





The following is a collection of essays, articles and conversations I've had with various people, all written over the past twenty months. Some words found here were penned a full twenty months ago, some a matter of days ago. Thus, there is great fluctuation in quality between the better parts and worse.

The main bulk is a piece of writing simply titled “Primer” which I first began just to make sense of my views at the time as an angry seventeen year-old on the radical Right. I debated whether or not I re-write Primer, but I decided against it given the fact that it serves as a kind of marker for intellectual, spiritual and moral growth. Some things written I disagree with now, some I agree with, much of it could be expanded; but – along with the other pieces of writing here – it gives a good enough picture of things so that there are few blank spaces overall.

Thank you to those who've assisted me along this far from complete journey.

*A. Wallace, Sunday, 7<sup>th</sup> February, 2016*

# *Primer*

## I: Introduction

I'm about to attempt a rather stretched pulling-together of things for the novices out there, as well as for my own sake; to outline my positions as best I can without taking too long. A kind of joining of dots. Whether or not I am successful; whether this will be extremely long-winded; or even if I am correct are all currently adrift (as my mind usually is, in a very wandering, meandering, chaotic fashion). I will likely add to this, or change things, or delete things, or whatever, as time progresses. Nevertheless, let's begin.

Firstly, let us introduce the notion of “decline” on the scale of a civilization or a culture. Most of our era truly believe that current values within the zeitgeist are how things should be. The values of liberalism, democracy, socialism, tolerance, diversity, sensitivity, acceptance, inclusiveness and so on which are supported by the mainstream, are to the vast majority of Western peoples, the correct way: the right way and, most of all; the moral way. Multiculturalism, for example, is something utterly supported by the political elite in the United Kingdom. 13% of the U.K. is non-white, that is to say, not of the native culture, which has its religious roots, for example, in several millennia of north-west European paganism from the Celts, Picts, Saxons and so on; several centuries of south European paganism from the Romans; and over a millennium of Christianity from mainland Europe (notably the Normans). Multiracialism – a significant portion of the country being of non-native race; people of different religions and cultures – has only been a feature of these islands for just under one century. That is not a long time in terms of the rise and fall of civilizations.

I hear you now: “Race and culture are not synonymous!” I have covered this before, but to put it shortly: the case which you, the liberal, says is factual – that culture is not dependent on race – has a slight problem. Cultures exemplify the common traits between individuals; whether or not the individuals all have similar experiences, or undergo certain circumstances, all play a part in the make-up of the culture they develop. The trouble now is that the immigrants and descendants of immigrants that live in Western countries have nothing to do, culturally, with the country they are now living in. Two things can happen: a) they retain their own culture by immigrating in large enough numbers and forming communities that are distinct from the native culture, which causes social fragmentation and a brutal divide between them and others, and b) the reason they immigrated at all was on materialistic lines: consumerism quickly swallows these immigrants and they do nothing but add to the pile of soulless, empty, materialistic product-obsessed plebeians, whose emergence is one of the many symptoms of “decline” (more

on that later). And all this is just one example – immigration – of the current liberal zeitgeist causing issues. No, liberalism is not to blame for the crisis in which these people find themselves in, but it does nothing to solve it, and in fact, it worsens the situation by sapping the cultural lifeblood of these people.

What saps the lifeblood? What is the cause? Consumerism, which is a manifestation of materialistic tendencies, allowed via a huge number of cheap resources supplied by capitalism. Here, we begin to move beyond the political “Left” and “Right.” Again, more on this at a later point.

There is actually a current within not only Western society, but within many groups globally, who believe that these values are, in fact, not the correct path. Issues like those pointed out above are scorned in the mainstream. Try going onto a TV show like Question Time or one of those fancy American talk-shows and saying something like “Mass-immigration is nothing but destructive” and see how long it takes for you to get death threats or receive physical harm from people so obsessed with ideology and group-think, that they cannot mentally process the possibility of themselves being duped by intellectuals who do not live in the real world; of being wrong.

I’m typing this as a guy who grew up in a single-parent, lower-working class household in the suburbs of a small city. Growing up I was surrounded by crime and nefarious types. Drugs, weapons, struggle – you name it, I’ve seen it. And believe me, people like Owen Jones and Russell Brand do not understand the consequences of the policies they advocate, nor do they truly know the people they affect. The nanny-state, mass-immigration, socialism, are all tragic because they are movements/ideas founded on kind intentions, but which cause awfulness when implemented in reality.

## II: The Modern West

The previous part intended to introduce talking points and bring about the asking of questions. Now, we will clarify the questions asked and questions answered in the first post:

1) Multiculturalism was presented, as one idea of many which is accepted by the contemporary Western zeitgeist, as a flawed concept. This introduces the possibility that the broad masses have either been misled or are just flat-out wrong. I'd dare suggest it is a bit of both, and that the two possibilities are the same thing at a certain point.

The vast majority of people – the masses – live their lives in their own lives; in the here and now. If we have just under one century of peace and prosperity, then the people born within that see this as the norm; as the default; as it is all they have ever known. The people have not been subject to many of the more nasty sides of human nature, and thus they see them as something external and completely alien. This is not the case. Human nature is equal parts good and bad; right and wrong; kind and cruel: it is simply the exterior cultural climate in which the individual lives which exemplifies certain sides of this. How one tunes a guitar, human nature is tuned. It can be done up to a certain point by, for instance, propaganda, but the tuning of human beings mostly lies on two things: the availability of material resources; and the interior, spiritual state of the individual. These two forces interplay, of course, but those are the key realms.

To bring this into our modern context, a human being living in the West will have experienced a good life, on average. He has clothes, food, shelter and security aplenty. There are exceptions to every rule, but this is the average. The same here applies to the majority of first-generation immigrants. They will experience an abundance of material resources which keeps them, and everyone else, happy. The trouble is that there is no spiritual, “higher” bond between these people beyond material tendencies. This is now climaxing in horrid racial violence in the U.S.; the immigrant crisis in Europe; and Islamic fundamentalists clashing with Western degenerates; just to name a few conflicts. These three examples, though, were allowed in the first place by a war-torn West who needed labour after the second World War, and secondly by tolerant liberals who wanted immigration, and thus accelerated the rate of migration into Western nations all in the name of “equality.” Both materialistic, worldly plans.

The masses have allowed all this because the conditions have been okay so far – we still have a functioning society – but these things will not last. As pointed out above by those three examples of racial and cultural tensions, cracks are

appearing in the narrative of “everyone is equal and everyone wants world peace.”

2) Consumerism is the primary driving force for not only mass-immigration, but for the daily life of most Western individuals. Of course, again; this is not to be taken absolutely, but gently; broadly. Modern man lives to work, and he works to buy things. He purchases his pleasures and lives for sensual experience. Drug culture, party culture, club culture, sex culture, pornography, et cetera, are all manifestations of this drive to wallow in hedonism. To reduce life itself down to the lowest common denominator between diverse peoples: physical pleasure.

If that’s good for you; if you think that’s all existence is about – then good for you. Interestingly enough, modern man, you’re in limbo. The ancient and heroic peoples understood that – yes – there is the animal part in all of us, but it is not everything. It is allocated a place and it is restrained. Even the orgiastic rites of ancient Greece existed to fill a religious – transcendent – function; they existed beyond just having a good fuck, they attempted, although degenerately so, to push man beyond his there-and-then temporary self. Consumerism and hedonism presuppose that there is nothing beyond the self and the ego, and that a life is “good” as long as one is “happy.” This was not enough for the ancients, so what has changed? Well, the availability of resources tends to do interesting things to groups; the psychology of crowds is startling in comparison to the psychology of individuals. More on that a later time.

3) Champagne socialists do not represent the lower classes nor understand them. The rise of the intellectual class in the West is a sign of the superficiality of information to the minds of people. Knowledge is now a commodity, and it is a tragedy. Students spend hours in classrooms theorizing about class-relations, oppression, critical theory and so on, and not enough time living in the real world around real people. You, my silly progressive mass-immigration advocate; go down to your local workman’s cafe on a weekday lunchtime and ask around for the working man’s views on multiculturalism, Islam, the boat people crisis and so on. You will be horrified, but you deserve it. Contrary to popular belief, the working man is not stupid nor ignorant. Racism is not a symptom of low intelligence. It can manifest in a kind of sub-personal tribalism, yes – that is a part of human nature – but these things are not a product of nothing. There is a tangible difference between groups; there are higher cultures and lesser cultures: this is the diversity of the human races. Only an intellectual-type could attain the level of mental gymnastics needed in order to side-step these glaring truths.

Our society has existed in a state of nihilistic peace for so long that true human nature has been forgotten, and the people have become a mass of soulless, mass-produced objects. This, however, is an illusion which is breaking. The signs are there, and the awful spectacularness of mankind will once again be out in the open, as described. What is the right “state” though? The right condition? Tradition. More on that at a later point.



### III: Beyond "Real"

So how does all of this link to “decline”? Before I properly sink my teeth into this, I must further clarify my style, in a sense. I really do not have the time to write anything more than an extended essay to explain in great detail a philosophy of history, especially not in the way Oswald Spengler did in *The Decline of the West*, for example. The answers and viewpoints here will not be probed into to the point of obsession. I am a flawed human being, and I’m especially not used to writing such lengthy things; so forgive any incoherence or inconsistency. Back to the topic at hand, however.

It’s often that one overhears people saying thing like “This is the best time in history! Everyone is equal, we have freedom, medicine and technology allow us to live healthier lives for longer – what’s the problem?” The problem is simple: Human society has collectively shifted from a focus on quality to a focus on quantity, meaning that the long-term survival of the civilisation is at risk. This has occurred in multiple fashions. However, before we can deal with Material Degeneration and Spiritual Degeneration, more points must be dealt with.

To fully grasp what this extended monologue is "all about," I’d encourage the reader to explore beyond the politics and socioeconomics of the here and now. What we are trying to treat here may manifest in the here and now and on the lower levels such as economics and within classes, but it itself exists anterior to the day-to-day. It is essentially an existential crisis for the whole of humankind regardless of class, culture, colour or creed.

All things have a higher realm and a lower. Physical reality is simply a mirroring of metaphysical principles. All in the category of “real,” as far as what can be perceived by the senses, is a manifestation of principles which are just resonating on a lower plane which we can sensually perceive. Areas such as religion, spirituality, and so on, are not "real" in this sense, but they are still “real” in the sense of being; of existing on a higher level than the mundane. Logic and rationale are tools human beings use to access these realms, as such they could be compared to mathematics, to a degree. Mathematics, in a raw form, is abstraction; ideas; concepts – but it is still a real thing. It exists metaphysically and can be applied as a tool, and the tools of logic and reason can be used to explore it. Religion, spirituality, and so on, exist in a similar manner. It’s no wonder philosophers and metaphysicians like René Guénon and Julius Evola found their beginnings in mathematics. It all essentially relies on the individual’s capacity for logic.

An understanding of this higher realm of principles is something really confined to a few among the masses of humanity who have the time and

intelligence to explore it. This does not mean, however, that it is something which is to be shunned by those who aren't immediately drawn to it. An interest in religious matters does have broad, idealistic, "What about the whole of humanity?" aspects, but so does it affect one's day-to-day existence. How one goes about life, relationships, one's career (if at all) and so on are all areas which can be affected by one's inner orientation; one's sense of morality, of righteousness, or "properness," et cetera. This is not a place for everybody, but many could find a use for it at some level if they so chose to.

#### IV: On Material Degeneration

The term “Material Degeneration” includes a diverse range of phenomena which all manifest in physical reality. Psychology, biology, economics, most of politics and the availability of resources all fall under this umbrella. Degeneration is a coin; the material is one side, and the spiritual is the other. The latter will be dealt with at another time.

As far as human history is concerned, without going into “degeneration” yet, the most fundamental change throughout history which the human races have been subject to is the availability of resources, how these resources are distributed, and the "who" getting "how much." As human history has progressed, technology has improved with growing population sizes. Bigger populations require more resources, and technology has to keep up with the number of mouths which need feeding. Moreover, if a group is much bigger than another, it's more than likely, looking at history, that the bigger group will have a larger military force and will conquer the smaller group for resources, space and the assimilation of extra citizens. In short, larger groups do well for as long as they can sustain themselves. The most important aspect here is the psychological shift between humans, and collectives of humans, considering the size of the group.

Man alone is essentially of a masculine, individualistic character as he must depend on himself to survive. People like this are leaders; heroes. The warrior and priestly castes are made up of individuals who are, inwardly and/or outwardly, of this type character-wise. In the early stages of humanity, and of civilizations, these men thrive and quickly achieve high stations within their group. This is a theme of the beginnings of empires, where great leaders come fourth and sharpen the people in need of leadership into a sharp stick to point into the arse of the world. For those familiar with *The Fate of Empires*, the ages of Pioneers and Conquest are the playgrounds of these masculine types.

## Summary of *The Fate of Empires and Search for Survival* by John Glubb:

- A) *We do not learn from history because our studies are brief and prejudiced.*
- B) *In a surprising manner, 250 years emerges as the average length of national greatness.*
- C) *This average has not varied for 3,000 years. Does it represent ten generations?*
- D) *The stages of the rise and fall of great nations seem to be:*
  - The Age of Pioneers (outburst)*
  - The Age of Conquests*
  - The Age of Commerce*
  - The Age of Affluence*
  - The Age of Intellect*
  - The Age of Decadence*
- E) *Decadence is marked by:*
  - Defensiveness*
  - Pessimism*
  - Materialism*
  - Frivolity*
  - An influx of foreigners*
  - The Welfare State*
  - A weakening of religion*
- F) *Decadence is due to:*
  - Too long a period of wealth and power*
  - Selfishness*
  - Love of money*
  - The loss of a sense of duty*
- G) *The life histories of great states are amazingly similar, and are due to internal factors.*
- H) *Their falls are diverse, because they are largely the result of external causes.*
- I) *History should be taught as the history of the human race, though of course with emphasis on the history of the student's own country.*

This, however, does not last (as most things). Great men tend to great things, and the legacy heroes leave tends to be great. Further using the Fate of Empires as a kind of logical framework, we're now entering the ages of Commerce and Affluence. Great men still appear in these times, but the broad masses of the group become a more deciding factor on the direction of the civilization culturally. The merchant caste really comes into its own here as the previously militant group adopts more peaceful measures to sustain itself. This further accelerates the power of the group and the age of Affluence appears. There is, underneath all this, still a heroic and positive, outward-facing direction.

Once the group becomes massive in size, disaster strikes. This is the key point in the life-cycles of civilizations, empires and broad collectives. The

group undergoes a shift from the masculine in mentality to the feminine in mentality. I do not mean this in a sexological way, but in a kind of psychological attitude. From aggression to defensiveness; from an exclusive, elitist outlook, to an inclusive, anti-elitist outlook.

This shift does not happen at one instant, but it is a gradual process which is due to the sheer size of the group. Once a group becomes big enough, once the masses of the group become the deciding factor on how the group fundamentally is, things go from quality to quantity. The broad masses declare themselves to be equal to or above any heroic individuals, and the hero-figure fades into obscurity, only to be replaced by a huge mass of bodies. Crowds are feminine in their nature as the phenomenon of social pressure thrives; group-think becomes the accepted reality and people would rather not shake the calm waters and differ from the group, so they just go with the flow, like a stream of water.

It is during and after the realization of the power of the majority that we see, again, drawing from the Fate of Empires, the age of Intellect and the age of Decadence. The central essence of the aim, of the "style" of the group, becomes quantity instead of quality. Take for instance, modern egalitarianism. The claim that all human beings are equal, are the same, and that no man is higher or lower than another. The very concept of "greatness" has to be disregarded in order for this to function as not every man is capable of the same things. Everything, then, is reduced to the lower common denominator: the simplest commonality between individuals. What is this? Being a "human"? Is that what passes for "greatness"? The only way to ensure absolute equality is to eliminate all differences between people; genders, classes, races, et cetera, all must be eradicated. This is a central point of modern Marxism – an ideological formulation of quantity, mass-orientatedness, and so on. The group may be materially rich, but it has no plans for tomorrow and nothing to aim for. Again, we see consumerism and the obsession of ego functioning here. If there is nothing beyond the self, then life and existence begin and end at one's own ego and pleasure.

