

## **The Uncertitude of Knowing**

### **Part One Being One More Personal Answer**

#### *Question:*

Mr Myatt, can you clarify whether you still support National-Socialism - albeit of the Reichsfolk variety - and the violent Jihad of those seeking to establish a Muslim Khilafah. For example, in your essay *Three O'clock One English Morning* where you wrote, I quote -

My experiences have taken me far beyond, far away from, National-Socialism and even from what I termed, over a decade ago, the ethical NS of Reichsfolk, since as I mentioned this is somewhat immoral because still based on what I have termed the immoral, un-empathic, abstractions, of race and of the folk."

#### *Reply:*

In respect of National-Socialism I have, I believe, acquired a more balanced view, having recently spoken to many people who suffered because of the policies of NS Germany, and which balanced view is far away from the extremism, and thus the National-Socialism and the violent Jihad of those seeking to establish a Muslim Khilafah, that I once so fanatically supported and propagated.

However, I am aware that I may not have all or even many of the answers required, and that such answers as I do have, or some of them, might be erroneous and that therefore may need to be amended. Therefore, all I can do here is try in a rather unsatisfactory way to summarize such answers, such views, of mine. [1]

In the past few years, there was someone 'above Time' waffling about the awful reality - of suffering - that presently exists for many people, and will most certainly continue to exist for some considerable duration of causal Time, with that person rashly expressing the view that:

some of that suffering may or possibly could be alleviated, for some of them, by good people doing good deeds and thence by the emergence

of, the striving for, societies which could possibly reduce the amount of suffering inflicted upon human beings, until we as a species have sufficiently evolved - by means such as The Numinous Way or Buddhism or Taoism or something similar or better - to be empathic compassionate beings who no longer require such societies and the causal forms which bring such societies into being by mechanisms such as encouraging more people to act in an honourable way;

even though the striving for such societies caused or contributed to suffering because what was strived for or sought or pursued were ideations, abstractions, and was impersonal; beyond the empathy and the individual knowing of the moment.

Thus one of my prime errors was in previously believing or hoping that some idealized, posited, future societies - such as a Muslim Khilafah or the folk cultures of Reichsfolk - might be in some way better than what-is now, because such societies might (so it was believed) cause less suffering than the suffering that now exists, or be better than other types of idealized, posited, societies.

However, the reality of suffering is that it is and has been caused by individuals; that its alleviation can only ever be individual; and that all ideations/abstractions - be they political, social, religious and be they posited future societies - by their very nature as ideations/abstractions and by the very nature of a striving for them, are the genesis of both of the tyrannos and of suffering. That it is the development, in individuals, of an appreciation of the numinous and of the faculty of empathy - and thus individual compassion and individual humility and individual honour - that alleviates suffering [2]. That anything and everything 'against Time' and/or 'in Time' - without exception and whatever the intention - leads to or or can lead to or causes or contributes to suffering, so that all one can do, in order to avoid causing or contributing to suffering, is strive to live a compassionate, empathic, life of humility and honour, accepting that one does not know, that one is fallible, and that a personal love between human beings is more important than any idealized duty to some cause or to some ideation.

Horrid things happen every day to people who do not deserve them - who have done nothing dishonourable. That is, every minute of every day some human being suffers because of some dishonourable deed done by some dishonourable person. Anyone of any sensitivity, anyone possessed of honour or even who has only an intimation of honour, knows and feels the difference between honourable deeds and dishonourable deeds. Knowing, feeling, this one can therefore do one of four things.

(1) Ignore such suffering, viewing it as unfortunate, and go or continue to conclusively dwell 'above Time' with one's detached compassion, and one's

understanding of the need for compassion and with one's hope of some better life in some future, in this world. There is here, in this approach, and for those who believe in some after-life, a certain view of those who do act, in practical ways to counter such dishonour - and this view depends on the mechanisms involved in the faith that assumes such an after-life or some supra-personal existence beyond mortal death, so that those who act, even if from honourable motives, are viewed as potential or as actual "sinners", who may be punished or forgiven by some deity; or viewed as having to be reborn again, in this mortal life, because of a failure due to having done such deeds; and so on. That is, such a faith - such a religious perspective - provides some comfort for those who, while aware of suffering, choose not to act directly.

