



Materia Magica

by ANDREAS WOLFSSON

“It is not only that [modern] man ignores, deforms, and denies himself, but that he also reenacts the myth of Medusa, turning everything around him into stone. He observes and sizes nature with weights and measures. He limits the life surrounding him to petty laws, and overcomes the mysteries with petty hypotheses. He freezes the universe into a static unity, and puts himself at the periphery of the world, shyly, humbly, as if he were an accidental secretion, without power or hope.”

Leo, *Barriers*

Modern man is altogether thrown into matter. His life confined to matter he considers as his existence, matter as the ultimate entity. In matter he sees the origin and purpose of all, hence issues all, therein and thereby is all to be accomplished. Hence emanates via evolution the cosmos and life, and life is spent therein. Even when he is willing to recognise some sort of soul, he regards this as the ensemble of certain processes of an organism consisting of matter, which, together with the body, is condemned to abolition by death ensuing in matter. Knowledge and cognition, too, are conceivable solely in relation to matter.

Former eras he regards likewise: the men of these eras were equally thrown into matter, or maybe even more hopelessly, due to the “inchoateness” of their material means. Ancient spirituality, religions, myths, and symbols are interpreted in this plane as well: they are but rudimentary attempts to explain material phenomena. In the background of historical endeavours, great wars, he also invariably discovers considerations pertaining to matter.¹

Those defining themselves as “believers”, that is, those who in one way or another still postulate some sort of God, are practical materialists, too: God is utterly separated from man thrown into matter, and in fact it is not clear what actually He could salvage out of this man as immortal. Practical materialism is revealed in that these believers would be utterly embarrassed to have to admit the occurrence of a miracle.² Hence, material world is getting on well enough without God according also to them. Equally telling are the different ideas about the postmortal destiny of man: the heaven-concept of Christians is becoming more and more substantial through the ages, while adherents of the pseudo- and counter-religions of New Age postulate no less than an indefinite number of rebirth in the earthly world.

The man of the moderns is but a hopelessly insignificant droplet in the vast ocean of matter.



In the present study, we set ourselves the aim to examine what actually this “matter” is, overestimated by the moderns without measure. We shall furthermore examine whether it is indeed to such an extent absolute, whether it has always existed in the form as it is understood today—to the extent that this can be called understanding at all—and what the relation of men of former eras to such an entity was.

Our aim is therefore in the sphere of natural philosophy or philosophy of science, but these problems we will approach from the direction of metaphysics. It immediately follows hence that this is not that form of the philosophy of science in which it is meant nowadays, and which—we will not hesitate to affirm—does not merit to be called philosophy. It does not merit not only because there is no mention of “wisdom” therein, and even less of “love” toward it, but also because philosophy should stand *above* sciences, providing the framework in which sciences can operate; whereas today the relationship appears the very contrary: Today’s “philosophers” for instance like to talk about 20th-century physics having altered the concept of matter. Such a thing is impossible because in the order in which physics operates, philosophical concepts appear as absolute, physics being unable either to prove or to refute them. What we see here is that physics in an unacceptable manner vindicates a higher status for itself than its legitimate due, and at the same time, philosophy, in an equally unacceptable manner, descends into a lower order.³ The legitimate hierarchy here, too, would be the following: at the highest stands metaphysics, underneath of it philosophy, and natural science at the bottom—with an arbitrary number of levels in between. From the universal, downwards in the hierarchy we tend toward the relative, the particular, the peripheral.



From the fact that moderns attribute such a significance to matter, we could expect that they certainly possess a very deeply understood concept thereof, and dispose of its precise definition—as medieval theology, for instance, possessed very clear concepts of God in an era which attributed great significance to Him. This, however, is not the case, as reflexion is not characteristic of our age, but indeed it cannot be the case either, since the notion of “matter” is used in too wide a sense to be definable.

First of all, therefore, we shall attempt to shed light on the modern concept of matter. So far as we consider specifically the “matter” of physics as modern science, what we first have to note is that for a mere “operation” of physics, a definition of matter is not necessary. On experimental physics we shall waste but half a sentence: this point of view has as its basis that *all is matter*. However, theoretical physics does not offer any definition either, and this problem does not even arise therein, it is not this question that it strives to answer. Matter does not appear in the theories in any way since these are mathematical theories by the help of which some quantities measured in experiments can be calculated.⁴ The notion of matter thus appears on the level of the interpretation of the theories on one hand, and, on the other hand, on the level of those hypotheses which are needed for setting up the theories and translating the results to the language of quantities actually measured in experiments. The ensemble of these hypotheses does define the physical matter to some extent, this defin-

ition being not ontological, however, but as it were an operative one—matter, therefore, whenever appears, appears as a primitive notion in physics.⁵

Even the most elementary physical theories rely on astonishingly many hypotheses, most of which are never articulated so that no question can ever arise concerning them. They seem fundamental since they have been incorporated into European mentality through the centuries, and they are indispensable to the modern scientific activity, and hence all physical theories. We articulate, however, once and for all, that *these will ever remain as mere hypotheses*, since the theories are deemed proven by empirical facts, but *facts cannot prove anything, solely the existence of the given facts*. Here we will consider even these fundamental hypotheses, and among them especially the following three:

Ad 1 Matter is objective reality independent of consciousness (my consciousness), a substance...

Ad 2 ... which is fraught with certain laws of *absolute validity*. It is not in the form known at a given time that these laws are absolute, as these will be succeeded by other laws as physics “progresses”, but the latter appear on the same plane and in the same manner. Or more precisely: the form of the laws depends on the level of detailedness of the consideration, but on a given level, the laws are absolute.⁶

Ad 3 These laws can be expressed by mathematics. They are laws, therefore, which express certain relations between quantities that can be measured in connection with objects consisting of this substance.