The material is a manifestation of the transcendent. As above, so below. Here we have so far briefly explored the higher side of the worldly meaning of "degeneration," without really looking too much at the lower side of Material Degeneration. For this, dear reader, simply look outside. Notice modernist architecture, which does not point upward towards the heavens as Cathedrals do, for instance; but instead appear as a mass of horizontal, mass-produced blocks. Cement, glass and plastic.

The most obvious manifestation of Material Degeneration is consumerism; mass-production; and the resulting social climate in which it

thrives. This is Globalism and Globalization - the turning of the world into a shopping mall and hotel. To quote Peter Hitchens,

*“Globalization is all about wealth. It knows the price of everything and the value of nothing. Without borders the world will become – is visibly becoming – a howling desert of traffic fumes, plastic and concrete, where nowhere is home and the only language is money.”*

## V: On Spiritual Degeneration

“Spiritual Degeneration” is something which can be taken either very specifically or very generally. We must deal with both broad and specific definitions for “Spiritual Degeneration,” both of which at a later point become one. To do this I must, generally, focus on what I see within the civilization of which I am a part of. For readers not of my culture, I’m sure that if you looked within your civilization – if it is of a modern type – you will be met with a familiar picture, no matter where you are geographically.

Broadly, mankind has collectively shifted from quality to quantity. This has happened on the material plane, as already covered; but also on the spiritual plane. The spiritual plane is distinguished from the material plane by essentially being a world of "principles," "ideas," "concepts," "abstractions," and so on; where the material is a world of the physical manifestations of these things: the material plane is a world of "things," "people," "matter," "reality," et cetera. So; where politically – materially – ideas such as borderlessness and mass socialism, for example, exist – the political application of the power of the masses, quantity over quality, anti-elitism, and so on – there is the spiritual counterpart which essentially follows the same essence of the collective politicking, but operates on the individual level.

A good example of the individual's spiritual degeneration, in fact the most obvious example, is the change in individual man's connection to God, to transcendence, to spirituality in general, over the ages. We, in the West, live under atheism, under nihilism, which is a far cry from previous forms of human civilization. Again, this degeneration over the ages is a very broad phenomenon, and both the material and spiritual sides of it interplay and are very much connected.

To pick, for instance, on a particular spiritual path which has degenerated, one could point a finger at Buddhism. In older times, Buddhism was seen as a warrior's religion, where through a process of utter self-discipline and self-slavery the individual would carve down into his self, cut through his consciousness and awaken his True Will and achieve a level of being called "enlightenment." The monk/ascetic would completely detach himself from normal, samsaric existence via a process or state of mind called *vivekka*, where he would be utterly immune to the development of ego. To quote the Buddhist Pali canon: *“To persevere steadfastly without wavering, the mind clear and unbewildered, the senses tranquil and undisturbed, consciousness concentrated and unified”*; *“With tireless and unremitting energy, with knowledge present and unshakable, with serene, untroubled body, with consciousness concentrated and unified”*; *“To persist alone, detached, tireless,*

*strenuous, with fervid, intimate earnestness.”;*

*“The ascetic has given up worldly craving and now rests with his mind free from craving, he purifies his mind of craving. He has given up hate and now rests with his mind free from hate, he purifies his mind of hate. He has given up inertia and accidie; lover of the light, clearly conscious, he purifies his mind of inertia and accidie. He has given up pride and restlessness, with his mind inwardly tranquil he purifies his mind of pride and restlessness. He has given up wavering, he has crossed over from doubtful uncertainty; he has no doubts about what is beneficial, he purifies his mind of wavering.”*

Need I even begin to compare this doctrine with the modern, Western interpretation of Buddhism which focuses on "love," "tolerance," "compassion," and so on? As someone who has family involved in Western interpretations of Buddhism, I can say very clearly to the reader: the vast majority of Western, modern "Buddhists" are well-intentioned, moral people, but they do not understand Buddhism or its more esoteric, "serious" aspects at all. Buddhism has devolved into a social cult as modern Westerners, hungry for some source of spirituality, have latched onto something which seems approachable and simple. It is deplorable, but unsurprising.

The spiritual state of the West has degenerated to the extent that many Westerners are looking outwards into other parts of the world for their spiritual needs. Western converts to Islam are becoming more and more frequent, as are converts to Buddhism, Sikhism, and various obscure sects and cults, as Christianity has essentially committed suicide in the West. An exploration into that will happen at another time.

One of the main troubles is how modern Westerners treat everything in rational, scientific terms and measures, and this even extends into spirituality. The mixing of physics and metaphysics is a great tragedy of our times. As one would try and fail to measure time with centimetres, or weight with the speed of sound, so one would try and fail to understand philosophy using politics or spirituality with science. I have already explained how metaphysics operates outside of space and time, anterior to its material manifestations.

The individual in the modern world sees nothing beyond his own there-and-then self; nothing to aim for. Self-overcoming or transcendence are forgotten ideas to the majority of people, let alone achieving a collective social order which also does this; which aims upwards. It must also be kept in mind



that we are not speaking of worldly goal-setting, which itself is not a degeneration, but it does become so when goal-setting is for its own sake and remains on the worldly plane.

Why would a man strive to attain peak physical condition? For women? For ego? Nonsense. A man would strive to attain peak physical condition because he is a man; he exists; he is real; he is absolute in his essence and demands of himself godliness wherever he can hope to attain it. Excellence is not a consequence or an end-goal, but a process; a style, whereby man aims to punch above his own weight in everyday life and constantly, untiringly, overcomes himself simply because he is. When this is put into a traditional perspective, the collective follows suit; not the other way around.

In a traditional collective, man is great, but so are all men. Not because the culture or society demands it, but because he, the individual demands it. Thus the collective is made of great individuals. Under the modern collective, it is the social and cultural; the external, which dominate man's life. He does things to serve outside causes and goals, and this may well result in a level of greatness - but greatness in this respect is a consequence, not the cause as it is for traditional man. Greatness is what the Gods are made of and what they demand, thus, no man is able to excuse himself from the duty of making his existence truly his and his alone via willpower and the urge to overcome; to, again; transcend.

Again, I will repeat; the shift has happened: mankind collectively has moved from looking upwards to looking downwards; from focusing on quality to focusing on quantity; from being exclusive to being inclusive; from becoming great to renouncing the very concept of greatness.

## VI: On Dealing with the Nonsense

It's no secret that if one's fundamental character is antithetical to what is accepted as social commonplace; one's moral compass is pointing in a different direction to that which most other people's moral compass points and one's attitude to life and the universe is in direct opposition to what is held as the present norm, then difficulties will arise. Difficulties in one's daily life, career, personal relationships, even how one spends one's evenings. If one takes a serious stance against the forces subverting and destroying the society at large, it becomes exceedingly difficult to just "go with the flow," so to speak.

On the news in Britain, for instance, you don't need to wait very long before you're set upon by the BBC to feel sorry for "migrants" or "minorities," who, in the eyes of the establishment, have as much right to live and benefit from this land as the native population who have defended and improved it for millennia. Of course, this is nonsense, but the liberal establishment, or "Cathedral" as Neoreactionaries have coined it, is of a worldview which is inclusive, mass-orientated, materialistic, and has methods and aims which are ultimately detrimental to the well-being and longevity of you, the European or Anglo-descendent, and your group. This anti-Anglo-European agenda is very obvious, and it can be extremely irritating (to be polite) for those of us who are capable of considering what our societies could be in the future – what mankind is and could be – due to the following of this worldview.

The introduction of women to formerly male-only workspaces has changed the very ethos of much of the Western Proletariat, from a masculine, strong force, to an effeminate, catty sub-plebeian class of zombies castrated by political correctness and other forms of social terrorism. The forces subverting the West, however, are not coming from below. They are out of reach for common people, and this has been done deliberately.

Your typical chauvinistic racist working man believes the problems in society to be, typically, politicians being greedy, and politicians being power-hungry. The idea that most of the problem right now is being articulated and fueled by intellectuals in universities is foreign, and extremely nonsensical to the common man. After all, university is for the clever people who know what they're doing. That newspapers constantly pick up on the failings of degenerate politicians and lawmakers only fuels this tunnel-vision, hence what isn't news to the Reactosphere, like decades of ideological progressivism or the misuse of various philosophical theories such as Hegelian Dialectics, remains hidden and, again, out of reach for the common man.

This is one very important fact. The scenario we find ourselves in has

largely been formed via ideology and especially philosophy. It's one thing for the common man to complain about low wages, but it is totally another for an intellectual to espouse anticapitalistic rhetoric garnished with notions of minimum wage, ethical treatment of workers and "power to the people." Once ideology is introduced to the scenario, the game changes completely. We are now playing a rigged game, which is not in our favour.

It's been said by former radical socialist, now Burkian conservative, Peter Hitchens that the only reason why he, in his younger days, would support mass immigration (and in turn wage compression, pressure on infrastructure and so on) to the detriment of the native proletariat wasn't out of compassion for either the immigrant or the prole, but because this conflict could be channeled against the established (at the time) conservative zeitgeist. And this is still the case for the majority of mass-immigration advocates, even if unconsciously; indirectly.

The forces in motion are largely existent for a purpose, to fulfill an aim, to meet a goal. If not deliberately, then as an unconsidered consequence. The destruction and desacralizing of the family unit, for example, has disastrous long-term consequences as well as startling implications for the here-and-now. As is the case with moral relativism. But these things, most of the time, aren't considered in the long-term by their architects or supporters (hence liberalism is self-destroying) – but they are utterly alien to people who could potentially rally a proper defence against them. The masses, as they have proven themselves to be throughout history, are ignorant, stupid, violent, short-sighted and incapable of prolonged intelligent thought beyond feeding and fucking. Individuals are often the opposite, but crowds, the masses, the common rabble, acts as a blind, rabid feral dog without thought of the next generation or even the latter stage of its own generation. This trait can be a strength when the bad must be flushed-out of a society via violence; but so is it detrimental as this idiocy can be taken advantage of and utilized to meet an end or avoid another. It must be understood that the present crisis is largely to be blamed on intellectuals and theorists who are either ignorant of the long-term consequences of their actions, or are demonically malevolent. Taking into account the damage that has been done thus far, the only cure for the either is the firing squad.

That our scenario is presently out of reach for the common people presents an interesting picture for those of us of a more academic or intellectual temperament who aren't hell-bent on the destruction of the human species. The forces which need obliterating are within the grasp of the Reactosphere, the Tradosphere, the Alternative Right, et cetera. Of course, we all have our opinions on how any "battle" should be fought if at all, but

nevertheless the option is there for us. Ideology and harmful philosophy cannot be trumped by random acts of discrimination, or spasms of violence, or any economic/materialistic incentive. Ideas which have been proven wrong in reality must also be proven wrong in theory, and further; in spirit.

Marxism has been a disaster globally, but the essence of the worldview; mass-orientatedness, inclusivity, materialism, degenerate femininity, baseness, squalor; has not been bested on the intellectual level by any mainstream alternative. Contemporary conservatism is not conservative by-in-large; it is essentially the liberalism of twenty years ago. Conservative pundits and figures regularly espouse egalitarianism, democracy, tolerance, mass public spending and so on, when a true Right would despise all of the aforementioned. A true Right is a traditional Right, something antithetical to the modern world; hence the lack of one within the remit of anything “normal” or “bourgeois.” Nevertheless, this again presents the importance of the alternative Right and its various manifestations; we are not normal or bourgeois in any sense. We are free from the chains of normalcy, and thus we can exercise our remit where any potential alternative has failed – and we are already doing so to a degree via the internet, via various political parties, via staying true to ourselves and who we are and what we want.

Serving modernity on the base economic level is not an issue, nor is it difficult for the most part. We are still living within successful civilizations whereby there are resources and helping hands aplenty should we need them. Any individual reading this and capable of understanding it is also capable of sustaining oneself. Whilst living in a rather spiritually desolate time, we do also live in rather simple, straight-forward times materially.

“Dealing with” the modern world on the interior level is something else entirely. As implied at the beginning of this piece, handling a society of a spirit which is so antithetical to our interior orientation is a difficulty in a multitude of ways. I myself have even gone as far as to consider suicide as a means to escape such a place and time I feel so strongly against. It is a deep feeling; purely intuitive. One can make arguments and rational statements about why things are “bad,” but what it comes down to ultimately is a pure, honest divide between what most of us are as people; our temperaments, personalities, characters, spirits; and what is extrapolated and encouraged by the society around us at large.

One part of our temperament, though, as those who want something else; something cleaner, more honest, rawer, stronger; is a resilience. A legionary resilience. Oswald Spengler’s maxim “*Loyalty is stronger than fire.*” burns true for us. And even if we have forgotten this, even if the external conditions have beaten down on us and choked the flame of courage which is

in our hearts, it still burns and it always will. This is who we are and we cannot lie to ourselves about who we are.

If one is so weak as to fall to pessimism and athleticism, then you aren't one of us. You don't deserve what you want. History is made by those who deserved what they got, and just as the liberals and agitators driving our societies over the edge of a cliff will suffer immensely when they begin the fall, so will those of us who are ready and waiting prevail. We know what civilization is, we know in ourselves what we need; we know what humanity is and what it needs. And the one thing it does not need is the present epoch, and so it will cast it away in the near future.

I said previously that the present liberalism is self-destroying, and how could it not be? Mass immigration has brought millions of outsiders into our lands upon strictly financial lines; the entire ethos of the society is centered around money and hedonism – a short chain which will inevitably collapse at some point as societies are cyclical. They rise and fall, and the present age is no more privileged or special than the last. Mass multiculturalism and multiethnicism are bubbles waiting to burst. Conflict and evil are one half of human nature, and there is no way in this reality that all these different groups, with different moral codes, different worldviews, different existential philosophies, will play nice forever. Human history has taught us better than to be so stupid. I could go on but there really is no need to, just look outside.

Returning directly to the title of this piece, “On Dealing with the Nonsense,” I'd say to those who are like-minded; those who are of a like-orientation: stay strong and have faith that these idiots are wrong. And they are, we know this; we have done the studying and the thinking and the contemplating, as well as the living and the seeing and the hearing. We are right and the evidence both in theory and reality proves us so. To politically change our scenario right now is a battle that was lost some time ago, I'd say, which leaves us with ourselves. Self-mastery and self-discipline ought to be rediscovered. We must make-do with our external situation and not let it get the better of us internally. This to be done actively, consistently and untiringly. We must lead by example.

Obviously, Julius Evola's *Ride the Tiger* is a well-known philosophical analysis of a certain Traditionalist existentialism which goes far deeper into spiritually “surviving” the modern world than I (or scarce few others) could. I'd encourage the reader to look there or to any of his other works which deal with pointing out a “path” for those of us who are not of the present social temperament and character if one is so inclined.

The one thing lacking within many individuals in these spheres is a true inner confidence and power. I would suggest the addressing of that to be the

first step on the path beyond being able to simply make arguments and rational points. I wouldn't trust myself if I weren't internally strong and organized, and I wouldn't expect others to either.

