no argument in the enlightenment sense, no

argument of modernity is not any more valid.

So, that is the force, if you want, of the Islam, that rejects everything of the modernity, still insisting on its own value. In one way, or other way, in Shia way, it is a good one, or in the Salafi way, it is a bad one. But, the problem that Shia tradition has nothing to do with modernity.

And, the Iranian people defend, eschatologically, Shia tradition up to the end, without hearing what the Westerners say, trying to create Iranian and Shia future. It is not the case for all Iranian society, but for ruling elite. We could create orthodox, hierarchical, traditional, with strong family, with patriarchal relations in the family, with the friendship between men and women based on the Christian values, as the future project.

That is unimaginable in modernity. So, we could, we have no right to think in that way. We could not, we have no right to speak about that, because that belongs to past, it is not evolution, that is not new enough, it is old form of iPhone.

So, we are defending something completely crazy, in their eyes, but what they defend, what they try to do, in our eyes, is completely perverted. So, and, for example, Muslim, actually, they go the right way. They say, your arguments, all your arguments of West are not valid.

So, we are opening the door for our understanding of the life of the men of the future. So, we should do the same in the context of Christian, orthodox, Slav tradition. And, that is absolutely new.

So, it is not the past, it is something that is more post-modern than any post-modern philosophy. So, we should first think differently, choose differently, and not be afraid to affirm this identity, this kind of discourse against everything. So, and then, we will find that majority is on our side.

The majority of our people, of Russian people, of Eastern people and the Western people, because now we see that the majority of European rejects the liberal tendency. They could not find the way to express themselves. And, that is why first political theory is translated in all European languages, in all, with no help from us, that they make that by themselves.

It is not promoting, for example, we don't pay nothing, we don't suggest that, we don't push it. Everybody understands that they need new approach. And, in the three political theory, that is impossible.

This new approach is impossible, because it always will come to the same liberalism, finally, by one or the other way. And, it is interesting that in United States, first political theory is prohibited in Amazon, with no reason at all. There is no hatred, nothing.

You could treat it in Serbia. It is prohibited. That is considered to be, I consider to be most dangerous philosopher in the world, because that is kind of challenging their consensus, liberal modern consensus, without playing their game in communist or nationalist critics.

So, I think that first political theory is the future, is the possible future, that is the ontological future, that the future that could be, and could and should have the relations with being, that is not the time. Being is something that is the origin, the source of time. So, that is, and that is why I don't want to show, to be a kind of publicity for false political theory.

It will solve one problem, that problem will feed the starving, will promote the progress. No, not at all. That's much more important.

Open this ontological dimension of the future, to put the time and the future aspect of time in the contact with being. That is precisely the goal of our political theory. And I am absolutely, almost sure that it's the same as the will of the Serbian people, that is the logic of the Serbian history and Bulgarian history, and the history of what is human in us.

Human, because now we are in front of total dehumanization, and that is declared already openly. Kurtzweiler, Elon Musk, they say, we need to replace the human by artificial intelligence. And that is evolution.

If you are against, so why not? That's evolution. No French in France, it's evolution. No human more, but it's evolution.

And that is logic of modernity, that we need to stop as such. Not say, oh, better conserve us as human as well, beside this artificial intelligence. Better to fray, to control development of artificial intelligence.

It's impossible. We need all overthrow, whether overthrow everything, or accept the final metaphysical defeat. Fourth political theory is invitation not to accept defeat metaphysically, and to fight against all that.

So not only part, not only this point, this dimension. Fight for our identity, for our logos, as it is, as it was, as it should be in the future. So just one quick thing.

So interestingly enough, Mein Kampf is fully available on Amazon in multiple editions, and your book is not. Absolutely. In America.

Yeah. So this all seems really, like you said, enticing for political theory, theory is an alternative, but what keeps coming to my mind is that liberalism is so coherent, and so entwined, and it pervades every facet of life. So you eat McDonald's, you drink Coca-Cola, you find your companion via Tinder, or some dating app, or speed dating.

You work in a company in Serbia, then you are transferred to work in Mozambique, etc. So everything is global, individual, progressive, etc. And we still live in a world of states.