Obviously, the second hypothesis appears inside the first one, the third one inside the second one, and all further hypotheses *inside* one of these three. For example, inside the first one all the hypotheses pertaining to the structuring of matter—which appear on the level of the interpretation of theories. The postulate of the Copenhagen “interpretation” of quantum mechanics that the theory must be interpreted statistically—in contrast to the deterministic interpretation of classical physics—appears inside the third hypothesis. Hence, quantum mechanics has by no means fundamentally altered the concept of matter as some—who strive to furnish physics with a higher dignity than its legitimate due—like to pretend. For instance, quantum mechanics did not touch these three hypotheses at all, as indeed it could not touch them, since the whole physics operates under them.

The historical time of the appearance of the hypotheses differs drastically in different civilizations. In the East, for instance, even a few hundred years ago, already the first hypothesis would have been considered absurd, while in the West, already the ancient Greeks flirted with the second and to a certain extent even the third hypothesis. With such statements, however, one has to be very careful since both in the case of the second and third hypotheses, the emphasis is on the word *absolute*, this being necessary for physics to operate as a science in the modern sense. And that of course cannot be known with any certainty how much the Greeks regarded their attempts into this direction as the research of absolute physical laws. Probably much less than those modern historians of science pretend who delight in presenting the ancient Greeks as the forerunners of modernity: It is well known for example that the ancient Greeks did not think highly of experimenting, and the third

hypotheses is connected verily to the spreading of experiments, since only these produce quantities. All in all, we will say that the men of Tradition would have looked strangely on such an entity.⁷

For from a purely metaphysical perspective—and in the East this perspective long retained its due dominating position, but among the Greeks it had a significant role as well—the matter concept defined by these three hypotheses is problematic on all the three levels. The most fundamental problem is that according to the traditional doctrines, there is no objective reality existing independently of the consciousness—putting it in the sharp way: of My consciousness.

“It is evident that there is objective reality: calling this into question would be senseless. But it is completely unfounded to assert that this objective reality can be independent of the consciousness—*of my consciousness* [...]. The world is not objective reality independent of consciousness but objective reality that is dependent on consciousness; but not only objective reality dependent on consciousness but a reality thoroughly of consciousness: it outright ‘consists of consciousness’. The world, regarding its substance, is amalgamated reality of consciousness: it is in consciousness and consists of consciousness.”⁸

Because the truly immersed, absorbing study reveals that the traditional doctrines—from the *Vedānta* to the innermost teachings of the Christ—are solipsistic. They cannot be understood to their full depth from outside the standpoint of solipsism. Furthermore, from outside the standpoint of solipsism, the ultimate aim appointed by the doctrines: the metaphysical realization—the Deliverance (*Mokṣa*), the Awakening (*Bodhi*), the *Opus Magnum*—would appear an absurdity. There is no existence but existence of consciousness, and there is no consciousness but My consciousness. This is the meaning of the Hindu notion *Ātmā*, which would also be quite unintelligible without. Pertaining to the hyperphilosophical solipsism, at this point we refer to the works of András László, and to forestall an eventual fatal misunderstanding, we will merely note this: Naturally, that Consciousness of Mine which is equivalent to the Totality, is not my consciousness as experienced commonly as a human individual. Similarly, when in the following we are using the term “I-self”⁹, we are not referring to the ego, and indeed anything else that could be seized by psychology for example.

The great question of Western philosophy—which one is more primordial: existence or consciousness—is answered by traditions definitely: *The question is senseless because the two are really one: existence of consciousness – consciousness as existence*. If the question is raised somewhat more intelligently as pertaining to the the subject and the object, the answer of the doctrines is still forthright: the two are really one, but their union is attained in the subject. Were this union attained in the object, that would be equivalent to annihilation.

Solipsism is not the perspective for writings and not a philosophical perspective either, even though it is the omega of all genuine philosophies. It is a point where philosophy terminates, and yields its place to that which is higher than philosophy. Therefore, to be able to expose the lower-level problems with the matter concept in question, in a strictly relative sense we have to leave the perspective of solipsism and first of all review the pertinent concepts of traditional cosmology: Surveying Western philosophy, in fact we find that since the scholastics—who revived Aristotelian concepts also in this respect—in the West there has not been any philosophical matter concept at all that we should take really seriously.

Screening the scholastics' concept without superseding it—since in the meantime, philosophy has descended into a lower order—eventually such “definitions” follow: matter is that which consists of atoms or excitations of quantum fields or maybe the quantum fields themselves.¹⁰ Why, telling about an entity “what it consists of”, “how it behaves”, “how it is organized”, does not define that entity. These are those very things which can contribute to the aforementioned operative definition only, facilitating empirical recognition and manipulation of matter. The whole modern science strives after this, and hence it renounces even the possibility of any real knowledge.

And since the scholastics' concept is rooted in metaphysics, which makes it an orthodox philosophy, it stands above science as understood in the modern sense, and hence it is not to be approached critically in its relation to science. Therefore, the question is not to what extent the scholastic teachings can be applied to what the moderns consider matter, that is, to what extent were they “right” in the “light of modern research”. No, the scholastics' concept is reality. Powerful reality of very high order. More powerful, that is, of higher order, that is, more real, than anything the moderns with all their “sciences” may even dare dream of. Therefore, the question is that in relation to this reality *what is* the matter of the moderns, how it can be placed *inside* traditional doctrines—since outside them, true cognition is not even possible at all.

And the scholastic doctrines being strictly traditional at this point, they are parallel with the Eastern concepts. Therefore, if in the following we will mostly use Hindu terminology, that is because this tradition is the most explicit on metaphysical contents. But whenever possible, we will also indicate the equivalent scholastic terms.