(2) Seek to do something practical about such suffering, as so very many people try and have tried to do, from various perspectives and in various ways. Here, in this approach, also there are mechanisms, perspectives, which provide some context, some justification, for those aware ones who choose to act - such as whether their deeds, their interference, was or is legal according to given definitions by some-thing such as some State; or they have some religious faith to motivate them, guide them, and provide answers and, in the case of Islam and Christianity, a deity to judge their deeds.

(3) Try to understand and appreciate why some individuals act 'against Time' in order to try and presence what is honourable, what is good, while also knowing, feeling, how and why some such actions with honourable intentions - although perhaps not all - continue to contribute to the cycle of suffering, as manifest in the wisdom that Aeschylus gave to us in *The Oresteia*. Here, in this approach, there is an attempt to rationally understand, and thus no given abstract mechanism which might lead one to harshly judge or criticize some of those who do so act and who have so acted. In my own case, my rational attempt at understanding devolves around the notion of honour.

(4) Accept, for yourself, that honour is personal, founded on empathy, and therefore limited to the immediacy of the living moment, so that you are morally obliged only to react to personal dishonourable deeds done to you or which occur when you are present and which affect those nearby or which affect those you are honour bound to help by virtue of them being family and thus bound to you because of kindred ties of loyalty.

Over the decades I have known - due to my strange if not quixotic ways of life - many individuals who took the first option, with most if not all of these justifying, to themselves, their non-involvement, by some belief in some after-life (such as heaven) or some belief in such mechanisms as karma, nirvana. Here, there are mechanisms - such as prayer, the Opus Dei of Christian monasticism for example - which it is believed may well offset such dishonourable deeds as exist in the world, with the believers sincerely believing their prayers, their ways of life, are some necessary (acausal) recompense to, some offering to set

against, the suffering that blights the world.

But if one does not so believe in such an after-life, in the efficacy of such prayer, posited by for example Christianity, or such mechanisms as rebirth as posited by, for example, Buddhism, what then?

Over the decades, I have also known - again due to my strange if not quixotic ways of life - some who have taken the second option. For example, I have known more good Police officers than bad, and some who were indeed honourable individuals, motivated by the best of intentions, trying to do their best in their own way to help victims of dishonourable deeds and catch those responsible for such deeds, and who strove to make a difference and who in their own way understood what Muslims mean by *Amr bil Maroof wa Nahi anil Munkar*. Is one to condemn such Police officers because they do not follow the ethical precepts of my own Numinous Way? Indeed, what basis is there for a criticism of them? That they, for example, adhere to some legal definition of 'the bad' posited by some State?

What I written in the past few years derives from my own diverse personal experiences, from my reflexion upon such experiences; from my pathei-mathos, from my experience of diverse ways of life, diverse religions, and by my interaction with individuals of good intentions and with individuals of bad intentions. Given such experiences I feel I understand in some small way something of the nature of suffering - having also personally caused and contributed to suffering - and why I assign myself to the fourth option above, for I find that to overtly condemn the honourable actions (and I stress, the honourable actions) of others requires one to have a belief in some particular abstraction or adhere to some dogmas or to have some faith in some conventional religious perspective. Having no such religious belief, no adherence to some political dogma, no desire now for such abstractions, who am I to condemn, to blame, to judge such honourable actions? I have made enough mistakes in my own life to know my fallibility, as my views have evolved, matured, as a result of my experiences, my pathei-mathos.

So all I have is my own perspective, my own uncertainty of knowing. Which perspective of mine is of feeling suffering, understanding how empathy and compassion and a personal honour in the immediacy of the moment are my answers to the problem of suffering - and yet which perspective also includes a knowing, a feeling, an understanding, of how suffering will continue, for centuries, if not millennia, and why some individuals are motivated, have been motivated, and will be motivated to try in their own way according to their own understanding to do something to alleviate such suffering, here, now. And why I have no right to condemn the actions of such individuals because I have no dogma, no adherence to some conventional faith, to base such a condemnation on. That is, I give them the benefit of the doubt, and only apply the criteria of honour, and which criteria express my own limited understanding of this complex and ethical issue.