## VII: On Competition and the Metaphysical Principle

The previous parts have largely been concerned with the scale of individuals and the scale of one's own present experience within the confines of the progressive, post-modern Western world. Further reading beyond my own inadequate monologues is recommended; mainly the work of the late Italian esotericist Julius Evola and his works *Revolt Against the Modern World*, *Men amid the Ruins* and *Ride the Tiger*; as well as the late French intellectual Rene Guenon and his work *The Crisis of the Modern World* (which ought to be read before any of Julius Evola's work). The central premise of the aforementioned works – differences taken into account – is that Western mankind is presently living within a state of spiritual deterioration which is leading to the demise of Western civilisation. If one is so inclined to believe history is cyclical then the present epoch can seem “natural” or, at the very least, not as artificial as some would believe; thus the “fall” of a civilization appears as a somewhat normal occurrence which happens once certain boxes are ticked, to put it one way. Once a society reaches a certain size, as spoken of in a previous part, forces are set in motion which change the nature of the society at large. The psychology and behaviour of large groups of individuals, as is a more common occurrence within developed, metropolitan Western cities, differs greatly than that of the behaviour of small communities or of individuals. Gustave le Bon's *The Crowd* deals with this extensively; and I certainly believe this is an area of study which requires much more attention than what it presently receives. That is not to say that certain groups with certain agendas cannot achieve certain things “unnaturally,” or at least ulteriorly and subversively. Western media at the present time is rife with agendas and the misrepresentation of reality: lies which misinform the population and in turn create a false image of reality which is then carried through nearly the entire society. Human nature is partly tribal and primal, and social consensus – the desire to fit into the norms of the group – exists as a mechanism to avoid infighting within a tribe, so that groups do not constantly tear each other apart. This, however, is an evolutionary mechanism which is constantly exploited by the contemporary intelligentsia. The doctrine of political correctness is one such exploitation of this innate, primal desire, which is clearly the result – at least in part – of intellectuals with agendas, wishing to control the scope of information and expression ordinary people are exposed to. Totalitarianism. To quote Evola's *Men amid the Ruins*,

*“I wish to say that it [liberalism] represents the antithesis of every organic doctrine. Since according to liberalism the primary element is the human being regarded not as person, but rather as an individual living in a formless freedom, this philosophy is able to conceive society merely as a mechanical interplay of forces and entities acting and reacting to each other, according to the space they succeed in gaining for themselves, without the overall system reflecting any higher law of order or meaning. The only law, and thus the only State, that liberalism can conceive has therefore an extrinsic character in regard to its subjects. Power is entrusted to the State by sovereign individuals, so that it may safeguard the freedoms of the individuals and intervene only when these freedoms clash and prove dangerous to one another. Thus, order appears as a limitation and a regulation of freedoms, rather than as a form that freedom itself expresses from within, as freedom to do something, or as freedom connected to a quality and a specific function. Order, namely the legal order, eventually amounts to an act of violence because, practically speaking, in a liberal and democratic regime a government is defined in terms of a majority; thus, the minority, though composed of “free individuals,” must bow and obey.”*

The semideliberate nature of the present crisis is of course a double-edged sword. Pampered, healthy Westerners who have never known danger or the very real nature of group versus group competition which exists throughout most of human history are ignorant, and thus vulnerable. It is quite clearly not the entire fault of the liberal establishment that these sorts of people exist – it is more a result of the prosperous, peaceful society Western people have spent millennia spilling blood for existing for a long enough period for a generation or two to be raised within, never fully understanding the exceptional nature of such a historical occurrence. To understand the exceptional nature of such an occurrence, one needs to know history and human nature in a certain way. That is, to see it in its wholeness: the good with the bad – the latter requiring extensive knowledge of (typically secondhand, but most effectively firsthand) to bring the two into equilibrium where all possibilities are taken into consideration. The greatest danger facing Westerners is twofold: 1) an incompetent and malevolent leadership which is not concerned with the



longterm survival of the group they ought to be representing and serving, and 2) the farce of multiculturalism which the Western leadership is bringing about, and will ultimately culminate in violence between native Westerners and outsiders. The first point is rather easily observable. The incompetence and stupidity of Western higher-ups is often exaggerated by the media for whatever reason, but is still existent enough for it to be noticeable and fatally powerful. From the naive antistrength stance of the political far Left, to the shallow, short-term interests of the Left, to the apathetic, powerless tolerance of the centerground, to the materialistic, lackluster rhetoric of the Right, to the often thuggish and overly populist far Right, all areas of the Western political spectrum fail to adequately diagnose and treat the illness we are currently experiencing – even though many individuals within the political elite have spent years if not decades refining their craft and their minds (or at least they ought've). So how are almost all areas of Western influence causing more problems than they are solving? The full reason is extremely complex of course, but to give the very short answer as I see it, the reason is simple lack of perspective.

Most people live their lives in the here and now, only really concerning themselves with day-to-day survival and filling the gap between life and death with as much comfort as possible. One can attribute this to our biological nature; creatures evolve and adapt to their environment to the bare minimum of what is required to survive with relative success without expending excess energy and resources. Without higher motivation such as religious or spiritual reasoning, humanity is prone likewise; where as a species we are very content to slough down into the lowest common denominators and only do what is necessary to get by without it being too intolerable. Of course, on the plane of human groups, one group which is stronger, more confident and more assertive than another will reign triumphant over the latter: survival of the fittest is a principle which humans are not wholly free of. As said, human history is the grand story of this dance of life and death; of the strong and clever besting the weak and stupid within the grand theatre of Mother Earth – and what a fascinating tale it has been thus far! But as we have also seen (especially concerning present-day Europe), groups which reach positions of power can quickly stop their advance due to the aforementioned mechanism whereby a group need not advance any further. This is evidently the case with the few isolated tribes which still exist in the more remote areas of South America, Africa and parts of Asia; human groups who didn't move much beyond the stone age by themselves because there was no reason for them to do so – they could survive relatively quite well as they were. European history, contrarily, is full of competition where groups had to continuously outdo

one another to survive; war is one of the primary drivers behind technological advancement, to pick one example, which in turn leads the population of the technologically advanced group to develop greater medicinal capabilities. Group competition is the primary driving force behind advancement. There are other forces which can further a society's advancement. That the West is still developing technologically is not really due to group versus group conflict, but because the resources are there within the civilization which enables "passive" advancement (instead of "aggressive" advancement like we see as a result of war) during peacetime or in areas which are not facing direct existential threats.

Direct existential threats, however, are not as common as indirect existential threats. The latter are in fact ever-present in all waking moments at all levels. It's a metaphysical principle, that of difference itself, which is manifest on all planes. As long as there exists one thing and another, there is difference, and the prospect of one overcoming the other in any way. From the simplest physics whereby strong forces dominate weak forces, to the most complex ecosystems whereby survival of the fittest is law, to the basest human interaction: we shake hands, but who extends their arm first, grips tightest and withdraws quickest? The exertion of power, manifest via the principle of multiplicity, is an inescapable law of reality and beyond. Regarding humanity, I'll quote Evola:

*"The notion of "many" (i.e., a multiplicity of individual beings) logically contradicts the notion of "many equals." First of all, ontologically speaking, this is due to the so-called "principle of indiscernibles," which is expressed in these terms: "A being that is absolutely identical to another, under every regard, would be one and the same with it." Thus, in the concept of "many" is implicit the concept of their fundamental difference: "many" beings that are equal, completely equal, would not be many, but one. To uphold the equality of the many is a contradiction in terms, unless we refer to a body of soulless mass-produced objects."*

Inequality; difference; competition; et cetera, is a fact of nature and of man and of life. This has been forgotten by a huge number of people living in the Western world, and that ignorance puts them at a disadvantage existentially against groups who are well aware, whether at an intelligent level or not, of the fact. Most non-Western people are aware of this fact; most immigrants coming to the West are aware of this fact; and so on. Western people will, very

soon, be forced to reawaken. If not, then they will be destroyed.

## VIII pt. 1: Diving In

The following will be slightly more personal, more human, than what's previously been discussed. There are issues I have, chaotic and demonic urges which I'm sure we all feel the pull of to some extent. Growing up fatherless I've always been leaderless; guideless. It's an extraordinarily difficult thing for me to do, this writing, podcasts, even pursuing my own hobbies such as mountain biking and drumming, because I can seldom motivate myself – or, more acutely, my motivation quickly dissipates and it takes an enormous amount of energy to regain momentum.

Perhaps this feature of my psyche is partly environmental, partly inborn. Perhaps it's a part of my personality which I cannot wholly "correct" or avoid. I do believe it is worth attempting, however. In a Nietzschean way, to paraphrase the late Jonathan Bowden, life should be imagined as a constant process of self overbecoming whereby one moves steadfastly ever closer to the sun. In this manner I do genuinely feel myself, in essence, as belonging to a different race than the overwhelming majority of my contemporaries (well done to you if you recognized that sentence). My birth caste feels alien and distant to me; I've been thrust into the world at a chaotic time, have undergone chaotic experiences, and developed a somewhat chaotic personality. On the surface, I'm often calm and collected; articulate and friendly. Beneath the surface, however I'm cut into halves: one half a bleak, self-destructive, chthonic place as the source of demonic urges and indulgence; the other half a serene place of reason, light and oneness which is the primary motivator for my political/philosophical/spiritual externalizations (and of course internalizations). There is constant interplay where the former must be continuously be beaten down and subdued. Occasionally it takes the upperhand and drowns me for what could be a period of minutes to weeks.

I titled this section "Diving In" to both explain my inner dichotomy as well as an outer dichotomy which I may or may not fully understand; hence the recent post I made titled "Inner Doctrine, Outer Doctrine or Both" and its subsequent deletion.

## Inner Doctrine, Outer Doctrine or Both?

From a Traditionalist standpoint, one of the many problems facing us in the modern world is the destruction of any true religious or high spiritual institution. Typically, the philosophical Left has been the root of these destructive tendencies, itself a manifestation of the Temporal Principle which is bent on reducing reality itself down to that level instead of allowing or admitting hierarchy as a fact of life. Thus, the Right – and I mean a true Right; late liberals, modernists and cuckservatives need not apply – has, as a part of its mission, the restoration of these institutions. Of course, the Right itself is not wholly Traditionalist as I have said before, but the true Right has its bedrock in the understanding of inequality as a principle: hierarchy as a natural law and a natural good. This is what differentiates the Right and the Left philosophically, which manifests politically (at least in principle). And it is this principle of hierarchy which religious paths are all a part of understanding; that there is the Above as there is the Below, and mankind can – and should – strive upwards towards the Divine by assimilating a yearning for Truth and the practice of Virtue. These are ideas which are vital, and have been a part of human existence for almost our entire history. It is only now in the post-Enlightenment age where we have deemed ourselves “too good” for such superstitions and “arbitrary rules,” thus Western Man particularly has entered a state of chaos, disunity and interior confusion.

So, if it is understood that the Right has, as a part of its mission in the future, the restoration and protection of religious institutions (as degenerated as many presently are), how do we reconcile proletarian Nationalism and esoteric Perennialism as being aimed in the same direction? This may be an eccentric statement to make, but the progressive, post-modern West is an enemy of both things, just at different levels.

If it is understood that the divide between the exoteric and esoteric is necessary (in fact, inevitable), then one can quite easily see the “lower” elements of our present scenario being challenged by the working man and his flags. Anti-European policies, laws and attitudes spewing forth from the intelligentsia may seem symptomatic of a higher function to the esotericist (and he is right), but not all people have the same reach. Thus, Nationalist groups – which largely stand for the traditional family, Christian or European-centric morality and loyalty as the basis of honour – have a role assigned to them in challenging the baser elements of the present age. The various Nationalist political parties throughout Europe do tend to make blunders however, especially when they’re on the brink of flowering into something more sophisticated than base ethno/racial-centrism devoid of culture and

form. This was clearly the case with the British National Party when certain members decided to ostracize the late intellectual Jonathan Bowden, himself far beyond most of his fellow members of the party intellectually-speaking. Men such as Bowden, who do in essence belong to another world compared to a typical working-class proud white man, are essential in bridging the divide between the exoteric and the esoteric in this sense. The bridging of this divide is absolutely essential, as of course any movement or organization needs to have some approachable populist tendencies – especially in our age – but so does it need to understand itself and what it stands for fundamentally; as well as how to achieve its aims.

I feel that there is grave error in assuming one is “above petty Nationalism.” For the overrunning of Europe by a very large number of outsiders when the native leaders are not interested in their own survival is more than just a racial or material issue. As the esotericist is already aware, that Europe has been reduced to this state by prior forces, the physical conditions are but a reflection of the spiritual conditions of the population. And those who can speak well about such things have no reason not to do so. Just as there is a torrent of ever-increasing Nationalism in Europe along material lines, so that struggle needs to be reinforced and strengthened by that which is transcendental and eternal. And it shall be so as the crisis exists at all levels! The civilization which – to a noticeable degree – has abandoned totally the idea of its own existence being important is a danger to all citizens of all castes! To never speak of the present migration crisis, or cultural Marxism or the various occurrences of self-hatred which emerge from the established narrative in favour of the Inner Path is not an error in and of itself, but to dedicate oneself to the Inner Path alone is a failure in duty to one’s fellow citizens, one’s nation and one’s family.

I hear the theologians and metaphysicians now: “But ah, you silly plebeian! The Absolute is eternal and unflinching, and is clearly superior to the mundane – eternal Truth triumphs over any and all temporal struggles as it is what lies behind and above the temporal!” Well I say to you: “Yes! Exactly! Hence your higher struggle is what the lower struggle is a reflection of – but one attacks on all fronts! If the mundane is one reflection of the Absolute, then – in principle – striving towards the perfect Absolute means striving towards the perfect mundane (or as perfect as the mundane could be inasmuch as it peers upwards)! If one dimension of our crisis is the interior, spiritual state of man, and this chaos is to blame for our mundane, physical Robertson, then is not the betterment of the former intrinsically linked to the latter? And vice versa? Is not, I say to you, the struggle of the prole fearful of what his homeland is becoming a reflection of a deeper concern? A concern

we all share? The resistance against the bleakness, the destruction, the abyss and the chaos of the present age is a battle we fight differently but together!”

Do not fall to despair, working man. You are not an equal to the esotericist, but your role is extraordinarily valuable – if not moreso. For it is you who will spill blood and bleed for your nature, it is you who will actively, physically manifest as the the sigil of righteous fury and strength when the time is ripe. My words do not count for much, I know, but it must be understood that animosity between those who partake in the domain of action and those who partake in the domain of contemplation is unnecessary and actually harmful. Divide and conquer should be applied to the enemy, not to ourselves.

What does all this rambling mean practically, however? It means consideration of inequality; the discarding of the proto-egalitarianism that is “socialism”; and most importantly, the striving upwards at all levels – not just the high philosophical or metaphysical, but the mundane and temporal as well. This principle is one we must all embody – it must be taken into ourselves and our very being and never forgotten in an age antithetical to such a notion. It means staying true to Truth and the virtue of Virtue.

We are entering the beginning of the end of the current cycle. The moment the overton window is ready to accelerate, the moment another Golden Age is ready to blossom, those of us who are ready and waiting must push forwards with courage. Nothing is impossible; we will prevail.

### VIII pt. 1: Diving In cont.

I essentially advocated for those of a higher caste and those of a lower caste to mutually respect one another, and gave the respective examples of a metaphysics-studying philosopher-priest and a working class Western nationalist. I wasn't in error in assuming castes should respect each other – they absolutely should in their own ways – but the post wasn't worth making (what I was advocating is self-evident and doesn't require writing on), and was to my perception after a night's rest just a projection of my own problem.

One part of me wants to dive in, it wants to travel that path of knowledge and liberation. The other is worldly and has no interest. Yet, both are aimed towards dissatisfaction with the world and what could be construed as a “Right-wing” orientation, to frame it politically, thus there does exist some semblance of balance, albeit on an egoistic level.

In life I've thought about my path and my professional direction. I still do not know what I'll end up doing. If I wasn't physically disabled and didn't have what I'd describe as issues coping with aggression I'd join the army. If I was religious or found Christian ethics appealing I'd become a priest. If I was more studious I'd become a writer of some description. I just don't know what to do with myself and my life.

Frequently I've considered suicide over my left hand (club radial syndrome). Knowing that no matter what I do, no matter what I achieve, no matter how much money I make, no matter how happy I become, no matter if I ever become spiritually at peace, I'll always be incomplete, broken, faulty, underdeveloped. It's hugely demoralising. Of course, if I do ever achieve some spiritual peace such questions will be irrelevant as will anything along those lines. But I cannot see it as right for myself to achieve that state. It isn't right. I do not believe this to be some superficial inferiority complex, but rather an admittance of weakness which I cannot ever hope to build upon and correct. My pessimism is out in the open here, and I apologise if this comes across as melodramatic or childish.

So, the process of even making steps is something I cannot rationalize fully. I'm held back constantly by the awareness that my physical self will never be a reflection of my metaphysical self, no matter how refined the latter. I seem to be bound to spiral downwards every time I make one step forwards.

I think, more broadly, however, the process of diving in is a difficult one for many to make – in fact I doubt it's a conscious moment, but a process. I believe myself to be undergoing that process, but part of me is turning back and pulling the rest with it. I am venting a little bit here – I know this isn't a personal blogging site – but I suppose I am seeking guidance and advice.