According to the symbolic recital of monotheistic religions, in the Beginning of all beginnings, the Creator created the Creation. Metaphysically, in a more direct way, this can be expressed as follows: The only non-dual Absolute manifests Itself, but without Its unity being in any way affected by this. This unity “is” beyond the duality of subject and object—hence, the Creation cannot be an object effected outside the Creator—but even beyond the duality of Existence and Nonexistence—hence, about It the question whether it exists or not cannot be raised: When It manifests Itself as pure Existence, then It is the only that exists, yea, It is Existence Itself. Hence, It can by no means be only one among the beings.¹¹

In manifestation, however, there *is* a multitude of beings, and out of Unity this multitude is effected through degrees—while in Unity (meant here as the Hindu *Īśvara*), they are present “together”, in the synthesis of actuality and potentiality, in a supra-temporal unceasing present, the *Æternitas*. The first degree is the primordial duality. According to a possible “definition” of manifestation, all manifested beings have an essential and a substantial side, so the primordial dyad is the very pair of pure Essence—the Hindu *Puruṣa*—and Substance—the Hindu *Prakṛti*. These two therefore remain unmanifested. The scholastic term for the substantial side of this pair is *Materia Prima*.¹² The *Materia Prima* is pure potentiality: the Nothing that can become anything. She is devoid of any determination, incapable of determining herself, but apt to accept any determination. She is completely formless, but apt to take any form upon herself. Quality-less root-nature, the root of all the manifested, the setting of the whole Manifestation. In herself she is not only absolutely

unexperienceable but absolutely unthinkable as well—since any experience, any thought, is bound to form—she can become known only via intellectual intuition. On the other hand, the *Puruṣa* is pure possibility,¹³ he does not become anything as on the level of possibilities he is All, and these possibilities become actualised in the *Prakṛti*, creating hence the totality of Manifestation.

The first degree of Manifestation, the firstborn of the Dyad is the *Spiritus Sanctus*, which corresponds to the Gnostic *Logos*, and the Hindu *Buddhi*; and analogically to the primordial Light.¹⁴ The substantial side of this is therefore the *Prakṛti* – *Materia Prima* herself.

It is apparent that the matter of physics is determined to such an extent that it is vastly distanced from this primordial Substance. If we intend to near it, then in the first step we have to consider the substance that the scholastics term *Materia Secunda*, which is: *signata quantitate*—substance designated by quantity. Such a substance therefore, whose only attribute is quantity, this, however, being already a formal determination in comparison to the perfectly formless *Materia Prima*. Yet, this cannot be the matter of physics either, as the latter is characterised not only by quantity, but inherent in it are also what these quantities measure, and furthermore even laws expressed by mathematical equations establishing connections between these quantities. The relative essence corresponding to the *Materia Secunda* is: the quality. The quality-quantity dyad therefore corresponds to the *Puruṣa-Prakṛti* pair on a more relative, more particular, less primordial level.

The matter postulated by physics arises via several such determining steps out of the *Materia Prima*.¹⁵ Along these steps, the essence and substance become more and more mingled. Together with Guénon, we will remind that this generative chain does not unfold in time rigorously—the “events” recounted by the scriptures are supra-temporal—but it is a logical-ontological chain. The relation of the hence arising matter to pure Essence and Substance can be understood with the help of an analogy: Therein, the essential side is analogically the absolute man, the substantial side the absolute woman, and the Oneness is the *Androgynos*¹⁶—the synthesis which surpasses the duality, a being whose one half is a complete man, the other half is a complete woman, in an æternal union (*coitus*). The matter of physics will then correspond to the *gynandromorphe*—this is not a synthesis but the *mixture* of essence and substance, a freak consisting of half a man and half a woman, an utterly masculinised woman or a feminised man, that is, neither a man nor a woman.¹⁷ An undominated substance, to which no relative essence can be postulated any more. The *Puruṣa* swoons into the *Prakṛti* and renounces his power over her: the Heaven leans on the Earth. The unquenchable desire of the *Puruṣa* and the *Prakṛti* for each other—which, via an implosion following their perfect separation, on the metaphysical level restores *Īśvara*, the *Androgynos*—here flattens utterly, deteriorating into a blind generative force, which but whirls the pool of the trillions of ephemeral beings. At the same time, this corresponds to the “vaulting” of Earth away from Heaven since in the lack of the essential side, there is no apparent way out of the plane of this substance.

An entity being less primordial is equivalent to its being less absolute, less real, less central, that is, to its being peripheral. Hence, the matter of physics is exceedingly peripheral, that is, exceedingly an illusion, exceedingly dreamed—determinations, measures, laws dreamed into the *Materia Prima* degree by degree. Exceedingly *Māyā*. At this point, however, we will note together with an inspired man that the *Māyā* means not that it is nonexistent.¹⁸

The *Māyā* means that I do not realise it as I-self. Ultimately, all this is produced by the *Prakṛti* under the influence of the *Puruṣa*, and according to solipsism, the *Puruṣa* is also I, this, however, I am not capable to realise. The *Māyā* is that which I do not realise as being dominated by I. And a mechanistic matter is very much like this indeed, since its proposition is equivalent to entirely renouncing the true, that is, spiritual dominion.



In the following, through an example, we will depict the stages of this process of losing dominion, the process which Guénon from a slightly different perspective in a very pictorial way terms the “solidification of the world”. Our example is gravity: one of the physical phenomena considered perhaps most fundamental.

That which is gravity today, was a controlled faculty of consciousness in the beginning, together with all external and internal realities, in the same way as cogitation and volition are faculties of consciousness today. At this stage, between “external” and “internal” there is in fact no real difference. The loss of this faculty, its separation from consciousness, took place gradually, while in the case of internal realities as for instance heart-function or digestion, the dominion of consciousness still persisted, subsequently to get lost as well. Today, man is already at the stage of losing all his remaining faculties of consciousness, these are even at present to an extraordinary extent under external dominion, not dominated by the self (*Auton*), but something “else” (*Heteron*).

The separation of these “external” realities from consciousness—their becoming something “else”—resulted in a substance, which shortly after¹⁹ the separation is in the state of non-solidified, magical substance, non-mechanistic, non-automatic substance, over which the dominion can be directly restored via a magical act—an increase of the degree of consciousness. Pertaining to gravity, this means that dropped bodies do not necessarily fall down but can for instance be floated through the air. The muslim saying—according to which natural laws are but *habits* of *Allah* (most of the times He is willing to operate gravity, but sometimes he does suspend it)—acquires a meaning in accordance with the present treatise when regarded from solipsism’s “perspective above all perspectives”. Hence does it become apparent as well that in former eras miracles could also be effected much more frequently than nowadays. Therefore, men of these eras were not at all thrown into matter to the extent modern man is.