For the important consideration here, for me at least, is that of honour - for my experiences, my learning, have led me to surmise two possibly important things.

First, that there are many honourable individuals in various societies who have strived and who strive to do what is good and who for so being honourable and so striving cannot - at least by me from my mystical airy-fairy 'above Time' Ivory Tower - be condemned. Such as an honourable Police officer seeking to find the person who has perpetrated a dishonourable deed, and whose whole professional life centres around such a noble seeking. I understand such a person; I respect and even admire them for their honourable behaviour, even if I personally and philosophically have reservations about The State, and the laws of such a State which give to such a Police officer certain authority. For it is the dishonourable nature of the deeds done by a dishonourable person, and the instinct for honour, for fairness, which motivates such an officer, which are important, which transcend the temporal nature of some law made by some government and the temporal nature of some police organization existing in some temporal State. For what is honourable is what is honourable and right, and what is dishonourable is wrong, Aeon after Aeon. Thus, such honourable individuals transcend their context, their causal Time, the causal form those individuals might personally adhere to, such as the British Police force. But perhaps it is necessary that I here in further explanation add that I have known such people, such honourable Police officers striving to do their honourable duty, and so am writing and talking about that which and those whom I have some practical knowledge of. That is, I have not constructed - or I believe I have not constructed - some abstract theory or dogma to judge such actions, such individuals, but only view them in the context of my own *πάθει μάθος* and that recorded and transmitted *πάθει μάθος* which resides in that treasure which is our human culture, and especially in the treasure that is the Hellenistic and Western cultural tradition - of philosophy, of music, of literature, Art - and in the treasures I have discovered and learned from in other cultures, such as the Muslim one, the Buddhist one, the Hindu one, and the Taoist one.

It is in this context, of practical knowledge and practical experience, that I, for instance, now write and speak about Adolf Hitler - for I have met people who knew him, as I have felt, known, understood, these people to themselves be honourable individuals. I have also met many people who lived in NS Germany - some who supported Hitler (even unto his death) and, more recently, far more who personally suffered because of his policies - as well as others who lived through the Second World War and who again suffered because of his policies and/or who witnessed such suffering caused by such policies [3]. Again, I have felt, known, understood, the majority of these people to also be honourable individuals.

Thus my view of Adolf Hitler, and of his National-Socialism, is now a critical, a harsh, one, even given that I aware (from a past knowing of people who

personally knew him) of the support he received from ordinary Germans, and the loyalty and indeed the love he inspired. A harsh view because of the affects, the human consequences, of his actions, decisions, and policies. A view which offsets his achievement in transforming Germany from a demoralized nation rife with poverty, with the immense suffering and the devastation that his policies, actions, and decisions brought to the German people, to Germany, to millions of other people, and to other lands.

My personal conclusion, now, in respect of Hitler, is of him as a tyrannos par excellence: someone with such an extreme hubriatic certitude of knowing that he excessively overstepped the limits, and - like Oedipus and Creon but more excessively - brought misfortune, retribution, suffering, upon himself and those around him. Someone lacking in compassion, empathy, humility and humanity, and who - both directly and indirectly - caused and sanctioned a plethora of dishonourable deeds. Someone - perhaps because of an arrogant belief in his own destiny reinforced, and made extreme, by his success for so many years - whom the gods sought to, and needed to, destroy.

Second, that of all the various proposed practical solutions - political and religious - to the problems of suffering that I have experienced and thus have some practical knowledge of, I have to admit that, in my view and on reflexion, the solutions proposed by Reichsfolk and by the Islamic revival manifest in the Way of Ahlus Sunnah wal-Jammah (and thus the desire for a new Khilafah in the lands of the Muslims) will cause or contribute to suffering because they enshrine or demand a certainty of knowing and because they posit or are founded on abstractions and ideations: in the case of Reichsfolk, of 'the folk' - of 'us' (the clan) and 'them' - and in the case of Ahlus Sunnah wal-Jammah of 'believers' and 'kuffar' and of the believers having 'the perfect, the right, answers' and which answers exclude empathy and pathei-mathos.