## VIII pt. 2: Velocity and Ferocity

Snow came to Exeter early this morning; the first in several years of cold but wet Winters. Allegedly there'll be more in the coming weeks, although no less rain as well. I hope for snow; it always makes for good fun and joyful spirits.

Last year was an interesting one for me. I re-entered the online world after several months of solitude starting from the twenty-second of December, 2014 and lasting until the twenty-second of March, 2015 – and even then my re-engagement with projects in a serious way began in June; writing and posting on *West Coast Reactionaries* after Andrew Martyanov passingly mentioned to me that he'd started a blog. In October I kicked off “The Plebeian Podcast” again which lasted for eight weeks, and within which a lot of ground was covered in a much cleaner, more direct way than it had been the previous year. In December I participated in Colin Robertson's “Millenniyule Hangouts” which resulted in a tidal wave of new subscribers to my YouTube channel, new contact requests, new friends and new projects in the works. It was certainly a catalyst.

One thing which really stuck out from all this was the sheer quantity of individuals involved with the Alternative Right, any of its component parts such as the Reactosphere or the Manosphere, and parallel phenomena such as Neoreaction. This gargantuan force of energy, this volatile and exciting nexus of creativity, isn't growing at the present by chance. Corresponding physical events outside of the internet such as the European “refugee” crisis, evermore common Jihadist attacks on European and Anglophone nations, continued malevolence and incompetence from the majority of the Western elite, et cetera. – all forming the present cultural climate which, dare I say, is growing evermore restless – all says to me that something sizeable will occur soon. Perhaps something this year or the next. It's a matter of lighting a fuse.

The velocity with which the West is throwing itself against the walls of its modern prison, again and again, means that I do not believe for a second that the Current Year™ will be able to successfully strengthen these walls and calm the madman trapped inside in the near future. Recent events in Cologne and the resulting backlash (all recently analysed excellently by Robertson) are but a taster of what's to come. I am not suggesting that any “Happening”-tier event will unfold, but we will continue to see ever-increasing levels of social discontent in mainland Europe and elsewhere. As Markus Willenger shouts out in *Generation Identity: A Declaration of War Against the '68ers*,

*“After the National Socialist reign of terror, our continent fell sick and lost its will to live. The next generation, the ’68ers, hated and condemned everything that had been passed down to them: every tradition, every belief in their own kind, every will toward an authentic identity. ... The ideology of the ’68ers has infected Europe. ... Even if we’ve lost our will to power, our neighbours haven’t, and they’re already penetrating our borders and occupying the places that we freely surrender to them. ...*

*A new political current is sweeping through Europe. It has one goal, one symbol, and one thought: Identity ... Our generation is rising up to dethrone the ’68ers.”*

Any major sociocultural shift is marked prior by psychological and spiritual undercurrents which later culminate at moments of strategic importance. Europe’s Identitarian movement is one such undercurrent, the Alt. Right is another, as is NRx, as are all of the various thinktanks, groups and organisations online or offline which follow a similar trajectory which is pro-identity, pro-power, and anti-establishment.

Of course, the problem or “enemy” isn’t what Willinger terms the “’68ers” for everyone or every movement. It’s this idea, however, that we are now seeing the birthing of generations who’re detached from the aftermath of the last European Civil War which is of note; generations unassociated with the guilt and psycho-emotional fluff the sixties extrapolated. As Edward Rosenthal noted in a recent discussion with me, it’s as if those dark clouds are dispersing, leaving the sky clear for the eyes to gaze upwards uninhibited.

The matrix of bourgeois liberalism is still in full swing overall, however; what we’re seeing now are cracks in it, not its destruction. It’s foolish to attempt to foresee the future geopolitically regarding any deterioration or collapse; what matters is the eternal values which stay true regardless of circumstance. But it is this style of upwardsness, of virtue, of telling the truth, of consequential loyalty to one’s self, family and community, of strength and honour, which unite us in the present epoch – the belief that the world can be a better place, and indeed it can be.

We must detach ourselves from the sinking ship of liberal conformity – that venomous snake. As Erich Fromm says in *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*,

*“What has happened in modern industrial society is that traditions, and common values, and genuine social personal ties with others have largely disappeared. The modern mass man is isolated and lonely, even though he is part of a crowd; he has no convictions which he could share with others, only slogans and ideologies he gets from the communications media.”*

The only way to regain what has been lost – at least on one level – is to consciously break away from the shackles which prohibit not only liberation at the higher level, but even the low – yet imperative – level of social expectations, of behaviour, et cetera. I have spoken of this elsewhere, notably – to give a good example of an artform which departs from bourgeois values – in an article about NOBODY™, as well as within a rather lengthy conversation with a friend on many topics. In a Nietzschean way, to paraphrase the late Jonathan Bowden, life should be imagined as a constant process of self-overbecoming whereby one moves steadfastly ever closer to the sun. Again: transcendence; the moving from the ground upwards.

The European is in a difficult position. Centuries of high social trust as an effect survival strategy, now mixed with evermore apparent atomisation brought about via capitalism and the global market. He is not in a good way to survive the coming centuries. But those of us who are awake must try, we must never give it or fall victim to any sort of defeatism or pessimism whatsoever. One could describe it as an anti-nihilism, an anti-apathy: a steadfast iron spirit, not dissimilar to what Oswald Spengler describes in *Man and Technics*:

*“We are born into this time and must bravely follow the path to the destined end. There is no other way. Our duty is to hold on to the lost position, without hope, without rescue, like that Roman soldier whose bones were found in front of a door in Pompeii, who, during the eruption of Vesuvius, died at his post because they forgot to relieve him. That is greatness. That is what it means to be a thoroughbred. The honourable end is the one thing that can not be taken from a man.”*

Of course there are parallels between this and much of what Julius Evola spoke of. The idea that we are living in a doomed age, in a final stage which we must endure, for what is the alternative? I have said this before but it is a

choice between a “Yes!” or a “No!” regarding the question of “Do we stay firm and upright in our principles amid an age of dissolution?” I am absolutely regurgitating the words of Evola and so on here, but it cannot be repeated enough; it cannot be overstated: Onwards and upwards. Forever.

## IX: End

It appears that the entirety of this series has been rendered obsolete. That isn't a decrying or negative statement, but rather an observation. I began this series in mid-2014 as an attempt at elucidating my own worldview, a "making sense of things" – at the time I'd only just then found the Reactosphere on YouTube and it was like finding a goldmine. Almost two years on, too much having changed to write down, and looking back upon what's written, I can surely say that I was onto something from the start. Intuition seems to be a gift I'm blessed with, and even if I'm not the best writer – far from it – or the most academic or studious – extremely far from it – I have a good "feel" for things; I visualise information as emotions, colours, shapes, movements, etc. – it's difficult to describe. But I digress.

What's occurred thus far in this piece is demonstrative of the series' usefulness running its end; the talking of myself as opposed to external ideas and so fourth. This is a pagan quality, however; the extrapolation of Fallen Man as opposed to from where he fell; from man as opposed to elsewhere. From the volk; "ur"; the earth; the ground; "As below." Not the chthonic from Man's perspective, but the chthonic from the perspective of the Firmament. Fractalistic dualism. Et cetera. And not from a sort of egotistic or narcissistic place; but what's closest to me is myself and my interior machinations, as flawed as they are.

This is of course a process, I'm not even in my twenties yet, so I'm sure I'll get muscle cramps from hunching downwards eventually and have to stretch upwards. I'm already aware of these things regardless, but I'm not actively interacting with such things beyond the simulated nature of "reading" and "discussing." It's quite illusory, but I know it is as such. If this writing thus far appears esoteric... so what? [Rhetoricae quaestio.]

If the Anglican or Catholic Church or perhaps another Western entity was in healthier shape I'd jump to it in a heartbeat. But, as we're all familiar, that isn't the case. A schism is needed in the mainstream Western Churches between those who are pro-European identity and those who are otherwise, to put it simplistically. One could contextualise it as "Right" and "Left" respectively. A counter-Reformation is in order, so to speak. (Almost as edgy as "counter-Revolution.")

In ~~related~~ Evolian news:

*“The elimination of every presupposition also causes a crisis for much of the Nietzschean doctrine of the superman, which is no less unilateral because of its frequent emphasis on aspects of life contrary to those just posited by Guyau: will to power, hardness, and so on. In all strictness, to be purely oneself and to have a fully free existence, one should be able to accept, will, and say an absolute “yes” to whatever one is – even when there is nothing in one’s nature that approaches the ideal of the superman; even if one’s own life and destiny do not present heroism, nobility, splendor, generosity, and altruism, but decadence, corruption, debility, and perversion. A distant reflection of this path is to be found even in the Christian world, in Calvinism. It is the doctrine of the fallen man, broken by original sin but redeemed through “faith”; of man simultaneously justified and a sinner, in the face of the Absolute. But in a world without God, the result of such an attitude is to leave oneself in an extreme trail of strength and denudation of the I. Hence the Nietzschean claim of having “rediscovered the way that leads to a yes and a no: I teach you to say yes to all that strengthens, that gathers energy, that justifies the feeling of vigor.” This claim is justified only when the corresponding command is transposed, internalized, and purified, detached from any specific content and especially from any reference to a greater or lesser vitality. It is rather a matter of either being capable or incapable of holding form within, in one’s own naked absolute being, with nothing to fear and nothing to hope for.”*

– *Ride the Tiger*, pg. 43

An externalisation is simply a willing for external response. Any outward motion beyond the self has an end somewhere. This series has been as such – the first copy of **Part VIII** was that in perhaps a too personal fashion (but even there the only response was from Paul Andersen) – and it’s served its purpose.

Regardless, all that needed to be said, hinted at, implied, vaguely referenced, etc. has been.

*Articles,  
Essays &  
Conversations*

## Nobody™ and Postmodern Antimodernism

On the various fringes of the alternative-o-sphere (something the alternative Right exists within as a manifestation of ideas in a philosophisociopolitical shape) there exist critiques, attacks, doubtings and hostile attitudes towards the modern world and its various oh-so poisonous delicious fruits. In amid suspicions of certain historical truths, the usefulness of certain theories, and all manner of general paranoia, distrust and scepticism there does exist an infinite number of individuals ranging from well-known moderates like Alex Jones, to radicals like David Duke; from pseudo-scientist-philosopher-psychonauts like the late Terence McKenna, to the always "interesting" David Icke. Among the less political and worldly, and more avantgarde, artistic and proto-spiritual individuals stands NOBODY™.

It must be stated before I make any bold assertions that due to the nature of NTM's work, it can be difficult to pin down any certain video, song or image and draw from it one clear message or intention. This can be done more easily with some things - and it's obvious enough that his work isn't celebrating much of the modern world - but there does exist, due to presentation and the absurdist framework, a sort of subjectivism; much of the work is open to multiple interpretations. This ought to be kept in mind during this little article.

Anyways - what am I even talking about? "Who or what is this 'NOBODY™'?" I hear people ask. The answer is multifarious and a little obscure. Let me recount how I first came across the title "NOBODY™" and the things catalogued under such a title.

What must have been two or three years ago, I remember browsing a notorious imageboard's politics section, where I came across a post referencing several URLs leading to strange YouTube videos I couldn't really understand. I knew I felt uncomfortable watching these videos, but at the same time the content resonated with a more visceral area of my spirit; I was unnerved and I felt psychologically molested, but simultaneously I felt cleansed. I watched one or two of the videos and thought nothing more of it at the time - I was (and still am) used to seeing strange things on the internet I oughtn't over-consider.

A while later, I recall the process repeating. Following URLs from a demonic area of the internet, I found myself again at scenes of images layered over oneanother of people acting violently, lustfully, insanely, irrationally; other scenes of political leaders making speeches in the background whilst in the foreground I was met with what might be pills, computers or porn. Other scenes might include religious or mystical themes, images, symbols and ideas.



It was as if humanity itself was being condensed into a single short-ish video; Wagner's ideal artform, however... twisted. Something was never quite right in the videos. There were elements which made me uncomfortable, made me want to look away or cover my ears - but I never did. As if all human expressions were simultaneously injected into me; as if I was forced-fed a combination of honey and krokodil before being thrust into the deathly cold of space, but before freezing to death, observing the stars dance together in the birthing of new galaxies. I believe this was my first conscious understanding of the skull beneath the skin, to use an Elisabethan expression; being presented with the nastiness that bourgeois life tries so very hard to ignore - humanity in both its good and bad (but mostly bad in the case of these strange videos).

The videos had short, naked, stripped-back, almost underdeveloped titles like "ep4," or were sometimes a blunt, out in the open religious term like "firmament." One video was simply titled "you" and it still exists on YouTube. I won't run-through the specifics of the short film - I'm not a reviewer or a critic in any proper sense. In any case, I think it's important to avoid slapping too much of my own interpretation/experience onto people who are yet to see NTM's work. I recommend readers watch it for themselves and make their own judgements.

"You" is, in my opinion, one of NTM's best films due to its accessible length and its no-nonsense exposition of several social phenomena which many people participate in, but I think even know themselves aren't quite right at some level nor truly fulfilling. It graphically pushes before us things which might make our skin crawl or our brows furrow; there isn't much use of words - even the words spoken serve a secondary role - as the visual and aural are primary. The tone, the spirit, the feeling of NTM's work are what immediately latches viewers to it, pulling at some of their basest emotions: anger, lust and curiosity. The deliberate pushing before people of that which is rotten, that which is hollow, that which is squalid, and that which is vulgar often invokes a negative reaction in many of those who are perceiving these things naively - from the outside - for the first time. I remember showing a very politically far-Left leaning friend another of NTM's films, "OUROBOROS." He angrily sneered that it was "just some anti-Obama propaganda." One can approach NTM's films at different levels, and he understands this very clearly. My friend's comment wasn't wholly untrue, but it was dreadfully shallow and shows that my friend was only willing to go so far in exposing himself totally to something he didn't like. A great deal of NTM's content requires sincerity from the recipient; it requires mental nakedness, essentially. One takes the content for what it is to the best of one's abilities. There are no instructions, no clear goals for the audience, nothing overtly specific, just an honest, semi-

artistic exposition of reality framed in abstract and often mystical ways.

The content produced by NTM, or according to the About section of his website, the content "edited" by him, is more an overall experience than a mere watching or listening. One is attacked emotionally, mentally and spiritually all at once; hence it is never just images and sounds which make up the films, but the feel - something achieved by colour, sound, volume, texture, shapes, as well as our pre-determined emotional-political reactions to various stimuli. Images are distorted and recoloured, cut and cropped and mutilated. A serene moment can become violently animated by a mere change in hue. It is in this dynamic environment scenes blur into one another, shifting and mutating. From bright to dark, upwards to downwards, peaceful to violent, clear to unclear, dominate to submissive. The human figure is frequently employed as a conduit - a living, breathing embodiment of a certain emotion or idea, which can twist in seconds. For example, vanity and chthonic ego-obsessions we are surrounded by and encouraged to engage in are displayed as a woman or young man recording themselves speaking of their lives. Clips presumably uploaded on YouTube and other websites originally are taken and their intention inverted. Instead of energy projecting into the individuals narcissistically bleating about themselves from onlookers and encouraging forces, energy coming from the vlogger is projected outwards towards the recipient of the film. Nearly every scene is a shock-scare, to use one phrase. Not that they are animalistically frightening, but these often strange and niche displays of various types are forced into an area where they are not desired for the original intention if they are valued positively at all. Values are inverted in more ways than one. Safe to say, much of NTM's video content is not ordinary by any means.

Certain films are centered around a specific topic. For instance, "UFO ZONE" is about UFOs, abductions and other super spooky phenomena. "HIVE PSYCHOSIS" is about big pharma, prescription drugs and psychochemical warfare. There is never anything put forward in these films other than a sort of "gotcha" exposition. That isn't to say the films are shallow or superficial in nature, but the overarching theme is merely an exposing of truth, of facts, of reality. As NTM puts it in the aforementioned About section, they are his way of saying "I was here" regarding our collective, many-sided crisis.