Gravity is however not absolute in our age either, since in the dream state it may function in a different way, or even cease to function altogether. To be able to duly appreciate this fact, however, we must take into account that according to the doctrines, the dream state does not take place *inside* the world we experience in the waking state, as modern psychology pretends. On the contrary: it is a world separate from the latter, and of equal bearing in many respects. On entering that world, the waking world ceases to exist, and on waking, it gets re-created. Or more precisely: the dream state is in the subtle domain of reality, which is the principle of the gross domain that corresponds to the waking state, and which can here be satisfactorily defined as follows:

The subtle domain is intermediate between the supra-formal and gross domains of manifestation, comprising all those possibilities which are bound to form but are *not* actualised in the gross domain.²⁰

In the dream state, however, the dominion of the self is diminished even as compared to the waking state today, the natural laws being present in a *decayed* form here. The relationship between dream state and waking state is analogous to that of the waking state and the state of dominion over natural laws, so that the latter could be achieved from the waking state by a further “awakening”.²¹ This state is the reflection of the dream state across the waking state, so that its centre is situated again in the subtle domain, but this together with a high degree of dominion.²²

All operative magical manipulations have as prerequisite such an at least partial reconquest of dominion, and the basis of this is that I reduce myself into the position of relative essence—relative *Puruṣa*—corresponding to a given substantial plane. This relative *Puruṣa*, depending on the case in question, may be a supra-individual state, and for him the given plane’s conditions, “natural laws” are but faculties of consciousness, dominated possibilities. Hence, since the subtle domain is the principle of the gross domain, it becomes possible to project entities out of the (relative) omni-possibility of the former domain into the latter domain, that is: magical projection.

Subsequent to “magical matter”, an intermediate degree follows, which could be called “qualitative physical matter”: in this, the dropped bodies always fall down, but not always with the same acceleration, and indeed such physical quantities as for example velocity, acceleration, and force, cannot even be defined in such a world. Such technological disciplines as for instance architecture, which today is altogether dominated by gravity, could operate in a fully different way, edifices being stabilized to a great extent rather by a will—the quality of which is unimaginable for modern men. Though we emphasise again that here there is no question of a process unfolding strictly in historical time, we will yet say that the construction of great antique edifices, but even that of the medieval cathedrals, presupposes such a qualitative form of gravity—their architects hardly relied on calculations, but not because they would not have been able to do so, but rather because this was not necessary, and pertaining to a non-quantitative matter, this would not even have been possible. The great architects of the *radiant* middle ages stood on a very high spiritual niveau, and the craft-art of architecture—together with other medieval craft-arts—was a sacred-magical labour.

The ultimate degree is the emergence of the matter conjectured by modern science, fraught with inherent laws, which can be expressed mathematically. In this, dropped bodies always fall down under gravity, and quantitatively always the same way, with the same acceleration. Between this and the previous degree, innumerable intermediary degrees can be postulated in such a way that while on a given plane the matter behaves already in a quantitative way, on other planes the qualitative character yet prevails. For example, a degree can be postulated in which the plane “governed” by classical physics today, behaves already in a mechanical way, while on the plane which is today “described” by quantum mechanics, the qualitative character still dominates. Somewhat excessively we will even say that these ever more peripheral realities are *created* along the progress of “research”, as a solidification, amalgamation of the omni-possibility of the subtle domain of reality. This is therefore the pertinent significance of the solidification of the world: the concrete physical law emerges out of the indefinite multitude of possibilities, from the omni-possibility freezing into a particular state. Thus is physical matter created in the form of an unceasing demiurgical-demonical creation as the amalgamation of the subtle domain.²³ Physical laws hence garner a certain degree of

reality, which among others will explain why technological applications can operate more or less correctly. It is equally clear, however, that stressing technology further intensifies solidification: as it were hammering into matter the discovered laws.

Since physical matter arises as a determination of the *Prakṛti*, it immediately follows for instance that the existence of any kind of atom as the fundamental building block of this matter, is an absurdity. For no “atom” can be postulated which could not be thought as further dividable, but everything that can be thought, has a form already, and as such it is present in the *Prakṛti* as a potentiality, which at a certain point can be actualized via the aforementioned demonical creation. Indeed—according to the above—all particles that had seemed undividable previously, at a certain point turned out to be dividable, from which we of course must not conclude that the same had been also true previously, or that the hence arising new lower level of material reality had existed also previously. In fact, it had existed only in the sense that it was one of innumerable, tantamount possibilities present in the subtle domain of reality. In physical matter, therefore, nothing can be absolute,²⁴ along its indefinite divisions modern science is grasping at nothing, so that the *sub*philosophy of absolutising this matter, “materialism”, is in truth: the “nothing-ism”, the chimera of believing in the nothing—or not believing in anything.

We have seen, therefore, that the emergence of physical matter is the result of a fall, during which the dominion of man over the world decreases drastically. This loss of the serene, unmovably moving veritable dominion was accompanied by the emergence of a swarming, fussing-fumbling pseudo-dominion. And this process the moderns term “progress”.



It should be obvious, therefore, that Galilei for instance—one of those figures who are revered in an all but religious way by the moderns—for his experimenting with gravity and as the forerunner of modern empirical sciences, not only does not merit reverence, but on the contrary, we consider him an outright negative figure, as he so to speak “invented” the mechanised, mathematised gravity, and hence he took an active part in “planking in” this segment of Heaven.²⁵ Naturally, we are not blaming for this him alone, a single individual would not have been capable of a thing of such a magnitude either—this presupposes many preliminary tendencies and even occult influences, whose ultimate governors are infra-human entities.

“The modern scientist—as indeed everybody else—is capable to experience but his actual state of consciousness projected into existence.”