So if we imagine Russia as an embodiment of capitalism, if it becomes, if it isn't now. So if you reintroduce this metaphysical Apollonian logos, will it have a reflection on the economy? So will it necessarily change the division of labor, in a sense, in making the country less economically developed, which means that we can foster a smaller and less effective army, which means that they will lose in fight with a liberal state, which is technologically, economically more advanced and can quite plainly field more troops. So this is kind of a trap.

So in order to defeat a modernistic country and a modernistic West, you need to have an efficient economy, which I do not see how it can function with this kind of metaphysical laws, which we're espousing here. For me, it seems that it will necessarily lead back to traditional pastoral life, which will then be defeated because it cannot field a strong state and a strong army. So can you address this? There are two answers.

First of all, the answer was Saint Lazarus. So we are preferring a heavenly kingdom at any price, and we will fight against them, including if we are doomed. So that is surely an answer, by the way.

So the next answer, more pragmatical, if we affirm the values as a kind of horizon of the future, our values, our logos. So we could use pragmatically some form of technology, but only in defensive way. That was more or less the way of Russia, trying to defensive modernization.

For example, Peter the Great has opened the window to the West in order to show their cannons. So we have opened the windows, put the cannons, and start to set fire, to shoot. So it is a decision, but that is very, very dangerous because the technological development is not natural.

So we are accepting the logos of civility, accepting this kind of competition, or it is we are accepting the rule of the enemy. So the enemy comes in us. So normal economy, normal economy, could be only agricultural and pastoral economy.

Economy when you produce, you produce and consume at the same time. And when the rest, for example, are all destroyed in the orgy or brachina or some festival, or is given to church, to God, or to the noble aristocracy, they defend you, they kill the enemies. So there is a kind of balanced economy with no development, because there is no idea to grow.

The idea is to preserve, to produce and consume and be the balance. So if no growth, that is the happiness. So no growth, no fall.

And the split between consumer and producer, division of labor, that was the split of

economy itself. That was the kind of asymmetric, tragical, dramatic economy that has created the differences inequalities and capitalism. So this system should be destroyed absolutely at the end of the day.

But how to destroy it? If we return personally for small agricultural communities, not enough. But if we try to reconstruct our society, putting the peasant as the symbol as a positive figure, trying to restore integrity, not divide more and more labor, trying to put together, trying to recreate integrity, the concept of integrity worker, but still, for defensive reasons, using in some way techniques. For example, there are spies.

Spies who are, for example, who pretend to be the other. They have the mask. They are trained.

Our spies, Russian spies, for example, they are Russian. They are working for, they are fighting for our cause. But they pretend to be Germans or Americans and so on.

They have masks. And we should use technical development precisely for that reason. But they should have very strong identity, stronger than normal people.

So if you are dealing with the Sibeli or technical or modern economy or something or modern state, you should be twice or thrice more sober. So you can overcome that. If you are weak, you should labor the earth.

So it is a kind of challenge for Dionysian aspects to come down to the hell. For example, we are normally, we steal the technological plans. In Russian history, we didn't create many things.

We have stolen them from the West and after that used against our enemies. So you could make everything because it is not, there is no ethics. They are evil and we should fight the evil, taking all opportunities that we have.

But the main orientation of the society should be changed from the beginning. So we could preserve some special zones in the society, a kind of dangerous zone, where only spies could come in. With the people with hard, very hard identity, that will be not affected by the poison of the technology, of economy.

So they should be agents, agents dealing in Dionysian way in the world of the hell. Because the modern state, modern economy, modern commerce is a hell, spiritually speaking. So that is more or less the second pragmatism question.

But if we will be obliged to choose, that was the choice of the Michael Palaiologos, when he has concluded alliance with Catholicism. And all the fathers, Christian fathers, priests were against that. And he has invited them and said, how you will resist against possible Sicilian aggression? What kind of force you have to oppose to them? Or I will conclude the pact with Pope of Rome, betraying Christianity, Orthodox Christianity.

Or you will show me where are your army, how we resist the possible and very probable aggression. And priests have responded, no, we have no force. We hope God only and he will help us, if we be true to our Christianity, Orthodox Christian Church.

And Michael Palaiologos has preferred to conclude the pact. He was not convinced by that. And that was politically correct, that was the kind of success.

But there was so much protest after his death to bury him in the Constantinople, that he was hidden from the people. Because his act that was successful politically was considered to be betrayal of the Christian Orthodox identity. So that is spiritual choice.