Two "discs" and an introduction to them are hosted under the Video section of nobodytm.com. Covered/exposed within these two hour-long films is a huge number of individual topics, and as I've said I won't be "reviewing" them as they explain themselves far more adequately than I could. Expect, however, everything from drugs to sex, from biology to metaphysics.

The bulk of NTM's video work is filed under the Episodes section. Each

episode is unique, and although specific scenes are occasionally recycled (as is the case the openings of "you" and "ep5" (season 1)), there are clear differences between the focus and mood of each film. Some are more focused – generally, not exclusively - on sex in culture, some are more focused on politics, some on propaganda, some on consumerism, et cetera. There isn't a clear agenda, either, which is very refreshing. The only perceivable outward message is to be sceptical about the world we're living in; to see our present epoch in its realness: its shallowness, materialism and hedonism. NTM's video work cuts through bourgeois normalcy like a shard of razor-sharp obsidian. It pushes the viewer to question the world around him in a profound sense. Jonathan Bowden was speaking about Julius Evola here, but I think the same could be said for NTM and his work at one level:

*“What is life really about? Is life really about shopping? Is life really about making more and more money? Is life really about bourgeois status when one already has enough to live on? Is life really about eating yourself to death? These are the sorts of things that [this] viewpoint pushes before people, which is why the majority will always push it away.”*

I have briefly spoken with the individual behind the NTM project - mostly at points when I wasn't in the best of states, to my regret. Regardless, in one or two of our exchanges he explained to me that there is a great divide between him and the mask he wears when he creates. He said to me something along the lines of - I can't access the conversations anymore so I have to paraphrase - "Give a man a mask, and he'll tell you the truth." [Oscar Wilde] I found this to be both a profoundly truthful statement, as well as a troubling one concerning my own endeavours. I came to the conclusion much later that "Give a man an ego and it can quickly interfere with the truth." seems to me to be a more useful maxim. Nevertheless, this is something worth being aware of due to the aforementioned shadowiness of the individual behind the person calling themselves "NOBODY™" (but of course, plenty of evidence for the latter's shenanigans)."

The About section of NTM's website is the only real window into the man behind it all (and I refer to NTM as male due to his creative tendencies), but aside from the clear evidence that he is very well-read and well-learned, there's nothing aside from his aesthetic tastes to go on - and even those are laden with symbolism and metaphor. This is part of what makes NTM so interesting and so important, the fact that principles, ideas, knowledge, come

first and foremost. There is a lightness to things, an irony, a knowing "nudge-nudge" which pops up from place to place. My guess is that it's to soften the blow; to balance the inevitable anger, confusion and sadness which is partly what his work induces for a lot of people.

Interestingly enough, there is a chatroom on his website. Since deleting his YouTube channel (hence his videos on YouTube are hosted on other channels) all of his content has been hosted here, and is the go-to place for those who want to speak to NTM directly. Very occasionally (at least in my experience) he'll appear in the chatroom talking to people, answering questions and interacting with his audience. It brings some much-appreciated humanity (the good side) into the mix; it's a port in the storm.

Another important thing to mention about NTM which was confirmed to me via conversation is his apolitical approach, and it's an approach I fully understand and respect. There have been instances where people have claimed NTM was "against 'degeneracy'" and was "Right-wing" (I even thought the latter to begin with). These assertions, although not inconceivable, are too plainly put to be of any value. A more sensible notion, in my opinion, is that NTM is concerned with matters of a priestly orientation caste-wise, not just because of his extensive use of religious themes, but made evident by the clear esoteric, perennial and metaphysical elements to his work. These things are - by their very nature - antihedonistic, antimaterialistic and antimodern. I want to avoid making too bold a claim without NTM's own verification that what I'm saying is accurate, but this is the crux of his standpoint as clearly as I can interpret it. This is made extremely evident when one reads the "mantra" displayed on the front page of his website or watches the video also there. I think it's fair to assume NTM has realized certain truths via his studies which are of an esoteric, transcendental nature. The last three lines of his "mantra" are especially indicative:

*“ENTER BEYOND  
BECOME BEING  
YOU ARE NOBODY”*

I'll resist the temptation to blather on about how this could be interpreted, and instead let NTM's content itself direct people and set events in motion as it has done for me and many others. Follow the links, look-up terms and ideas and always ask "Why?"

Probably my favourite area of NTM's work is his music, displayed on the Albums section of his website where there is a list of recent albums, an embedded media player and links to download the albums for free.

The albums NTM creates are parallel to his videos as mentioned in his website's About section. There are four main styles which seem most prevalent in his discography (as of the writing of this article) which are:

- Songs with easily recognizable beats and melodies, such as "Dedication" on the Dreams of Infinity album. These songs genre-wise are often floating around electronica or techno and last a few minutes each.
- Songs which are edits/remixes of pre-existing songs such as "Close the Door" on the Afterlife Syntax album. These songs are typically soul, disco or pop tracks which have been recycled, lasting a few minutes each.
- Songs of the ambient genre such as "Twin Pink Bunk Beds" on the Tu Fui Ego Eris album. These tracks last a few minutes and can contain underlying pulses, but aren't melodic and are, typical enough of the ambient genre, seemingly intended at times to induce certain mental states such as relaxation.
- Songs of the ambient genre which last over twenty minutes. These songs are less entertainment and more a tool as just mentioned concerning this genre. Headwaters from the album of the same name is one such track of this sort.

In amid NTM's massive discography there are tracks which point at certain things in certain ways. The track "Alex Bones" from the New Manufactured Music album is about the radioshow host and film-maker Alex Jones. The track "Vacation" from the Ghost of Paradise album features lines taken from American Airlines advertisements framed in an interesting way. The track "An Alchemical Passage" on the Woken Vestige album is an especially interesting piece of music for reasons hinted at in the title alone. Throughout all of this art there are little hints to things, little clues and little shoves in certain directions. As stated, it's down to the audience to take from the content as much as they like or nothing at all. Initiative and willpower are all that's required. As the ancient saying goes, "Whoever has ears to hear, let them hear" (Mark 4:9-12).

As with the videos, to appreciate the music of NTM the reader will need to go to the Album section of his website and have a listen at what's there themselves. There is in the music - even within individual albums - a great diversity of sound. I'm very sure that anyone who gives it a listen will find at least one or two albums to their liking no matter their ordinary musical tastes.

Attention to detail is what makes NTM's content so intriguing on a sensible level, and this even extends to the artwork which goes along with his albums. Distorted and cut-apart images are fastened together, layered upon one another and edited to form visuals extremely effective by their own

measure. Biblical themes, references to modern living, detailed textures and fantastic use of colour are just some of the things used to create stunning visuals. The look of NTM's album art is equally a part of the overall aesthetic as is the design of his website. Flashes of colour here, mythical references there, all play a part in developing the complex and unique aesthetic NTM has achieved.

The artwork of NTM is clearly modern in form. The reuse and repurposing of content - editing, as he calls it - makes up the bulk of what exists on nobodytm.com. The using of modern forms, of contemporary styles, to relay a fundamentally antimodern message is a trope which does exist elsewhere - and is the general focus of this piece of writing. Using the enemy's weapons against them, to use a slightly crude term, is an effective tool. Reverse-engineering.

## **Millennial Woes, the Fate of Empires and Behavioural Sink**

This is a revision of a monologue recorded for a YouTube channel, which has since been removed. The first part is a transcript of the spoken, improvised monologue and the second part is the typed revision of the thoughts explored in the first part.

8<sup>th</sup> September, 2014:

This is going to be a response to a YouTube video by Millennial Woes, titled "The Issue of the Century". The video itself is fifteen minutes long and I'm not going to provide a transcript, so watch it yourself. The fundamental premise of the video, the main point that he made; his main proposition, is that the events in Rotherham are extremely significant. And I agree. His second point, was that race is the fundamental issue here; the difference between races and ideologies and cultures. And yes, I agree with this. However, I do think it runs deeper than that.

Empires last between two hundred and two hundred and fifty years. I'll link to the essay to which I'm referring in the description. It's titled "The Fate of Empires," and as the essay brilliantly points out, empires last two centuries and half, on average. The British Empire ended in the fifties when we gave away the last of our colonies. Britain willingly committed suicide. We gave away the last of the land that we conquered because there was a cultural shift, a very, very important cultural shift. At the end of the British Empire we didn't suffer physical conquering; there was no army that came and destroyed London; there wasn't anywhere that was ransacked; no-one was raped. There wasn't anything you could find which would be typical of the end of an empire; most other empires end violently, or, harshly, in the best cases; but that didn't happen to Britain; that didn't happen to the British Empire. Instead of being physically conquered, we, culturally, were conquered by outside forces. The [cultural conquering of the] U.S. was around the same time, too. I'm not going to go into all this in great detail here.

This trapped us in the final stage of the fate of empires. Again, if you're confused as to what I'm referring to, read the essay in the description. It's only twenty-odd pages long, it won't take you a lifetime. We were stuck in the age of decadence, and we have been stuck in the age of decadence for the better part of half a century. We've been in this murky quagmire where things have only got worse. The age of decadence is typically marked by a weakening of religion, and we've seen that all over the West; the welfare state, we've seen that all over the West; an influx of foreigners, we've seen that all over the bloody West; frivolity; pessimism; defensiveness; and especially materialism, again, the West is rampant with materialism. This is caused by too long a

period of wealth and power; people become lazy. In the natural world this is a phenomenon known as behavioural sink. I will link to an article on that as well because I'm not going to bore people to death with scientific analysis. But, obviously, humans are a bit more complicated than typical animals, and thus, "our version" of behavioural sink has many more variables, but we do see it. Behavioral sink is the same thing as the fate of empires; albeit with the fate of empires there are more variables and it's far more complex. Nonetheless, the same things happens in every society; the end of every empire and when behavioural sink kicks in to a population of animals in the wild. Both groups experience depravity and degeneracy, hyper-sexualization. Men become infertile and weak and effeminate, women take the opposite; women become aggressive and hyper-sexualized. Sound familiar? Yeah, scary stuff.

Bringing this "back home", I propose to Millennial Woes that this runs deeper than just the conflict of two cultures; this is a conflict between an aggressive culture and a decadent culture; one that is on the way out, and one that is growing, unfortunately. Now, is there any way to reverse this? I don't know, I honestly don't know. I don't know if there's any way to reverse the fate of empires; if there's any way to overcome it. Logic would tell you that if everyone was educated then we would be able to avoid it, but I don't think human intelligence can overcome natural law such as behavioural sink. I don't know. If anyone has anything to add to this discussion, then please feel free to. More people need to know about this stuff, it's extremely important and bloody interesting.

6<sup>th</sup> April, 2015:

This was the first non-scripted monologue I recorded, and it shows; especially in my way of speaking; the speed at which I speak, my vocabulary, certain terminology, et cetera. But, nevertheless, it is one of my most popular broadcasts, almost definitely because it has "Millennial Woes" in the title. Intellectually speaking, I move through a lot of rather in-depth, heavy-weight stuff very briefly without going into as much detail as I should have. Generally, I still hold with most of what I said, although I do think a deal of teenage excitement is a little prevalent in the recording and I may have put some things across with too much certainty; a little bit of overconfidence.

I still believe *The Fate of Empires* is a worthwhile read; in fact I consider it near-essential reading for anyone who is interested in history, politics, sociology, psychology or any subject of human (or more abstract) persuasion. The reading of this essay was my true beginning; an entry-point into politics and philosophy, as it brought a great deal into perspective. The notion that there are wider forces at work in regard to the decline of the West was not



something I was committed to prior to reading it. This, along with an awareness of behavioural sink, pretty much ruled out "The Jews did it!", "The Church did it!", or "The corporations did it!" and suggested that the truth was in fact more nuanced and more complex than I had previously anticipated. One friend of mine made a response to my video where at one point he outright stated that he did not like the idea of "fate," that there are some things that are largely out of conscious control of individuals. Issues such as the decline of Western civilization are easy to attribute to the actions of individuals, or groups of individuals; people blame other people because people are often understandable to a certain degree. However, as I alluded to in my video, it seems more likely that there is a much larger force at work; not to say that the actions of individuals are obsolete, but that they are more likely in conjunction with something else; something most likely even above them; something that pre-exists them and will, later, post-exist them.

The intention of *The Fate of Empires* is noble. The contents are definitely interesting, especially comparisons of the present world and the ancient, or past; such as this excerpt from Ch. XV, The Age of Affluence (P. 11):

*"The Arab moralist, Ghazali (1058-1111), complains ... of the lowering of objectives in the declining Arab world of his time. Students, he says, no longer attend college to acquire learning and virtue, but to obtain those qualifications which will enable them to grow rich. The same situation is everywhere evident among us in the West today."*

However, one thing we need to see is a revision of sorts; an expansion of it. I say that as the essay is simply not in-depth enough. It is a short read, and the examples of civilizations abiding by the theories presented in the essay are few in number in comparison to the number of empires that have fallen over the course of human history that we are aware of. The essay counts ten to fifteen empires that have fallen, all of which are from Europe and the Middle-East; which of course, is simply not enough for a serious study. Also, there are obvious and significant exceptions to the theory; for example, one of the greatest civilizations in history, ancient Egypt, lasted some four thousand years divided among several dynasties. Similar examples of civilizations that do not align to the fate of empires include those of South and Central America, many groups in the East and Far East, and countless others. Perhaps the theory can only be attributed to groups who satisfy certain conditions, which then enables something akin to behavioural sink.

I say "something akin" to behavioural sink because this phenomenon is not exactly the same thing as what John Glubb names "the fate of empires". There are similarities, yes, but to see behavioural sink, we need to look no further than large cities. Behavioral sink, after all, is a consequence of, according to the researcher whose name escapes me, overpopulation. Would it be fair to say that it is overpopulation which is linked with the fate of empires? I think so, especially in the modern context where we have millions of third-world people moving into large Western cities on a purely materialistic basis. From this, then, we might have reason to look into behavioural sink, not purely from the few symptoms it shares with the fate of empires.

As of the moment, I do not have access to the internet to immerse myself in studies about over-population, and it is too cold for me to be bothered to trek into the town library, but to clarify, I will say that, in keeping with the theme of behavioural sink, it is the collective psychology of busy metropolitan cities which is of interest. Not only in the scientific sense, but in the spiritual sense also; after all, like I have said, millions of people being in the same space not for cultural, racial, spiritual or metaphysical reasons, but for nothing short of money and comfort, is of high significance and is unlike anything we have witnessed before in human history, at least on this scale. The resulting culture exemplifies the commonalities of these people, and thus modern, hedonistic, materialistic, consumerist culture is the result: not only in one place, but in every large city of the modern multiracial, multicultural type in the West (and more recently, the Far East).

As I have made clear on multiple occasions, race itself, in a purely biological, scientific sense, is a very messy topic. Not only due to the modern consensus on it, but also because it can quickly spiral into racial purism; physically unattainable and thus mentally a frustrated, violent realm. Colin Robertson himself has referred to neo-Nazi types as "thug[s]", and I would agree; it is unfortunate that many bright young men fall into this trap, but it is not surprising due to the highly materialistic and scientific world they are surrounded by which in turn influences how they view and judge said world. Robertson's premise that Rotherham was a largely racial conflict is true. Racial groups develop their own histories; thus genetically-similar communities develop their own cultures confined to them and them alone. Islam is mostly practiced by Middle-Eastern people as it originated in the Middle-East; and the ideology itself (in a true, non-Westernized sense) is rather "old-fashioned" to put it kindly. Miscegenation within the Islamic Middle-East is almost non-existent and other racial groups are rightly shunned as outsiders. This is why the Pakistani Muslim men perpetrated those evil, heinous, despicable acts upon almost exclusively English girls; they are not them; they are the "other",

the "white slags"; "fair game" as non-Muslims of another race.