This allows us to perceive

“... the part played by irrational elements in the scientist’s makeup, quite aside from his formal research methods, especially regarding his choice of hypotheses and interpretive theories. There is a substratum of which the modern scientist is unaware: a substratum in regard to which he is passive and subject to precise influences that originate in part from the forces that have shaped a civilization at one or another point of its cycle. In our case it is the terminal and twilight phase of the Western cycle. One gains a presentiment of how important this substratum is from the criticism of science and its ‘superstition of the fact’ (as Guénon puts it²⁶), showing that the fact means little in itself, but that the essential factor is the system into which it fits and on whose basis it is interpreted. This also indicates the limitations that prejudice the ideal of clarity and

objectivity in the modern type of scientist. The secret and true history of modern science is still waiting to be written.”²⁷

We therefore firmly take sides with the Church of the age against Galilei, as no doubt She still had representatives able to comprehend the considerations sketched in the present study and from this platform to condemn Galilei’s endeavours. The greats of the Church of the age no doubt comprehended: the modern scientific outlook to be formed following Galilei’s endeavours is inherently diabolic, as it strives after an illegitimate form of dominion. With the symbolism of the *Genesis* this could be best characterised by the harvest from the forbidden tree—the utter intensification of the Fall is this, an ever more intensive generation of *samsāra*.

It is not from Unity that modern science derives, not on the basis of That that it strives to understand the world. That is to say, it postulates Another aside from Unity, and by this it implicitly denies Unity—the etimological meaning of diabolicity.

The only legitimate endeavour worthy of a human is the magical dominion over the world, not merely fiddling the fruits of the tree, the periphery, but dominating the whole tree.²⁸ This is what sacred science strives after, by “investigating”—contemplating—how entities attach to the Oneness through the higher and higher principles: It understands and dominates all entities via their principles.

This is also a higher, symbolic meaning of the story of the Christ’s temptation: the Satan offers the Christ the total *earthly* dominion, the Christ however strives not after this, but after *perfect* dominion, since only via this can the Fall be amended. Of course, as always, the Satan is lying, because there is no total earthly dominion, only the indefinite generation of the whirlpool of existence.



The principles—the Platonian Ideas or Forms—are entities appearing on the aforementioned relative essential planes. With the following few paragraphs, we wish to contribute to their understanding.

The principle of an entity is its cause, antecedent, creator, and governor. Logical cause, ontological antecedent. Reality stems from principles in the form of a hierarchical manifestation. In this hierarchy, substance of any order is merely a plane, which is totally dominated by the principles. And above all, There Is the *Principium Principiorum*: the Principle of Principles—the Hindu *Brahman = Ātmā*, the Chinese *Tao*, the Muslim *Allah*, the *Über götliche Gottheit* (Eckhart), the metaphysical Absolute—God.

Analogy attaches all entities through higher and higher planes of existence to their principle. The chain of analogies attaching the higher and higher planes of existence is the aforementioned logical-ontological chain. The “descending” branch of the analogical correspondence is: the symbol. An example is the *solaritas* as principle, the Sun God as mythological figure, and the Sun, as an entity appearing on the material plane: Contrary to the modernist view, the Sun God is not a symbol of the Sun, he was not “contrived” to personalise the Sun. The situation is the very contrary: the Sun as a celestial body can exist because there is Sun God and there is *solaritas*, and the Sun as a celestial body is a symbol of this—it is evidently among the most powerful, but there are several other solar symbols. Of great

importance is also the familiar geometrical symbol: ☉, as this can exist also because there is *solaritas*, that is, geometry itself is such as it is for the reason that this symbol—together with many other geometrical symbols—can exist and symbolise what they symbolise.

These remarks are suitable to convey an impression of how deep a view on reality becomes possible in that contemplation which takes as its starting point the sacred symbols and their attachment to the higher and higher principles and ultimately the Absolute—the synthesis of all causes and effects. Higher and higher planes mean that the entities of these planes exclude less and less possibilities, being less and less determined, less and less alternatives are possible since they are less and less individual; up to the *Puruṣa*, the principle of all manifested, the synthesis of all the possibilities of Manifestation. Compared to these depths, modern science is scraping but the surface of surfaces. In Manifestation, nothing can be accidental, but the reason why things are the way they are, can be investigated only by the Unity-logic (Hamvas) based on analogies as outlined above. Modern science is thoroughly impotent in this respect because for empirically observable phenomena it puts up theories, which then are again verified by empiria—it is running its unending cycles in this plane only, without ever advancing toward That, Which bears the cause of Its existence in Itself.

The *solaritas* is a principle and as such it precedes material reality—also in the respect of realness. The myth of the Sun God is not a device, a mere tale, but a universal proceeding: it is enacted in innumerable forms in the different spheres of manifestation, and over and over in those spheres bound to time. One such act is the celestial passing of the Sun through the Zodiac year by year, which is hence a symbol as well.

To forstall an eventual misunderstanding, we will remark that the principles are not abstract entities: Their proposition is not equivalent to abstraction, and in a certain sense it is into the very opposite direction. For the more abstract an entity is, the more it can be characterised quantitatively, and it can be characterised with the less quantities—until ultimately, by continuing the abstraction process to the end, the entity, as it were “downwards”, through the pure quantity, the *Materia Secunda*, drops out of the sphere of manifestation. Approaching the principles, however, is into an ascending direction: The principle is a quality, and the higher the principle, the purer quality it is, the less it can be characterised quantitatively. Therefore, the principle grasps the entities from above, while the abstraction from below. Similarly, we need to differentiate between the universal and the general: the former belongs to the principle while the latter to the abstraction. The aforementioned operative character of modern science acquires deeper meaning at this point: through abstraction, it strives to understand and control things “from below”, as diametrically opposed to the real understanding through principles, and the magical dominion hence realised. Abstraction is lifeless in the sense of being below and bereft of life, while the principle is above life, in the sense of containment and dominion.