In respect of other solutions - other Ways - that I have experienced and thus have some practical knowledge of, I feel that Buddhism, Taoism, the Sufism of Islam, and the remnants of the old Catholicism of the Catholic Church (manifest for example in the Latin Opus Dei of monasticism) do radiate, do manifest, something numinous, something honourable, in this suffering-blighted world. Thus I understand such Ways for the type of presencing of the numinous that they are; for the guidance that they are, have been, to a better, more ethical, way of life for many human beings, and thus how they have alleviated and still can alleviate some suffering.

But all I can really do, based on my hope and on my very limited understanding, is concur with what Aeschylus wrote, over two millennia ago:

*Δίκη δὲ τοῖς μὲν παθοῦσ-  
ιν μαθεῖν ἐπὶρρέπει \**

\* The goddess, Judgement, favours someone *learning from adversity*. (Aeschylus: Agamemnon, 250-251)

---

## **Part Two**

### **Being Some Lucubrations Concerning Society**

*Question:*

Since you mentioned in some of your writings about the emergence of new ways of living based on your Numinous Way isn't there going to be a conflict with existing societies?

*Reply:*

If one is being pedantic - as I often am - then the term society, shorn of some of its recent associations, imputes a group or grouping of individuals with shared interests and goals who work and/or live in the same locality and who relate to each other in a way where manners, certain standards of personal behaviour, are expected. And it is in this sense that I shall use the term here.

A basic aim of a Way such as my Philosophy of The Numen is to foster a better understanding of empathy - for instance, as a source of ethics, and for what I have termed acausal knowing - and thus to suggest that by cultivating empathy human beings can live in a compassionate, a well-mannered, and honourable way. Since empathy by its nature is personal, it cannot be projected, or abstracted, beyond the individual. That is, it is an individual standard only.

Thus, the Numinous Way is by the very nature of empathy an individual way, and there is no necessity, no duty explicit or implied, no expectation for individuals sympathetic to The Numinous Way, to agitate for change in a political, social, or religious, way; no expectation that others will or should follow where empathy leads.

For, as I have outlined elsewhere:

" Empathy is only and ever direct, personal - only living, being present, in the personal moment; in one particular moment of

causal Time where one is in close personal contact with another human being or another living being. Empathy cannot, by its very nature, be abstracted out from such a personal interaction in a particular moment. It cannot be objectified, for it is numinous - that is, organic; dependant upon an immediate interaction between two living beings. Empathy thus has no rules; no dogma; no guidelines..."

In practical terms, this means that The Numinous Way is not only an individual choice for people to accept or to reject, agree with or disagree with, but also that individuals who are sympathetic to it can choose to live in any currently existing society and engage, for example, in whatever occupation they choose, for it is their empathy - their application of empathy - which is important; their personal judgement deriving from their empathy and from the immediacy of the living moment. That is, their choice, their choices, is and are determined only by themselves by means of their own empathy.

The personal, the individual, nature of empathy means there can be no conflict with those forces that govern and strive to control existing societies, such as governments, for each and every empath is unique, a unique individual - a uniqueness predicated on the the nature, the being, of empathy itself - with their interactions with others determined by their empathy in the uniqueness of each moment when they so interact with those others. Which means that empaths are not classifiable by any existing category, form, *-ism* or *-ology*. Which means that there is nothing, beyond the individual, to trouble or concern those forces that govern and strive to control existing societies, especially as the most practical criteria which empathy implies, in respect of others, is the cessation of suffering - the desire not to cause or to contribute to suffering.

This uniqueness of empathy, breeding as it does unique individuals in numinous fluxion with the changing causal moment they interact with - and where and with whom their being is only momentarily presented - explains why no currently existing political, religious, or 'social', designation or type can be projected, by others, onto those who uphold or who are in sympathy with The Numinous Way.