As I have stated, though, race is not something to be caught up in lightly; in fact most of the time race is involved, it is often in conjunction with culture. In the "04/04/2015 Babblefest", broadcast on my YouTube channel, Robertson described race as being the "foundation"; the "blueprint" upon which culture is built. Race and culture often act in conjunction with one another, race being the stable foundation, as Robertson described, where culture is a more free-acting thing which is more subject to change and evolution. In this light, the perpetrators of the Rotherham Scandal were acting upon more than simply race; but the mind-set which came as a result of their Islamic worldview; their culture. This must be kept in mind as, of course, there are Muslims in the world who would rightfully shun the rape and torture of children, no matter their race or culture. Again: race in a strictly biological sense without the pretext of culture or spirituality is a dead-end where the only result is angry young men who shun the world and the rest of mankind. There is a hierarchy, some racial groups are above others; but only with the pretext of culture and spirituality. Without these things, there is nothing but flesh. As this is true, the reverse is also; there can be no culture without race, specifically racial homogeneity. As described: "Racial groups develop their own histories; thus genetically-similar communities develop their own cultures confined to them and them alone." Can multiracial communities develop sound cultural and spiritual customs in the current conditions? Again, this has been covered: "The resulting culture of course exemplifies the commonalities of these people, and thus modern, hedonistic, materialistic, consumerist culture results: not only in one place, but in every large city of the modern multiracial, multicultural type in the West (and more recently, the Far East)."

Immigrant populations almost never assimilate if they immigrate in large enough numbers; they have no need to, as they can quite easily create their own pockets of their culture within the geographical spaces they move into as the pre-existing civilization, namely the Anglosphere (and the West, generally), will not prohibit them from doing so in the present age. Modern egalitarianism and humanitarianism prevent the Western states from exercising their will to exist (the metaphor of "a prison without walls or chains" seems appropriate), and so we see severe cultural fragmentation. So, when several immigrant populations move into a single large Western city, they each maintain their own culture; their metaphysical selves, as in race and culture, and yet, their physical selves change; as in wealth, health and geographical location. Thus, like I have described, only their commonalities come into harmony, and the only commonality of these culturally and spiritually distinct people in this case is the desire for wealth; and thus the

desire of security. Of course, security in the purely physical, material sense.

Whilst Robertson is correct on his assertion that race is fundamental, I will stress again that it is a difficult topic to focus wholly on. At the present, we in Britain have a flawed, but functioning society. If this were to, as many of us in the alternative right believe is likely, collapse in some sort of violent fashion, race would again become immensely obvious to most people. It would be the divider between people; between groups fighting to survive and preserve themselves. The only glue holding the current liberal daydream together is the abundance of resources, which are, as I have described, the only commonality between all these different groups. Once the money runs out, many people will most likely awaken from their stupor and rely on the safety of their in-group to sustain themselves. These in-groups will be almost absolutely racially distinct, as race is the fundamental signifier of difference between people; it is prevalent, obvious, and as explained, synonymous with culture. However, that will be then; it is not now. The events in Rotherham and similar cities simply confirms what the racially and culturally aware man already knows; that there still lingers in each human being an understanding of "them" and "us", whether this a "good" or "bad" thing is irrelevant; what matters is that it is still present, no-matter how much the liberal of today may wish it not to be so. There is the well-known Tolkien quote which clarifies this: "*Those who have not swords can still die upon them.*"

To conclude:

1. *The Fate of Empires* is a worthwhile read, and I would encourage anyone to read it. However, it is not perfect; much more study is required on the subject.
2. Behavioral sink and the fate of empires are not synonymous, but they do share symptoms, such as overpopulation.
3. Western "multiculturalism" is a pseudonym for material, consumerist culture with an absence of any concrete spiritual or metaphysical basis.
4. The cause of the Rotherham scandal (and similar incidences) is racial tension involving cultural (or religious) pretext. However, race means little without culture, and culture cannot manifest without a racially homogenous "template" of people.
5. Robertson was ultimately correct in his judgement, although the general topic should be approached with caution and a great deal of patience.

## A conversation between Adam Wallace and Paul Andersen

5<sup>th</sup> June, 2015

I think you may be underestimating yourself and the potential of your channel to influence others. You're right that discussion about Jews, blacks, etc. is already being done elsewhere and is at this point probably pointless anyway. But when it comes to things that actually matter (Evola, Tradition, etc.) there isn't a whole lot going on, on YouTube at least. Maybe it's taking place somewhere else. Of course the things that really matter, are very complex and difficult to speak intelligently about, but... I don't know, maybe it's at least worth trying.

You started a YouTube channel for some purpose, whatever it was. If you feel you've accomplished that and there is nothing further to be said, then you're right not to continue. However, I'm not convinced that's the case.

When it comes to the matter of caste, all I can say is that in listening to your conversations, you had perceptions and insights that the others mostly lacked. Whether you and I or anyone else is genuinely of the warrior or priest caste, I don't know if that matters anymore. We are the people living on the planet at this time. We are the ones who have at least some understanding of Tradition, or the way things should be. We have no choice but to face the circumstances we find ourselves in, difficult as they may be. We each have to find our own way to ride the tiger. I don't claim to know what that is specifically, but what I do know, is that it must be done intentionally, actively, and consistently.

In regard to underestimating myself; possibly. I don't think I have an inferiority complex, but I do think the majority of people in these spheres approach these topics too boisterously and too aggressively; too "commonly," not to be a little demeaning. For example, Nationalism is inherently inclusive and populist; it is an appeal to the masses instead of the elite. There is a plebeian element which rears its head rather fiercely in these circles, however, it's to be expected as the internet allows everyone and his dog to have an opinion broadcast to thousands in just a few seconds. The very nature of the internet is inclusive and mass-orientated – for people like you and I trying to get ourselves across at all using it, it's like joining PETA and bragging about

“that delicious steak last night.”

On discussions; there are sites where it's taking place; one the best is Gornahoor (I highly recommend it). Other avenues and little corners are around, but again; this goes back to my first paragraph here: it's difficult for exclusive thought to thrive in an inclusive space. As far as trying to show the path? I think, like in the mind Siddhartha, guided by Brahma; it's worth a shot in the off-chance that it is beneficial to someone.

I started my channel to “document my learning process,” but in hindsight, this is an aim which I can achieve without the channel; without the egotism. As for finding a new reason for this channel, like I've said; showing a path could be that. As for avoiding egotism and pettiness? I think it'll essentially come as a result of approaching the channel with a certain intention; in a certain style. A detachment from my own self, but a focus on what myself will act as a conduit for: principles.

To speak of my thoughts; I think that's due to my interest in history, culture and religion over science, economics and dialectic. Utilizing a kind of “soft” logic instead a “hard” logic. Hard logic, in this case, is simply an observation of material reality and the result of an inclusive rationalism which is pretty democratic in its essence: “these are the facts; this is reality; we all agree.” Soft logic, is a much more personal thing which operates, in my mind, utterly independent of the opinions of others and an obsession with material reality; and especially with a kind of open-mindedness void of prejudice or the presence of ego. This is where metaphysics operates; where spirituality operates. Take, for example, the hermetic maxim “as above, so below.” One interpretation of this (one of many) is that the physical realm (below) is basically a reflection of higher principles (above). Imagine water: on the hard, “material” level it is ice, but on the soft, “etheric” level it is vapour; it is, however, all the same thing. As above, so below is a description of how the universe, how reality, operates within and upon fractals, within fractals, et cetera. Below is the fractal within above, and yet – even within below itself – there are other “aboves” and other “belows.” Dualism within dualism.

All of this is, of course, a “style” of thinking, enabled by an acquiring of specific knowledge, that the vast majority of humans (especially now) will never even encounter. The hard style of logic, however, is the norm experienced by everyone born in the west. The soft style is reserved and accessible by and to only a few. Again: dualism: the dichotomy of exoteric/esoteric; hard/soft: as above, so below.

I fully agree with your last paragraph and you are absolutely correct. To relate this to my channel, though, this path ought to be made open to those with the ears to hear it. To connect dots in the same way *the Kybalion*

describes (assuming you've read it – if not: do it!) I definitely know people who're in between where we are and where the rest of the Reactosphere and such is, so perhaps they would render my exposition useful. An applicable, realistic and yet profound doctrine is what I see as missing from these spheres, and the lack of it is holding many people - who're capable of understanding it – in a kind of internal as well as external stasis, going nowhere beyond “Hey look at these stupid liberals!” or “Hey aren't black people just the worst?” or “The Jews are to blame! If we kill them all we'll find ourselves in a hyperborean utopia! Hail Hitler!” Suffice to say, it's not just you and I who're bored of all that nonsense.

On another, more trivial, note; I really seem to have “come a long way” intellectually since last August. I think this was enabled by my independence, and not acting for others but just following my nose. Doing what needed to be done, as far as I could tell.

7<sup>th</sup> June, 2015

Coming to the Alt. Right – if indeed I am truly part of the Alt. Right – was a long process for me. I spent a long time in the Alt. Left, conspiracy theory, and alternative history “realms,” and my thinking is still very much influenced by at least elements of all of those things. Reading Counter Currents and listening to Jonathan Bowden “converted” me, but I still do not fully feel at home here for many of the reasons that you mentioned. There is a Traditionalist sphere as well, but that is for the most part very attached to Christianity, which doesn't necessarily bother me, except that it is often very dismissive of paganism, though unfortunately that is understandable. The pagan world is a disaster, including much of the Right-wing pagans, who try to blame everything on Christianity. At various times I have written online, but I had not very active for quite a while. The only reason I even joined YouTube was to comment on Colin Robertson's channel. Although our perspectives are in some ways very different, there was a lot that I could relate to in what he said. I was going through a very difficult time when I came across his channel, and it was very helpful to me. Around Christmas of last year I asked him to do a video addressing several religious topics. I'm still hoping he'll do it.

I have not yet read the *Kybalion*, though it is on my to-read list. I've recently started the book *The Germanization of Early Medieval Christianity*. The author displays a

lack of understanding of the esoteric dimension, but it's still fairly interesting. Of course I could read the *Kybalion* now as the internet does provide access to an enormous number of texts, I just hate reading pdfs.

Andrew Martyanov has talked a number of times about the importance of art in communicating ideas and values, and I think he's quite right. There's an interesting article on Counter Currents by James O'Meara talking about the place of Wagner in the alt. Right. He made the amusing point that some feel that Wagner can be used against the Left the same way it was used by the air cavalry against the Vietcong in *Apocalypse Now*, blasting them into submission. He suggested that we needed to move on beyond Wagner and embrace some other form of music, perhaps new age. And many commenters were in an uproar over what he said. Wagner is sacred to some. But there was a lot of truth in what he said. Classical music is basically dead, and 19th century romanticism is really a rather decadent and degraded style of music, which we should not return to even if we could.

This is not a minor issue. As the ancients recognized, the music of a people reflects their character. And ours is obviously quite ugly. Creating an entirely new system of composition will probably require the life's work of an inspired genius, but recognizing the problem, that is the spiritual problem of our music, not just technical matters, may allow at least some more insightful and intuitive types to begin moving in new, healthy directions.

Robertson is an interesting case; he's a very nice guy; but he is extremely behind on things he wants to do. Last year, before we began *The Plebeian Podcasts*, we recorded hours of conversations on a number of topics, including a kind of short intellectual biography of myself up to that point. He's uploaded nothing – remember the Rotherham series he was planning to do? It was supposed to be uploaded this January and February, but he keeps postponing things and inventing other things to fill his channel with. The guy needs to do something soon: he's spending too much time obsessing over his YouTube channel and his opinions, and pretty soon he'll burn-out and have nothing else to do with himself and his life. I wish the guy the best, but I am worried for him. Maybe you should remind him about your request? It'd be a better way to spend his time than bickering with liberals on Facebook or falling to



melancholy.

On *the Kybalion*, it is only over a hundred pages long; and it's probably the most important text I've ever read as it joins a lot of dots, and introduces the pre-existing foundation for much of what is essentially floating around the minds of clever, but rudderless guys. And I can empathize about not enjoying .pdfs, hence I order physical copies of books whenever I can; just yesterday I finally got a hardback of Evola's *Revolt Against the Modern World*. I'm still waiting for a copy of Guénon's *The Crisis of the Modern World* from my local bookstore, though.

**Thesis:** *Tradition is the normal state for human spiritual well-being.*

**Hypothesis:** *The Western World is in crisis due to its forgetting of tradition.*

**Antithesis:** *The proper response, then, is to revolt against the modern world.*

**Synthesis:** *Some few men will undertake the effort to restore tradition.*

*René Guénon's The Crisis of the Modern World is the fundamental text that proves the hypothesis. Julius Evola's Revolt against the Modern World is the text of the antithesis. By understanding the thesis, hypothesis and antithesis, work can begin on the synthesis.*

Hence I'd have preferred *Crisis* first, but never mind.

On Andrew and his thoughts, me and him are good friends and have lengthy conversations on Skype almost every night. He's a good guy, although, like many others, he is still meandering within politics and the surface-level opinions of other confused rebels. He's on a good path though – he'll have a good life.

On art, it is context; intention, which ultimately matters – just look at Evola's involvement in Dadá. One can use the modern conceptions and tools in a certain way; to turn them against themselves: to use the tools of the enemy against them – reverse-engineering, in a sense. To attempt to revitalize some sort of central traditional ethos that is present in the classical tradition, to me, seems ludicrous and unrealistic. Especially considering the classical tradition is not free of any degenerative elements and it is so out of the mainstream, like you said. What seems more approachable, again, to me; is to reverse-engineer the contemporary media and the contemporary culture; much in the way NOBODY™ (fascinating guy, by the way – introduced me to *the Kybalion*). As a musician myself, perhaps in the future any of my endeavours could follow that route. But again, it's the intention, I think, which is important as things are presented in a certain style; as it could be with my YouTube channel, like I said.

You mentioning your writings and such has given me an idea: would, sometime in the future, you be interested in doing something on my channel? I feel like you'd definitely have insights I wouldn't, and it would be nice to

share this platform, now that there are 300+ subscribers and nearly half a million minutes watched.

8<sup>th</sup> June, 2015

Sure. What did you have in mind?

Have a think about what you believe yourself to be quite knowledgeable of, and we can work from there; I can read up on anything I'm not familiar with. Perhaps an introduction to paganism? A discussion on Christianity and whether or not it could revitalize tradition? Setting boundaries to what one should look into and what one shouldn't, that way it's applicable; it's useful to people instead of just being well-meaning but fantastical meandering. I'll leave it up to you, really.

9<sup>th</sup> June, 2015

I don't know if I think of myself as truly knowledgeable about anything, but I think Christianity and its proper place and role in European life is the central question. Can it be restored or not? And indeed should it be restored?

One of the biggest problems within Christianity is the place of the Bible. The Protestants' main criticism of Catholicism is that its doctrines were not to be found in the Bible. And they were right. What the Protestants didn't realize is that you can't have a functioning society based on the Bible, certainly not on the New Testament.

The New Testament presupposes an opposition or at least separation between mainstream society and the Christian religion. Christ called his followers to leave everything to follow him, even to the point of hating father and mother. But obviously that command cannot apply to all of society and at all times.

Christ's words "Render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's and to God what is God's" are very problematic. Didn't Caesar himself become a god at death? Isn't he God's representative on earth? Isn't part of rendering to Caesar his due participating in religious sacrifices and pledging loyalty to the state? His claim that he did not come to abolish the law but to fulfill it likewise is unclear. Should the law still be followed or not? And what if one is not Jewish? Did Christ mean he came to fulfill the Jewish law alone,

or that he was the fulfillment of all religions?

And Paul's words "There is no authority except that which God has established." And he commands one not to rebel against authority. But as I'm sure you know in the ancient world religious and state authority were linked. To not honour Jupiter is to rebel against authority.

There is no clear indication of exactly what the relationship between state and church is supposed to be as there was no consideration of a Christian society. That leaves the Old Testament which does present a society where the two are linked but that results in other problems. This includes the question of how does a Christian interpret the Old Testament, something that still has not been resolved. But more than that, it creates an impression that I find deeply troubling. The Jewish scriptures were written for the Jewish people, to include them as part of the Christian scripture, but not the scriptures of any other earlier culture, give the impression that before the coming of Christ, the Jews and the Jews alone knew the truth, knew God. Everyone else is in error.

About art: I agree that modern methods can be used effectively as a weapon. But I wonder when does the destruction end and the construction begin? Evola was involved in Dadá, but he moved on, when he felt that there was no reason for him to continue with that, I believe when he started to get a better understanding of the world of Tradition. Imagine Guénon had been a painter, can you see him being involved in Dadá?