Principle is for instance the femininity, which is a pure quality, it is obviously impossible to characterise quantitatively. Astrology-astrosophy is consecrated to the study of principles, where each and every element is a symbol. As there is *solaritas*, Sun-principle, so there is also *Mars*-principle, *Venus*-principle, &c. The macrocosmical projections of these are the planets situated and moving in a symbolical, that is, qualitative space and time. Their microcosmical projections are primarily psychic realities, situated in the internal space. And

their mythological projections are divine figures: the symbolic narratives about them are essential contributions to the understanding of these principles. Another eminent opportunity for studying the relationship and hierarchy of principles is offered by the *Animalia*, where each animal species is the manifestation of a principle, the genius of the species, which can even be personalised and considered a god—to which we find examples in the various totemisms. The taxonomical categories are projections of the hierarchy of these principles.

If we consider, for instance, what it is that makes a lion a lion; that unambiguously separates the lion from all the other, however close species, we have to realise that this cannot be defined as a finite set of attributes.²⁹ In this sense a principle is inexhaustible. At the same time, a lion can be depicted in infinitely many ways, such that it remains recognisable, that is, there exists an infinite manifold of valid abstractions of the lion-principle—one of them being the lion as an animal. A species is therefore a pure quality, it is not subjected to quantity, so it exists also independently of how many individuals represent the given species.³⁰ The principle of a species projected into the *Materia Secunda* produces the individuals of the species. In this sense could the scholastics say that the substance is the *Principium Individuationis*—the principle of individuation. In the individuals, therefore, the quality and the quantity is mingled in such a way that while quantitative determinations separate them, a quality unifies them into a single species. To conclude this excursus and to forstall an eventual misunderstanding, and further to illustrate that according to sacred biology, man is how much not merely one of the animals, we will note that in this sense the man is not a species, but every single individual is of the same order of magnitude as an animal species.



For the greats of the Church of the age it could be furthermore clear that fumbling with such a matter that the future physics will postulate, and emphasising it at every turn, is profoundly anti-spiritual, and it leads straight to practical materialism. It leads straight to such a *Weltaanschauung* in which either God is “glued” to this matter as the one who created it at some point (this is the standpoint of deism), or it is outright proclaimed that this matter is absolute (this would be the atheist materialism). The two versions are all but equivalent *fundamental heresies from the perspective of all religions*, and this is true notwithstanding the modernised catholicism is increasingly adopting the former standpoint. This heresy is further intensified in darwinism, according to which matter produces life and man, and social-darwinism appearing in the next stage, according to which it produces society and civilizations. These counter-doctrines then assist in the production of marxism and psycho-analysis, and finally—not a little ironically—the pseudo- and counter-spirituality of the New Age. It is *against all these* and generally against “progress” already set in the adequate light above, that the Catholic Church in her action against Galilei wished to protect the world.

The mechanistic matter results in the real-verity of confinement into matter as mentioned in the introduction, and on the part of the alleged believers, in the mere passive expectation that somebody will yet salvage them hence—this fundamentally feminine attitude. Therefore, the theorem according to which the *gynandromorphe* is incapable of the Awakening, proves true in this transposed sense as well.

For according to the traditional doctrines, the primordial state of man—symbolically, the Edenic state—is total knowledge and total dominion. The restoration of this state is one degree of the path toward Deliverance. On the path, along which I transform I-self first to deathless Initiate, then to a god, further to God, and finally to *Übergöttliche Gottheit*—metaphysical Absolute. It could hardly be clearer that this has nothing to do with the painful renouncement of life. On the contrary, this is the only and true significance of life, and around this significance were the traditional societies organized, this is indirectly—but not too indirectly—the purport of the caste system as well, which in the medieval West was to a certain extent still present. Therefore, these were not at all organized along considerations pertaining to matter, but considerations well above life, and if they were not humanist, it was not because they were inhuman, but because they were supra-human. All this again sheds a sharp light on the complete insignificance of the “developed” modern life and societies, since *everything* that these can designate as goal, becomes less than nothing—in death.

The question whether the *Materia Prima* is good or bad, positive or negative, is senseless. If I separate it from I-self—“reducing” I-self (alchemy)—while realising I-self in the position of the *Puruṣa*, it is such a high state that from the common earthly human perspective it is unconceivable. If, however, somebody places his centre into the *Materia Prima*, it is equivalent to his annihilation. And the impetus to this is the satanicity. That is, the endeavour of the Satan is that man do not seize the possibility of Deliverance, but instead in a first stage he stray horizontally in the world dominated by matter as principle, and then he annihilate—and this endeavour likewise has no *rationaly* seizable purport as on a higher level the whole Creation has none.

And since the satanic tendencies are surfacing more and more in the earthly human world along the advance of the historical cycle, this world as a collective advances in this very direction, toward annihilation. We will say that with the rationalism of the 19th-century – early-20th-century pseudo-bourgeois *śūdra* world has man arrived at the stage where he places his centre into physical matter. This is the climax of scientism, the triumph of modernity. Physical matter corresponds to the maximum of solidification and the perfect vaulting of Earth away from Heaven. It is the matter of physics that can be “researched” and manipulated indefinitely, without ever thinking about any transcendence, and that man places his centre into this, means exactly that this is what fills his existence. In the postmodern era, the fall continues from here, since if a domain of existence breaks away from Heaven, then its opening from below, its demonisation, is inevitable—an example for this is the altogether demoniac economy of our age. Solidification is followed by dissolution. Regarding matter, this may mean for example that the physical laws dissolve, and such inconsistencies, logical leaps, as known from dreams, appear in matter—with consequences, however, defined by the conditions of the waking state. This is already the world of the infra-caste, the *upavarṇa*, the pariah—that of *infrarationalism*.



It is not difficult to see that what we have written here is irrefutable, independently of whether it is accepted as truth or not. For us there can be no doubt: its irrefutability originates from the applied perspective—which is not individual but traditional—being rooted in absolute Truth.

In sacred science absolute truths are revealed, and manifest themselves as my most intimate knowledge. As something I had virtually ever known, but actually they have been concealed from me by a veil—it is intellectual intuition that may lift this veil. For this, however, I have to transform myself. Without such transformation, neither understanding nor operation is possible in sacred science. Any investigation is only pretext-like here: I investigate to learn something about I-self and the path which leads back to I-self. This is pragmatism in the highest and most positive sense, which is at the same time the aptest as well, since in the strictest sense of the word, all entities exist *for this very reason*: as symbols of essential realities inside I-self.