If we really believe in God and the Spirit, and if it does matter for us, maybe we could prefer in some situation to lose the battle, than to betray our identity. But that is always as well the proportions. So we could not solve this situation a priori.

When we are inside of it, we could understand how difficult to take decision, how it is existential decision. So as well, for example, we are now in Russia, we are defending our sovereignty at any price. This is very good.

But we are losing our identity at the same time. And what is the use of the sovereignty without identity? So the balance, it's very good to have sovereignty and identity in order to defend identity. But if you insist too much on sovereignty, it serves for no purpose.

So there is no people anymore, because there is completely destroyed, degraded, almost dying spiritually and mentally, mass of schizophrenia that is now Russian people, Russian society. And in that case, you could maybe prefer to be invaded in order to be awake. Because now there is a kind of sleep, dogmatical sleep of Russian society with some success of Russian state.

So it is hard to say, because better to have sovereignty, identity and prosperity, economical path. And the reality, you always should choose between the choice, real choices, is difficult one. That is a kind of existential challenge to us.

I would just, your remark about the army and about fight between inequality. For example, if we take the Serbian design as something heroic, patriotic and throughout the history, there were very many brave men and very many strategic warriors in our country, in our battles, which are now studied throughout Western academies, military academies. And if we compare the concept of courage, which is introduced recently in Serbia.

So the most courageous cop of the year, two years ago in Serbian police forces was the guy who publicly admitted that he is gay. So the concept of courage is really disturbed. And if the concept of courage is disturbed, there is no army.

So just to follow up on what you said. So I talked with Axel yesterday, when I said that

we were the children of Sibelius. So it turns out I was wrong.

He pointed out something to me. So he basically said that the Serbian peasants were apollonic, basically, because when the Ottomans came in, they took the cities over, then the Christians went from the cities to the semi-Christianized villages. And even if they were Sibelian, eventually they became more apollonic in nature.

That's why we have St. Sava, who is worn on the flags. You have Karadjordje, who is an apollonic figure. So could the solution basically be that all of us, whoever harbors this apollonic logos, should just basically live within the Sibelian dominant world and wait until it collapses in on itself, as the Ottoman Empire eventually became the sick man of the Balkans.

So is that just the answer? So just keep to yourself, preserve your identity and wait until Sibelius collapses under the weight of its own corruption? So it could be a solution. Because first of all, preserve identity. But it is not... Nobody will let us alone.

Nobody will give us this peaceful opportunity to do so. They will attack us inside, outside, every minute. So in order to keep the identity, we should fight against.

But I agree, the most important situation... But what is most important, what you have said, now the situation is not pro-peace, not ready or not so dramatical to do absolutely something with politics. Because the situation, we could not solve easily the problem we have. The Sibelian world is attacking us, but it's decaying as well, as liberalism.

And the most important thing to establish alternative, establish based on identity, establish it. It is not the time to speak about what we are going to do, because we are not yet present fully. So there is nobody to suggest, because everything that will react now, it will be premature.

It could be a simulacrum as well. So if we try to react now, before establishing full identity, full locus, before coming to ourselves, it could be a kind of new simulacrum. We will only give to the enemy new power.

And that is the problem. Too early. Antichrist arrives too early, before Christ.

So we need to wait up to the right moment. But to wait, it is to fight. Wait is create, resist, be active in the right way.

First of all, in intellectual way, in the kind of network, cultivating mind, spirit, returning to tradition, trying to put with us, to the church, to our roots, to our history, to our spirit, trying to our culture, to our knowledge of the history, trying to invite the others around us, the families, the friends, everybody. By the means we have. Big, small or great.

And established position. We could not now, seriously, we could not speak about the

fight against this civilian locus. We need to ground ourselves, to gain the ground, the space for us.

Because we don't, officially we don't exist in Amazon, by books, don't exist. We need to insist on that. So they think we shouldn't exist.

And if they pretend we are not here, should not. Evolution. So they should be replaced by someone else.

But still existing is the heroic act as bearers of this identity. So defend identity, cultivate identity, establish intellectual activity inside of this identity. So that is the kind of conservation and as well that is awakening, waking of the locus.

So it is most important activity than any else. So the measure of this activity is inner, spiritual. And that was the essence and the source of Lord Sapapol.

So it is inner, inner spiritual heaven that we have inside of our history, inside of our identity. Slavic identity, orthodox Christian identity and Serbian identity. So we could make a kind of break.