I don't see anything ludicrous about attempting to revitalize tradition within music, if one is so inclined. Likewise for painting, sculpture, architecture, etc. We must go beyond reading Tradition and thinking Tradition, to living Tradition, being Tradition. Tradition encompasses all aspects of life.

11<sup>th</sup> June, 2015

For Christianity to revitalize Tradition a number of important changes would need to be made. First would be to get the "bible" out of the vernacular. It's time to bring back the "vulgate." The other option is to end universal literacy. Some would call that cruel, but it really isn't. The essay "The Bugbear of Literacy" by Coomaraswamy is very good on

that topic.

If most people could not read the Bible, it could much more easily be changed. Texts by figures that some saw as predecessors to Christ could be added as the “new” Old Testament. These could include Plato, Hermes Trismegistus, and Zoroaster.

Sex has always been a major problem for Christianity and that would need to be addressed. While both Christ and Paul do advocate celibacy, they never require it, so the requirement that priests be celibate would need to be dropped, to ensure that high quality individuals that make up the priesthood would continue their family line. The ascetic path of the monk would be recognized as a valid one, but only for the few. The prohibition of birth control and avoiding “deviant” sexual practices (ones not leading to pregnancy) would also need to be dropped. These prohibitions indicate that the sacred character of sexuality was lost in Christianity, if it was ever there. Sexual imagery from the Song of Solomon could be used for paintings and sculptures within churches.

The institutional church should take the attitude toward sexuality and all moral issues that a pagan priest would. That isn't really his concern. The church's concern should be that church buildings are maintained, that mass is performed properly, and that people attend. Matters of personal morality are a matter for individual families and the community. Pagan figures including Thor or Herakles could be added as patron saints that individuals could pray to.

Some inner initiatic order, like the Templars, would need to be created to “control” the church whether openly or not.

On your first message: I'll be honest, you appear far more knowledgeable of Christianity than I am. My main criticism would be that it (in the mainstream) lacks an inner esoteric doctrine, thus the entire faith rests upon the exoteric interpretation of the masses: something unstable and very changeable as history has shown. Any vagueness remains unclarified, history becomes muddled, symbolism is forgotten and the ethos of the entire doctrine declines; it shifts (and has done) from aiming upwards to aiming downwards. I shouldn't need to provide examples of this. Besides that, I don't really have any other comments or quarrels with anything you've written there.

On your second message: On Evola's involvement in Dadá, keep in mind that he was a warrior; he felt a deep inclination to make statements and to

externalize his internal side in an aggressive, provocative manner. It was just a part of his personality. Guénon was a scholar and a priest through-and-through, thus he largely had no inclination to externalize himself overmuch with the exception being works of academic value. A far calling from the boisterous involvement Evola had with those turbulent ideologies in the middle-twentieth century. It comes down, again, I think, to intention; to do things in a certain style: Evola was an outward facing warrior, Guénon an inward facing scholar, and the interplay of those two archetypes essentially creates leaders for people like you and I, I'd assume. Personally? I feel I'm more of a scholar, but we are living in times in need of warriors; of leaders.

You are right about Tradition, but I'm sticking with my guns as far as what I said before about music. Thinking about it more, Tradition manifests in a certain way through classical music, not the other way around. Tradition is a style; an intention; of looking upwards. This can manifest in multiple fashions, as we have seen through the ages in various cultures; various races; and yet them all being of "Tradition." "Classical music" is one such manifestation of Tradition, but it is dead as far as the mainstream goes – and the intention here, as far as I'm aware, is to re-introduce Tradition to the masses; to re-implement it back into mainstream society to steer or civilization onto a better course. This is not an aim which is achievable through attempting to regenerate "dead" manifestations. New ones need to appear, I think.

The danger of allowing the Bible/Vulgate to be more easily changed is the question of how to avoid it degenerating further? How can we be sure those who are tasked with reconstructing it, with "correcting" it, will do so in a proper fashion? In the "right" fashion? Questions, questions, questions...

I wholeheartedly agree with you on the creation of a new initiatic order. This is tied with the lack of an inner, esoteric doctrine in the church. The creation of such a thing could definitely steer things in a proper direction, but this would be very difficult to achieve realistically.

13<sup>th</sup> June, 2015

Yes, there is a danger with changing the Bible, but it's been done before, several times. To avoid removing anything, books of lesser spiritual value, such as most of the Torah, could be moved into an expanded apocryphal section. A less satisfactory option would be to include Plato or Asclepius as church fathers of equal stature to Augustine or Aquinas. How this could be done by the right people in the right way, I have no idea, but that's true of everything I'm discussing here. It simply has to be done. Either Christianity

will go through the greatest transformation/reformation in its history or it will lose all relevance for Western Man.

The problem with the Bible closely relates to the issue of an inner esoteric doctrine. It's unclear just what the authors of the New Testament were really trying to say, and to what extent the various authors would have been in agreement. Is it meant to read straight, that is only on the surface, or is there some deeper meaning? It is possible to read much of the Bible esoterically, but one can never be sure if that meaning is really there or not.

What to me does seem clear is that at some point in its history, there have been people in the church who did have a deep spiritual understanding, the almost magical power of medieval art, music, and especially architecture reveal this. However, where or how these individuals obtained this spiritual knowledge may have had nothing to do with the Bible.

John Anthony West, the primary interpreter of the work of Rene Schwaller, has talked about the distinct effect that each Egyptian temple has on an occupant. Each temple was designed to “embody” a principle of the universe, that is, a God. So at one temple Thoth would be present, Horus at another, and Hathor at another. The medieval cathedrals were the closest thing that Europe produced in modern times to following this same principle.

The sacraments, especially the Eucharist, should be a sort of Yoga for the West. That they are not experienced in that way indicates that they are not being performed correctly, or that that were ineffectively designed, perhaps elements of both.

Whether the Bible or orthodox Christianity contains true esoteric wisdom or not, there is such wisdom to be found in the western tradition, as many Christians themselves have recognized. Most people are not pursuing esoteric wisdom, nor should they be, as they are not inclined that way, and therefore they do not need to be well informed about doctrine and theology. They need only order and structure to their lives, which could be provided by the church. The inner core of the church does need that esoteric wisdom, and they would be far better served in that regard by reading the corpus Hermeticum than the Book of James.

19<sup>th</sup> June, 2015

What you're suggesting is not something I can find fault in. The only issue here is: how are these things to be done?

I think in the next century or so, Europe could potentially enter another Dark Age as a result of all the chaotic and subversive elements within the mainstream culminating into a whirlpool of nihilistic destruction. Whether this climaxes in an all-out world war, or the collapse of nation-states, or whatever, is beside the point. The chaos of the internal state of modern man will worsen to a point of absolutism which is then reflected into the external culture even more so than it presently is. Cultural Marxism has destroyed literally all roots between individuals with only two exceptions: the desire for material wealth; and the identity of "human being" (the latter is already shaded by some identity politics). Absolute chaos, nihilism; nothingness via everythingness; a drowning of man in a sea of phantasmagorical ideology and desire. This, of course, is not the case for every human being. You, I, and others are essentially free from the spell of bourgeois, modern living. We're the disillusioned ones who, really, are liberated but alone. Freedom is a lonely place, but someone has to be here; it's an inevitability.

The issue with focusing on religion or religious doctrine, is that it is a presupposition that there is an external, collective culture within which it can operate and provide the collective with a spiritual basis for life. The contemporary thing which is serving a religious function is a multi-headed hydra; the dragon of modernity (to be poetic) which encompasses:

A. The political Left in its many forms, which is a practical application of an inclusive, mass-orientated worldview centered on bringing existence itself down to the very basest and most common denominator.

B. Personal freedom, which operates on a purely selfish, hedonistic, ego-serving level devoid of anything above itself. The individual traps his existence within his own capacity for sensual experience; "a man lives a good life when he is happy." "Happy" of course is synonymous with sensual pleasure and a feeling of euphoria and escapism: liberation on a strictly worldly level.

C. The articulation of ideology. This is not the same as A) as the latter is a kind of manifestation of tribal populism which ultimately aims at the fulfilment of B) as far as the masses are concerned. The articulation of ideology is elitism: Marxism; progressivism, which are the products of intellectuals. Essentially, intellectuals of this type believe that human society should be ran by a class of hyper-academics who can treat the broad masses of human civilization like a scientist treats a petri dish. The higher capitalists such as bankers are partly of this realms, but they really just wish for more money. A Marxist truly believes himself to be aiding the whole collective in

the name of destiny.

There are, of course, fringe elements such as immigrants and asylum seekers who are essentially a part of the masses, but only with the permission of the intellectual class who see them as a tool to further destroy the bonds between Europeans, but the prior three areas are the ones which seem apparent to me right at this second. I could be wrong, in any case.

Now... How on earth is the Christianity you're formulating going to be introduced to this scenario? I understand that, on Christianity, we are being hypothetical, but the world to me seems to be in such a case of utter chaos, that any introduction of "order" in any sense will be rejected. Would the church be dying in Western Europe and the Anglosphere if this wasn't already the case?

This brings us back to a collapse of Europe. I think after the slate is essentially wiped clean, then there could be a chance at some revival or reintroduction of sorts. Perhaps the chances and implications of this are more worth exploring than group religion at this point? It seems like, in my eyes, we're putting the cart before the horse.

20<sup>th</sup> June, 2015

The Second World War, far from leading to a spiritual regeneration of Europe, only left it vulnerable to the consumerism of America and the communism of the Soviet Union. But clearly that was not devastating enough to truly wipe the slate clean. Something even more devastating, something on the order of the Black Death, may very well be in our future. And this time things could be different as America is in decline. A rejuvenated orthodox Russia could lead the way for Europe, assuming Russia isn't itself destroyed in any potential conflict. I don't particularly like that scenario, but that might be the only option. Of course the great danger of "allowing" things to descend to that point is that Europe itself may simply not survive.

Unfortunately the actions of the main traditionalists seem to indicate is that that is exactly what they expect will happen. Both Guénon and Schuon joined Islam and left Europe. Evola retired from public life and declared that there was nothing that could be done. Who am I to argue with them?

The only way to avoid catastrophe that I see is for order to be restored in and through the church. In order for that to happen there probably would have to be some



sort of coup to replace the current leadership. I'm certain there are many disgruntled elements within the church, and wouldn't be surprised if there is an attempted coup and/or major schism at some point. The real question is if there is anywhere in the church a significant element that could revive tradition.

If catastrophe is taken as a given then I don't know if it's worth trying to save Christianity. If my own life circumstances had been different I could easily see myself being involved in the church leadership now, dealing with many of these questions. But I left the church long ago and do not see myself ever returning. Perhaps part of the reason for that is that I know it cannot be restored, at least under current circumstances.

25<sup>th</sup> June, 2015

As for Russia and Eastern Europe leading the whole of Europe to a brighter future? I don't think it's impossible, but I don't think it's likely; especially considering the devouring, bloodsucking jaw of the U.S. Military is still functioning, as is the soviet-esque E.U. which is hell-bent on enforcing cultural totalitarianism over the whole of the continent via subversion and economic terrorism. Things aren't looking good, as far as the material, temporal conditions are concerned. I'm of the opinion, with the traditionalist school, that this is literally the lowest point in human history thus far in terms of the collective spiritual state of almost all races and stratum of society.

However, it is the case that after the Kali Yuga, the Dark Age, comes the Golden Age; the Age of Heroes. Every cycle ends and begins again, and the present epoch is no more privileged or "special" than the last. Things will get worse before they get better, in any case. One doesn't need to understand metaphysics or high philosophy to see that almost the entire world is in a state of chaos, of turmoil, of sheer confusion.

Perhaps our role is to survive the long night and greet the men of the new dawn? That is definitely an option open to us, and I believe it isn't at all unrealistic or fantastical to assume so. "Riding the tiger" is a very specific mode of operating, but it is another viable way of "surviving" the present state of exterior affairs. We, as individuals cannot hope to steer the whole of the world onto a "better" course, largely due to the material conditions we find ourselves in: there are resources aplenty which satisfies the notion that "things are okay" in the minds of the majority of people's day-to-day existence. People like to complain about politics and culture, but really, as long as there is food on the table, life is bearable for the masses. You and I aren't really of that category; we genuinely require some spiritual and cultural stability to function

properly, and to remain at the least content whilst breathing. For me, my human life is of lower value than the life which it could ideally become under a traditional setting, which is itself closer to the divine than the mundane. “Living” in the sense of how we see it goes far beyond not going cold or hungry. It’s a very “dramatic” orientation to have as far as present conditions are concerned, because the present conditions are antitraditional, antipriest, antiwarrior, and so on. Like I’ve said, this is a lonely place for those like us.

Whilst this may be the case, how do we respond? Well – as we all have free will – I choose not to adopt a kind of defeatism or pessimism, despite the direness of our situation. This is the attitude we are forced to adopt: an attitude of defiant strength. We are what we feel ourselves to be, and we refuse to let the external conditions change that. Uprightness; heroism; sureness; confidence; et cetera. I am here, and I am alive, and I will not lie to myself or to others about who I am. It is the world which is in the wrong – not I! This is a kind of stubbornness, but it is a necessary hardheadedness because the alternative is what? Defeat? Extinction?

Again, it’s a choice; we have options here. Evola spent his life pointing out our options, hence his importance – there are multiple “ways,” and they are all there for us to take advantage of as the mainstream no longer allows us a “way” due to its antitraditionalism. Back more to your actual points though...

A revival of Christianity could occur via Eastern Europe. However, I’m of the opinion that there is nothing which would prevent the doctrine from degenerating again as the ages pass due to the very nature of the religion. Its mass-orientatedness; its feminine obsession with “love”; its inclusive nature; and so on. Christianity functions on a small scale where every participant agrees to the rules of the game. Once the game gets big enough, however, contrarian elements arise and take advantage of the situation. The same goes for many movements, religions, ideologies, and so forth, all over the world. Democracy and communism are similar in this way.

I think what ultimately matters is one’s personal equation. One’s personal orientation. One’s personal state. We must let go of the external, which is now ice melting through our fingers as we grasp it, and turn inwards – even those of us who are warriors. Keep in mind that individuals in traditional societies were not concerned with the group consensus, but the group consensus was concerned with the individuals. Many great men forming a great culture, not a great culture forming great men. This is part of what needs to be remembered by most in the alt. Right and other spheres, and is unbelievably absent from the even the most astute commentators.

29<sup>th</sup> June, 2015

I'm of the view that the Kali Yuga is only just beginning, and even if the 432,000 year figure is not correct, mankind can still sink much lower than its current state. Brief and minor golden ages may be possible even within this dark time, but I do not think they will just happen of themselves, only through the intentional actions of men, under the right conditions. Whether conditions or men capable of creating such an age currently exist, I do not know.

I agree we must increasingly turn inward and steadfastly refuse to allow external conditions to alter our true course. The question is if there is any role that we can or should play in today's world or if it is instead better for us to withdraw entirely. Are any of the religions worth saving? Any institution of any kind? If not, then we must retreat from the world and devote ourselves to inner growth and development until such a time that a sufficient number have gained the wisdom and strength necessary to create new religions and institutions rooted in tradition.

1<sup>st</sup> July, 2015

I recently read the Bika Reed translation of *The Dispute between a Man and His Ba* (rebel in the soul) where the speaker is contemplating suicide, with the expectation, or at least desperate hope, that he will escape the physical world and join the spiritual one. His soul responds "Brother, as long as you burn you belong to life."

In weaker moments, while not hoping to escape earthly life, I have thought that perhaps I should just end this particular incarnation now, and hope that the next life would be one of better circumstances. This of course is delusion. Even if there were to be another incarnation circumstances would not be better. Reality cannot be avoided. It is what it is, and it must be faced.

Ideally and for most necessarily, there must be some sort of externally imposed structure for life to have meaning. This includes those of warrior and priest disposition. The religions are corrupt. There may be small pockets led by genuine teachers, or there may not, or they may be inaccessible. If at all possible one should find such groups, or form one of like-minded individuals, those committed to developing wisdom, strength, and excellence. If necessary one may have no choice but to live as a hermit, totally withdrawn, but that's a very difficult life, one that very few can really live successfully.