For the departure on this path, it is indispensable to substitute the totality of the content of modern mind for an integral *Weltanschauung* rooted in metaphysical Truth, which may then illuminate everything in the mental space as it were from above. In the present essay, we wished to contribute to the formation of this *Weltanschauung* as pertaining to the adequate, truly spiritual and hence truly intellectual approach to matter. The stakes are the highest possible: Since everybody who does not weed modern scientific mythologies from their minds, is condemned to annihilation. What kind of salvation, deliverance, resurrection could such a man expect for himself? Not any at all, obviously: Following his death occurring in matter, his fate is dissolution into and annihilation together with matter—the triumph of Satan.

And no *man* can be indifferent toward this.

Notes

- 1→ Admittedly, in this ultimate horizontalism one hierarchy is risen, but this, too, inside matter only: as the different levels of organisation of matter. In this hierarchy, man is indeed higher than, say, flatworms. According to the moderns, however, from the viewpoint of confinement to matter, there is no and indeed cannot be any difference between these two creatures.
- 2→ The notion of miracle has accordingly degenerated, descended into the material order: the miracles of science, of technology, and also the miracles of nature—abuses of the notion of miracle at every turn, as it is originally: the penetration of the supranatural into nature.
- 3→ This we see in common usage, too, since today everybody can create their own philosophies, and there even exist bank- or corporate philosophies. It is true, however, that from a purely intellectual perspective, academic philosophy is not of a much higher niveau than these peanut philosophies.
- 4→ On the operation of physics and modern science in general cf. our previous study entitled “*Sherds of Physis shattered*”
- 5→ The situation is similar in the case of the only primitive notion of mathematics, the “set”. This is never defined but in an operative manner, because the axioms of set theory define only how a set *behaves*, for instance, what it means to be an element of a set. But mathematics cannot offer any definition as to what the set ontologically is.
- 6→ It is another question that sometimes the transition between these levels cannot be tracked.
- 7→ Cf. René Guénon, *General Introduction to the Study of the Hindu Doctrines*, II/8, III/11. It is worth noting that neither in the Sanskrit nor in the ancient Greek language is there a word which would correspond to “matter”.
- 8→ András László, *Solum Ipsum*, 94–95.

- 9→ For the sake of better conveying our meaning, in what follows we will effect a modification of the English grammar: we will mostly use the pronoun *I* throughout, instead of *me*, *my*, &c. Indeed, the *Self* is the very *I*, instead of being something that is merely *mine*. We note in passing that it is at least remarkable that in English the fundamental distinction between the *I* and everything else is further emphasised by capitalizing the first person singular pronoun—and this quite independently of what the moderns think about its reason.
- 10→ At another place, we intend to return to this point for a survey because it is instructive to track the descent of philosophy going hand-in-hand with its profanation.
- 11→ The theist-atheist debates are therefore generated by an ill-posed question. Pertaining to the Absolute, there is obviously no place for “beliefs”, the only sense in which questions may arise is whether one is capable of ascending the level of proposing the Absolute. This would be true spirituality, true intellect; and clearly, this cannot be equalled not only by atheism, but by any other *Weltanschauung* which is not based on this.
It is important to note, moreover, that the worship of one of the beings—no matter which being—of an object—no matter which object—is the original meaning of idolatry.
- 12→ This pair is the Aristotelian *Eidos* and *Hyle*, the Chinese *Yang* and *Yin*, Active and Passive Pole, symbolically the Heaven and the Earth, the Man and the Woman.
- 13→ From another point of view, the one which considers the full spectrum of potentiality – possibility – virtuality – actuality, the *Puruṣa* is of course pure actuality, yea, the act itself. In the text, we use the word *possibility* in an extended sense as the synthesis of the latter three notions.
- 14→ *Spiritus Dei ferebatur super aquas* (Gen.1.2)—here the Spirit of God corresponds to the *Puruṣa*, and the Waters to the *Prakṛti*, the separation of the two being an “event” preceding creation, since *in principio creavit Deus celum et terram* (Gen.1.1)—means already the separation of the supra-formal and formal domains of manifestation, the biblical Genesis taking up the threads at this point. *Et facta est lux* (Gen.1.3) means already the birth of the Light or the *Spiritus Sanctus*.
- 15→ Cf. René Guénon, *The Reign of Quantity & the Signs of the Times*, introductory chapters
- 16→ A symbolic description of this miraculous being is to be found in Plato’s *Symposium* in Aristophanes’s speech, while in later times in the West it was also central to the Hermetic tradition (cf. chemical *marriage*). It is obvious that in the hierarchy of beings, the duality of sexes has to be surpassed above a certain level, and also in Christianity already the angels, although commonly thought of and referred to as masculine, are in fact androgynous beings. The Greek *Androgynos* is the exact equivalent of the Latin *Hermaphroditus* and no negative meaning should be attributed to them, in sharp contrast to the *gynandromorphe*. We cannot leave without mentioning that in analogy with the aforementioned transcension of dualities, in the *Androgynos*, the union of man and woman is attained *in the man*, it is he who so to say integrates the woman. The proposition of the *Androgynos* and this theorem together form the basis of the traditional approach to the relation of sexes.
- 17→ It is not at all accidental that the rise to hegemony of the physical matter’s concept coincides with the “emancipation” of women. Here there is no question of uplifting women, on the contrary, the ultimate hidden aim behind the process is the nivellation of both men and women on the level of *gynandromorphe*.
- 18→ Hence, our issue here is not to deny the existence of physical laws since in a certain sphere of being—or, correspondingly, in a certain historical era—these do very much exist. Along with metaphysical Tradition, what we deny is their absoluteness or primordality, and we deny furthermore that engaging in them be the adequate pursuit of mankind.
- 19→ When here and throughout we use expressions pertaining to chronology, we do not refer strictly to historical time, but we resort to traditional time symbolism, in which former eras correspond

to higher states of consciousness. Naturally, historical time is also but a projection of this symbolical time, however, when we refer to “the beginning”, we mean eras well before history. Modern “historical science” we have to dismiss all but completely, as regards more recent times mainly its interpretations, but as regards the ur-history of mankind its factual “findings” as well. Indeed, from the perspective adopted here, *it is obvious that mankind always existed, living in civilizations of no matter how high a level, without their leaving the least trace in that which the moderns consider matter.*

20→ Cf. René Guénon, *Man and His becoming according to the Vedānta*, freely quoted to convey the essence of the definition.