For instance, The Numinous Way is a-political. It is not fascist, or nazi, or communist, or anarchic, or conservative, or republican, or democratic, or socialist, or liberal, and - importantly - has or shows no sympathy or allegiance with any of these forms or types. It is just a philosophy: a Way of and for individuals; one means whereby empathy may be appreciated, and cultivated, and thus whereby individuals can be compassionate, cease to be a cause of suffering, and appreciate and feel the importance of personal love.

The Numinous Way is also, by its personal nature, non-judgemental. To clarify this particular distinguishing and important feature - and to provide more context - I will expand upon two matters I have direct years-long personal

experience and some practical knowledge of, and upon one matter which I have some personal experience of but not much practical knowledge of. The first two are the traditional Catholicism of the Catholic Church [4] and Buddhism, and the third is an honourable Police officer doing their honourable duty.

1) An honourable Police officer doing their honourable duty in, for example, England or the United States, is certainly (in my fallible opinion) a good example of someone acting in an honourable way who also has the ability, by so acting in accord with the official duty they have sworn to do, to both alleviate at least some suffering and to guide individuals to do what is honourable. But since my knowledge and experience of the Police involved interaction with specific individuals, and did not involve practical and years-long experience of their working society, it is thus limited, and I therefore have to make assumptions, to generalize, about whether the society which is the Police force in England (or the United States) embeds personal honour and manifests honour in a consistent and practical manner. My assumption is that they may well do so.

However, I would prefer not to make such an assumption, such a generalization, since in my view such generalizations are not a good basis on which to formulate a reasoned opinion about a particular matter, and because I prefer to speak and write about my own *πάθει μάθος* and of those things I have a personal, a practical, knowledge and experience of. Hence I do not have the knowledge, even given my personal experience, to correctly judge the whole society, the extended family, which is the Police force in England (or the United States) although my feeling, my intuition, based on my limited personal experience, is that such a society does embed personal honour and does manifest honour in a consistent and practical manner and thus alleviates some suffering and guides some individuals to do what is honourable. Therefore, I give all of them, and have given all of them, the benefit of the doubt and respectfully interact with them on the basis of mutual honour, as I admire them for the work that they do and have done just as I appreciate that they do and have, as a society, as an extended family, presented something of the numinous. Of course, being human, some members of the Police family may err, make mistakes, or even do something dishonourable; but these few should not detract from the majority, for on balance - as my personal experience reveals - the majority do strive to do what is honourable. Thus in my view the society which is the Police in England (and the United States) is capable of guiding, and does and has guided, honourable individuals to do what is honourable, and thus has the ability to, and does, alleviate at least some of the suffering which blights this world.

2) For over a millennia Catholicism presented something of the numinous - as is evident, for example, in the Latin plainchant of *liturgia horarum*; in the solemnity of the Latin Tridentine Mass; and in the inspiration Catholicism afforded to composers such as John Dunstable, Dufay, and Josquin Desprez, and

artists such as Raphael and Michelangelo. In addition, Catholicism contributed significantly to the development of Western culture - for example, by the scholarly attitude that developed in the monasteries and led to the foundation of places of learning such as Oxford; and in the monastic contribution to medieval and pre-medieval life, which included care of the sick and dying, and which in places such as England led, for instance, to the drainage and cultivation of the Fens and the Somerset levels, and the development of the trade in wool, all of which increased the well-being and prosperity of the local population.

What is important here is that by so presenting the numen, by so manifesting a cultural ethos, a civilized attitude where manners, certain standards of personal behaviour, were expected - and having a living tradition to maintain these over centuries - Catholicism, by its unique society, provided a reminder of balance, of Δίκη, and thus of that personal humility that is not only essential to civilized behaviour but which is the prehension of wisdom. That is, it expressed and gave a necessary intimation of the divine beyond our mortal and often dishonourable lives. For without such an expression, without such an intimation, without such a reminder, we so often descend down to be barbarians, again.

Now, in our times, and to a much lesser extent, Catholicism still does this, for many individuals both in the lands of the West, and elsewhere, even though the reforms of the Second Vatican Council replaced much of the remaining numinosity with modernist abstractions.