But as you say there are many paths that have been pointed out to us and it's to our advantage to explore them as deeply as we can.

I'm in utter agreement with you that the prime question is whether or not we should attempt to play any roles in the external world. I really am torn on this issue, because on the one hand, I know enlightened individuals will appear consistently whether or not I personally attempt to show a path, and moreover that even in my showing a path, the number of people who will actually – genuinely – see the path for themselves is extremely miniscule. There are thousands of people in the Alt. Right attacking and analyzing the consequences or things, but almost no-one seeing the causes; the originators of today's Robertson. I think we do live, due to this confusion - even amid the "revolt" – in times where conditions are almost ready. What's lacking is an organized, truthful, profound "sect," almost, within the alt. Right/Reactosphere/Tradosphere which could organize the rabble into something sharp, direct and honourable. The emergence of this is a possibility – not to say that it's likely. The "white nationalist," "race-realist," "neofascist," and so on, elements within something like the Reactosphere are holding it back due to their modernism and materialism, and only a true "elite" in the Guénonian sense would actually be able to march into these spheres and set them straight.

A more likely picture, again involving a Guénonian elite, could be the potential scenario after a "collapse" of sorts. These men would take control of street movements like National Action and the various identitarian movements throughout Europe and bend them into a more militaristic, spiritual direction. Of course, what I'm hypothesizing here would require almost divine luck, and not to mention the further unlikeliness of this due to a Guénonian elite's view of these movements. They would be seen as – essentially – a kind of materialistic rabble who are only reacting abase strictly worldly lines; just further evidence of the Kali Yuga, I suppose.

For some genuine "correction" to take place in a really profound sense, I'm going to say it would take something akin to another Dark Age to quell the subversive elements in modernity enough for the heroes to gain the upper hand. Just like a snake constricts tighter and tighter the more one struggles, if one is to relax and give the beast the illusion that it has won, then, when it relaxes to re-orientate itself to consume you, you defeat it. A taking advantage of the scenario in such a sense seems unattainable now, considering the venomously hegemonic nature of the present zeitgeist which, like the snake, will only tighten its grasp at any sign of resistance, but maybe it will be possible in the future. I think it will.

As far as religious doctrines or other institutions go, I think the only way to “save” anything at this point is through one’s own mastery of it, and then the relaying of this unto one’s children and smaller community. Like I said previously in regard to great men and great societies; it is not the external which shapes the internal, but the internal which shapes the external. This is the only way anything can be preserved properly, earnestly, honestly – as purely as possible. By one’s own studying, contemplation, et cetera. Subtle action. The subtle internal instead of the unsubtle external; but then the subtle external via the subtle internal. We must cease relying on the outside world for our needs. You are right that it is needed for wider society and most individuals to flourish – with framework come direction – but I do not think we have a choice anymore due to how far the pre-existing institutions and such have deteriorated.

This goes back again to our question on whether we should have roles in the external world. I think we need to have this role; similar to Evola, inasmuch as we are able to. Evola’s body of work is mighty, but it is not complete nor is it particularly accessible to those with the eyes to see and the ears to hear. I am not advocating we scrap the esoteric to favour as many people as possible, but I do think more work must be done. If no-one else will do it, who will? Gornahoor, Counter Currents and so on are a small part of this, but there is no reason for those of us who are “switched on” to shy away and let others do all the work. I do think we have a role available to us; that is to get as many to the lifeboats as possible, essentially. Writing blog posts, recording podcasts, having conversations like this, are all a part of that, I think. It’s a positive, constructive step which can only build - not destroy. Of course, if these things are done in the wrong manner then adverse effects can arise, but I think you and I, for example, are sensible enough.

The externally imposed structure could come – partly – from people like you and I. You speak of “small pockets led by genuine teachers” which could be “inaccessible.” this is tricky as some esoteric groups are just that – esoteric; secret; closed – and they should be. I do, however, feel that the current scenario is so dire that some rules must be bent, or new ones developed. I’m all for the hoarding of knowledge and the keeping of secrets away from the “vulgar swine who, when pearls are cast before them, would trample them,” but there are many among the herd who are simply lost, dazed and confused. I imagine you weren’t always the man you are now; the same goes for me and many others, and it was only through the seeing of small scraps of information as well as what seems to be fate which led me here where I am now. It is said of the Kybalion that it only appears in one’s life when it is needed most. That was true for me when I read it a short while after being sent a download link

by nobody tm, and maybe it'll be for you when you read it – if that's now or later. Does this mean, then, that I am an active participant in fate? In destiny? In the mysterious way things can sometimes be timed just right? If so, what is preventing my endeavours in the sort of philosophical realms to be of a similar character? Say a post I wrote made it to the eyes of someone who then ended up on the path which you and I are treading, and it was my post which began this – would it be worthwhile? I think it would be, absolutely. I've made this point before, however; in relation to Buddha receiving guidance from Brahma.

5<sup>th</sup> July, 2015

The fact that you grew up outside of any religious tradition may give you an advantage that I don't have. As unsatisfactory as my protestant upbringing was, and the fact that I have not regularly attended church in over ten years, I still have a romantic attachment to Christianity. Several years ago when I visited the church of St. Paul outside the walls in Rome I was affected while viewing the portraits of the popes. I felt a great sense of loss, a tradition I should have had, but didn't, or only a shadow of it. While I don't think I could be part of it, I would still like to see the church restored.

This may be impossible however, and the same may be true of all the major religions. I think you're quite right that we cannot afford to rely on externals, religions, institutions, or leaders. We should cooperate with others as much as possible, but ultimately we must do the work ourselves. I've wasted many years looking for some 'movement' that just isn't there.

There may be no better option than to simply have "faith" that when the collapse comes, the new elite will appear, that this new elite will have essentially created themselves, without the benefit of religions and institutions.

There is so much work to do, that it is daunting, even overwhelming. The reason I wish so desperately for some external structure and discipline is that I know my own inclination to laziness. I feel the burden of enormous amounts of wasted time and resources. Perhaps you don't struggle with this to the extent that I do. In any case the work has to be done, the only alternative is destruction.

6<sup>th</sup> July, 2015

I don't think your connection to Christianity is something trivial or "romantic," I think your sense that something is being lost is quite the case in reality. The present scenario actually is very tragic, and some of us will be more moved by this. I know I'm not exactly immune to what's before my eyes - the loss of tradition, especially the European Christian tradition, is rather painful. It's a violent severing between the soul and body; a fracturing; a ripping apart which leaves us with nothing.

I think any elite which arises will - as it is the elite - make do with the situation they've inherited. We could be a part of this group for all I know, on some level. I think anyone who has reached a kind of "Evolian conclusion" is a part of this elite to some degree. The "active" part, though - the part which actively rebuilds the external institutions and so on - will come at a later point. That is not to say you, I and others have no role there, though. As said, one of the most important steps is the turning inwards - only through enough people doing this will it be successfully projected into the external to a strong enough degree. But the "active" role to be assumed in the future will entail a rebuilding of exoteric religiosity; the ordering of groups within society and so on and so forth. First the internal, then the external; the external is a reflection of the internal. Familiar territory, I know.

As far as wasting time? Nonsense. The fact that you are aware of the state of affairs is an active position; you haven't assumed a kind of isolation and anti-everything-ness which has consumed others of a pessimistic nature. Your very writing of words to me or elsewhere is an outwards grasp towards the world by your own initiative, which can be utilized in a certain direction. It's the fuel, not the engine, if you see my meaning. As long as you continue to speak, to think, to know and to desire, then that is an affront to laziness, to apathy, to the nihilism which has swallowed many people within the broad masses. Of course we long for external direction and for structure, but we must form that ourselves - and we're already doing it via the aforementioned channels (blogs/podcasts/conversations/et cetera). Of course, these things take time to fully crystallize, but it is a process which has been set in motion; slowly but steadily; and can only be stopped by a sudden, absolute withdrawal which at this point I think we've ruled-out.

## Ex Falso Quodlibet

By “Cato Disapproves” for West Coast Reactionaries

In formal logic, an argument is considered to be valid if it is impossible for conclusion to be false if the premises are true. Bear with me here, consider the following syllogism:

1. The second premise is false.
2. The first premise is false.
3. Therefore Richard Spencer is a Jew.

You must be thinking this is patently absurd, Jews could never pull off Spencer’s haircut, but let me assure you, this argument is in fact valid. Recall our definition of validity and glance over our syllogism again. There is no condition in which the premises are both true and the conclusion false, therefore the argument is valid regardless of its conclusion. We have no choice but to infer from this that inconsistent premises imply all conclusions. In classical logic this is what is known as the principle of explosion, which demonstrates how any conclusion can be inferred from a contradiction. The take-home message being: *ex falso quodlibet* – “from falsehood, anything follows.”

Allow me to divert your attention momentarily to this lovely specimen of modernity who is named Whitney Wisconsin, who has recently gained worldwide notoriety as the result of a viral YouTube video called “*10 Reasons Why Girls Should Have Sex With Dogs.*” The video features Ms. Wisconsin sitting on her bathroom floor while sinisterly petting her German Shepard as she delineates... well, the benefits of having sex with dogs, as the title of the video suggests. You may be asking: “*But why Mr. Disapproves? We know Western civilization is circling the drain. What is the purpose of pointing out individual cases of depravity? It’s not like there is an epidemic of girls sleeping with their dogs, it’s just one degenerate. Why not discuss the serious issues of the day?*”

Well dear reader, let me bring your attention to a quote from Ms. Wisconsin regarding the feedback she received from the video that made her famous:

*“What I do doesn’t hurt you. It doesn’t affect you. I fuck dogs, get over it.”*

The profoundness of this statement may be lost on some but it perfectly encapsulates the moral attitude of my generation (millennials). If modernity had a bumper-sticker, this would be it. The singular moral axiom is thus “Do



what thou wilt, anything is permissible as long as no-one gets hurt.” In other words, the moral compass of the modern individual always points towards “me.” It’s not just libertarians (or whatever progressives like to call themselves these days) acting according to the Non-Aggression Principle, this is the dominant normative moral philosophy of millennials and boomers alike. How did it come to pass that this libertine conception of morality has replaced moral traditions as old as mankind itself? As I said in *“The Decline of the Community”*:

*“Edmund Burke said “Society ... it becomes a partnership not only between those who are living, but between those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are to be born.” Yet in modern times, the living exist autonomously, unconstrained by the traditions of a once great civilization and no longer beholden to family and community. The idea that the individual is the irreducible, atomic unit of society and that the protection of individual or natural rights is the highest good a society can aim to, necessarily creates the conditions for a “permanent social revolution” against the past because any constraints placed on the individual that would inhibit these inalienable rights must be abolished for the sake of progress. What is good is simply what the individual desires and what is evil is that which inhibits those desires.”*

This is the inevitable result of a society based on falsehood. The pernicious idea of liberalism, the falso from which triviality explodes, is that individuals exist outside of the context of their social relationships, that the individual is autonomous and can be detached at will from social and historical roles and norms. Individual liberty and natural rights became apart of the political metaphysics in the West when Thomas Jefferson wrote the following in *the Declaration of Independence*:

*“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.”*

What kind of reactionary would find fault with such common-sense statements? In hindsight it has now become evident that the implications of this seemingly harmless pronouncement were left unexamined as the “pursuit of Happiness” has become the sole end of Liberty in the modern age, in fact the righteous crusade to obtain absolute personal freedom has come at the price of Liberty itself. Perhaps if someone were to inform Jefferson that his rhetoric would be used to justify men cutting off their own penises and insisting on everyone pretending that they are women because they say so, he may have added a caveat to “the pursuit of Happiness.”

The Enlightenment consensus on human nature is that man is rational and thereby seeks to maximize his utility, which inevitably leads to the voluntary and inorganic formation of society to escape the state of nature. The individual is presumed to be primordial or antecedent to community and society instead of a derivative of it. This is perhaps the most formative axiom of modern liberalism and if this “self-evident” axiom turns out to be falsehood, than any conclusion – or for that matter, society – predicated on it will result in absurdity and will inevitably decay. Robert Bork notes,

*“...the continual pressure for more individual autonomy necessarily weakened the restraints on individuals. The ideal slowly became the autonomous individual who stood in adversarial relationship to any institution or group that attempted to set limits to acceptable thought and behavior.”*

Furthermore, John Stuart Mill, the father of the insidious moral philosophy known as Utilitarianism writes, “Liberty consists in doing what one desires.” Placing moral or legal restraints on individual liberty thus becomes an a priori crime against humanity and the aims of society become subordinate to the aims of the individual.

Behavior which harms and destabilizes institutions or abstract entities like “the family” or “the public good” are permissible because only physical harm to an individual is considered relevant in determining the morality of an action. It’s clear to see that this is not progress; this is a regression to a primordial conception of morality where animistic impulses and whims are the sole determinant of the moral weight of an action. As Thomas Hobbes writes on morality in a state of nature, “*But whatsoever is the object of any man’s appetite or desire, that is it which he for his part calleth good; and the object of his hate and aversion, evil ...*” The paleoconservative prophet Richard Weaver foresaw this state of affairs as the consequence the West’s adoption of

Nominalism, which denies the existence of universals or abstract objects. This philosophical struggle, if you will, has been waged since the time of Plato, who wrote in *The Republic*:

*“What about someone who believes in beautiful things, but doesn’t believe in the beautiful itself ... ? Don’t you think he is living in a dream rather than a wakened state?”*

For liberal nihilists, there is no wrong or property of wrongness that is intrinsic to actions, only the consequences exist. Wrongness does not exist, only harm; good does not exist, only pleasure. They reject mind-independent truth whose source is higher than man, and therefore reject perennial values which have provided form and cohesion to human societies since the dawn of man. In this way, nihilists tug at the threads of the fabric of civilization, unraveling the very values and traditions which wove it in the first place. They undermine society while insisting that it is progress. But how I choose to live my life doesn’t affect you, right? This is progress, right?

In a recent episode of *“Kulture Kampf,”* Titus Flavius explicated the importance of justice in society is to place a check or to minimize the hedonistic impulses of the individual which can be corrosive to institutions and practices that are responsible for a flourishing society. I would add to this that modernity has inverted this role in that society now protects the individual at the expense of the institutions like the family and community which have always been sources of social cohesion and stability throughout human history. The inherent sanctity of human life is now secondary to a woman’s right to choose. The building blocks of society – the family and community – have been desecrated by rootless individuals that belong to no tribe, community, race or nation in pursuit of pleasure and “finding themselves.” As civilization is being unwoven seam by seam as a result of liberalism’s conception in the womb of falsehood, it becomes apparent, at least to me, that basic conservatism is not nearly extreme enough to clean up this mess, and that perhaps the modern fetishization of the individual and their rights was a grave and fatal mistake. Joseph de Maistre was right when he said, *“Man in general, if reduced to himself, is too wicked to be free.”*

## The Game

*Wandering and observer  
Traveling to foreign parts  
But never astray, lest  
Encountering foreign faces  
Subtly, though, a quaint fascination  
Feeling the same core within  
A similar presentation  
Going where I go; upon only will*

*Of the Tradition and yet shattered  
Glass on the floor:  
Safe and pretty from afar  
But beware if one is to grasp it!  
Picking up the pieces; calmly, patiently  
Without thought of “next” or “where” or “how far”  
But to act to act: upon itself  
Upon oneself:  
This is the Game!*

*Ought one even play, though?  
Competition, conflict; an externalization  
Is the Game individual?  
Perhaps so, perhaps so  
Is the external a mirroring of the individual?  
Perhaps so.  
The Game is within fractals within fractals within fractals  
Subsisting oblivious to observers although  
They may cheer and shout if they please*

*Conflicted within the ego; a conflict of two  
Sides of the realm; inner and outer  
Which will reign supreme? One? None? Both?  
Both: for they are two sides of the same coin  
The very coins used in the grand Game!  
Don't you see?  
Me neither - we're all fools here*

*Upon the supra-temporal one wonders  
One walks, however, upon the temporal  
To think, to know; to understand, to see  
Further though, I go; steadily  
I have all the time in the world*

*Patient, honest, warm, upright;  
Still and quiet, triumphal in grace  
But in the grace of whom?  
You decide for it is*

*All in the mind*



*Thursday, 23rd April, 2015*