21→ This must not be confused with the Awakening of the *Buddha*, because this ultimate Awakening could be achieved only via an indefinite series of such partial awakenings. Hence, the supra-statal states achieved by the *Buddha* are “situated” not only above the natural laws in such a way that they exert perfect dominion over the latter, but also above logical laws, and even the duality of Existence and Nonexistence.

22→ The states of consciousness around the waking state can be sketched as follows:

...			
<i>Jāgrat-svapna</i>	dominated dream	subtle	
<i>Jāgrad-jāgrat</i>	“exalted” waking	gross	
<hr style="width: 100%;"/>			
<i>Jāgrat</i>	common waking	gross	
<i>Svapna</i>	dream state	subtle	
...			

The first column indicates the Sanskrit names, and the horizontal line is the axis of reflection. Both upwards and downwards, two further degrees each can be postulated. Since we cannot expound here the relationship between *Jāgrat* and *Jāgrad-jāgrat*, in the text we treat the waking state in an extended sense as the sum of these two; with the reservation that the common waking state of modern man corresponds to the first only, with an ever increasing infiltration of *Svapna*.

23→ For this process, physics itself exhibits an extremely cogent symbol, in the so-called phase-transition processes. For example, water is analogous to the subtle domain, and ice to the gross, while the phase transition occurring between them—the *freezing*—to the solidification. Such processes are accompanied by a so called spontaneous symmetry breaking, during which emerges the ice’s particular crystalline structure (the actualized physical law) out of the complete formlessness of water (omni-possibility). The spontaneity of the process—which in fact means that the actual course is determined by uncontrolled factors—refers to the demonical character.

24→ Obviously, for the very same reason there cannot exist the fundamental “quanta” of space and time, and—though the proposition is absurd in itself in many other respects as well—the so-called “theory of everything” either. We cannot expound here adequately, therefore will but mention that in its original sense, atomisms could still be true, provided that it was not conceived on the material plane. Rather, it could refer to that metaphysical theory which the Hindus express as the (truly “undividable”) *Puruṣa* “dwelling” in the centre (not spatial, of course) of all beings. For any being reflects a modality of the *Puruṣa*, it is something whence the *Puruṣa* almost completely—with the exception of this sole modality—withdraw, however, as it were through his own absence, he is still present. Or more precisely: as the *Prakṛti* is that whence the *Ātmā* withdrew completely—and the latter is hence called *Puruṣa*—a being is that whence the *Puruṣa* withdrew only *almost completely*. However, this withdrawal must needs be relative as nothing can be outside *Ātmā*.

25→ And with his notorious statement—“And yet it moves!”—he displayed such a degree of incomprehension which would be ridiculous if all this would not have its extremely severe consequences: For the Earth is immovable *by definition*. Though later the theory of relativity articulated a paraphrase of this traditional doctrine: the Earth can as well be considered motionless—but it had added well in advance that the same can be said about all “reference frames”. For this latter, however, there is

no as indeed cannot be any proof, because it is glaringly obvious that always and everywhere I am situated in the centre of observation, and hence the only really existing reference frame is the one which refers everything to I-self.

26→ Cf. René Guénon: *The crisis of the modern world*

27→ Julius Evola: *Ride the Tiger—a Survival Manual for the Aristocrats of the Soul*, chapter 20. One of our aims with the present study is even to solidify the basis of the *Anschauung* indispensable for writing this occult history of science, while in subsequent studies we may have the opportunity to work out some of its chapters.

28→ At the risk of emphasising the obvious do we note that here the maniacal notions of dominion have to be dispensed with altogether, which can anyway arise in connection with “earthly” dominion only.

29→ This is a metaphysical reason why the biological evolution is absurd, since two principles in a given plane, horizontally, cannot transform into each other. For in this plane they are absolute, and they are connected only through a higher principle in the hierarchy of principles, whence both originate. Or putting it more concretely: as we have seen, for a species to transform into another one, an infinite number of attributes would have to change simultaneously. And against this it is pointless to argue that there is a finite number of “genes”, and evolution takes places on the level of these, since a finite set of anything cannot determine an infinite set of attributes. Hence, it is not its “genome”, which determines a species.

At the same time, this is a good example for that no new scientific result can ever refute a theorem of such a natural philosophy which is rooted in metaphysics, be it as revolutionary—a word to which we must not assign any positive meaning—in its own sphere, as the discovery of “genes” in biology. When this apparently happens yet, we can be sure of facing an abatement and misunderstanding of the original theorem. This is usually an attempt to apply it in a lower sphere than the one to which it was originally articulated. We must not spare any effort in dissipating such mistakes, because verily from these originates the peculiar approach of modern man to the intellectuality of former eras.

30→ Hence, a species cannot get “extinct”, since the principles are immortal, being able to cease together with time only. That is of course possible that at some point in time a certain species is not represented by a single individual in the earthly world.

From these our remarks, it is also transparent how little is the worth of the mathematical models so praised by modern ecology, which in many respect considerably spurred post-modern evolutionary “theory”, too. These models typically characterise an animal phenotype by one or two parameters, however, it would not amend the situation the least, were the number of parameters a million or a quadrillion, and this for the simple reason that quantity can never become quality. These therefore can only describe changes inside one species only, that is, pertaining to micro-evolution at the most, since by altering one or any number of quantitative attributes, the barrier between species cannot be crossed.