Thus, Catholicism - especially of the traditionalist variety - is still in my view capable of guiding honourable individuals to do what is honourable, and thus still (again in my view) has the ability to alleviate at least some of the suffering which blights this world.

However, what this Catholicism seems to me to lack is a practical manifestation of personal honour. Honour is not embedded in it - not an essential part of its weltanschauung.

3) Similarly in respect of the Way of Buddhism, be it of the Theravada, or the Mahayana form, or even that particular form which seems to be developing in the West and embraced by many individuals who, ancestrally at least, belong the culture of the West. For there is also in this particular Way a reminder of balance, of Δίκη, and thus a development of the necessary personal humility as well as an awareness of the reality of suffering and the need for us to strive to alleviate suffering or at least not contribute to suffering. Hence, this Way, in its varieties, is "capable of guiding honourable individuals to do what is honourable", and thus has "the ability to alleviate at least some of the suffering which blights this world." Yet, as with Catholicism, it also does not, at least in my experience, have honour embedded, consciously, or otherwise, in either the matrix which is its weltanschauung or in those societies inspired by it.

I admit I do not have all or many of the answers - only my own personal judgement, only some suggestions, deriving from my personal experience, from my personal learning, and from the application of the principles of The Numinous Way.

Personally, for me there is the wisdom termed wu-wei. There is the empathy of the immediacy of the moment, and the desire deriving therefrom to cease to personally be a cause of suffering and to instead become imbued with such manifestations of the numinous as culture kept and keeps alive. This, and these, preclude involvements in causal things, and causal organizations, such as many people suspect me of. They preclude support for all such causal forms, although I do on occasion admit to feeling as Παλλάς Ἀθήνη felt:

ὦ πόποι, ἦ δὴ πολλὸν ἀποιχομένου Ὀδυσῆος  
δεύη, ὃ κε μνηστῆρσιν ἀναιδέσι χειῖρας ἐφείη [5]

---

### **Part Three**

#### **Being Even More Personal Answers**

##### *Question:*

Isn't there a problem with the use of violence by individuals since your Numinous Way proclaims that violence is justified in cases of individual self-defence and that it is for the individual to decide whether circumstances merit it. Isn't that giving individuals a license to do what they want when they want - to use violence when they feel like it?

##### *Reply:*

Yes, there is a problem here in championing individual judgement over and above the judgement of a tyrannos, or over and above the judgement of a particular society enshrined as such a collective societal judgement often is (or is assumed to be) in enforceable laws made by some government which (by whatever means) has assumed an authority to govern.

It is the complex problem of individual free-will, authority, law, society, and government. The Numinous Way certainly does indicate that the use of force sufficient to cause injury (or in certain cases death) is only ethical when used by

individuals in self-defence or in defence of someone unfairly attacked, and that it is for the individual to decide, using their own judgement, in the immediacy of the moment, if such a use of force is warranted. This does presuppose a good, a balanced, an honourable individual judgement, just as such a use of force by an individual may sometimes contravene some law in an existing society where that individual dwells.

But if empathy and *pathei-mathos* possess a numinous authority - as the Numinous Way suggests - then there are no absolutes, no general answers, only individuals making their own decisions using their own judgement in the immediacy of the passing moment, and an acceptance that you do not concern yourself with matters that are not personal and not of the immediacy of the moment, and thus you do not judge the actions of those you do not know, have no personal knowledge, and are not interacting with or have never personally interacted with. That you act only in a personal situation because someone or some many in that immediate personal situation is or are acting in a dishonourable way either toward you, or toward those around or near to you, or have so acted to someone you personally love. That justice is only and ever personal, and injustice only actual dishonourable deeds done by others.

Of course, sometimes - or often - an individual will have to make a difficult choice, whether to act and how to act, how to respond. The only guideline is that of honour, and as I mentioned earlier, anyone of any sensitivity, anyone possessed of honour or even who has only an intimation of honour, knows and feels the difference between honourable deeds and dishonourable deeds.

In terms of individual choice and honour, consider this hypothetical scenario. Extra-terrestrial beings - aliens - land and begin to occupy your country and become the *ipso facto* government and make laws detailing what you can and cannot do. These aliens have superior weaponry, and vast resources, and they demand you accept their authority, and that you live in a certain way. Many of your neighbours welcome these aliens and adopt the way of life the aliens recommend, and collaborate with the aliens in rounding up, torturing, killing, imprisoning those who do not accept this alien occupation and this collaboration with them.

What would you do? What is the correct moral choice in this situation? Passive, individual, and non-violent, resistance? Welcome the aliens and their rule and their way of life? Collaborate with them? Ignore everything and just continue with your own life, in peace? Or be or join the resistance?

Let us say you opted on moral grounds to ignore everything, and then one day your sister and her family are killed by weapons fired by aliens. Or let us say you yourself are arrested, and brutally interrogated, and see others being humiliated and tortured by those collaborating with these aliens. What would you do then? Maintain your *sang-froid*? Be as the early Christian martyrs and endure the suffering with Christian grace and humility? For you might possibly endure it

with such grace if there was a belief in redemption by some deity - the promise of an after-life. But if you do not believe in such redemption, such an after-life, how then to endure such humiliation, such personal suffering, and why? How then to watch others endure such humiliation, such suffering? How to watch your family - people you love - suffer and be killed?

Personally, I feel I know - based on my own experience and character - what I would probably do, what choice I would make. I would give up my airy-fairy reclusive Ivory Tower life and fight, in an honourable way. I would resist if necessary unto death. And I would be glad that there were others fighting such dishonour, even if I disagreed with some or all of their aims. I might even try to organize others to resist and fight in an honourable way, and so hope to inspire others by such an honourable resistance, for the criteria here, for me, would be using only honourable means. Yet this would only be my personal response - my individual reaction - and others might consider it was not the correct, the moral, response for me to make. But who is to judge? What criteria of judgement is there?

For what is important in all this is the necessary personal nature of the response; that the Numinous Way is the way of individuals deciding for themselves how to react, how to live, in such situations. My answers, my suggestions - here as elsewhere - are only my personal answers and my fallible suggestions, based on my understanding, my experience. Others may have, will have, and indeed should have their own particular solutions, and it is not for me to judge them if I do not know them and their circumstances, or even if I do not personally agree with their decisions, their solutions.

Thus, it is not The Numinous Way 'recommending' certain things - only me trying to give my own personal suggestions, my own particular interpretation, of how the ethics of that Way may or could be applied. That is all. For there is not, and cannot be, any dogma associated with this moral way - only, as I tried to indicate, the application of empathy by individuals. This interpretation of mine is only that: mine, and it may well be incorrect.

Ultimately, who or what can or should judge if some deed or some interpretation is moral, right, just? God? Allah? A functionary or representative of some State? Some law made by some State? Some person or persons - whether described as a judge or a jury - in some Court of Law whose authority has been assigned by some State, some nation, some supra-nation organization founded by some Charter signed by representatives of some States? Or judged by some elusive cosmic process described by some term such as karma? If judged by some functionary or representative of some State, from whence derives their authority? And howsoever derived, is that authority, being supra-personal, itself moral? Is all supra-personal authority - by being dependant on the threat of the use of force and the demand for conformity - by its nature immoral? And so on.

My own answer - manifest in The Numinous way - is that the criteria are empathy and *pathei-mathos*. Which are only and ever personal and direct, in the immediacy of the moment when one is interacting with another human being. And it is this personal, this living, this transient, interaction with other human beings which is important, indeed vital.

But since it seems, and unfortunately, that not everyone here, living now, has developed their faculty of empathy, how can or should those who lack such empathy judge? What guidelines should or could they use? How can they move toward a more honourable, a more compassionate, way of life for themselves and their descendants, until such a time as the use of empathy becomes far more widespread than it is now?

I suggested that Buddhism had been, and is, one such possibly. Catholicism is another. As might be - as I also suggested - a Police force which upholds honour.

Thus, one should understand, appreciate, the context, and the reality of dishonour that now exists, that has existed, and will continue to exist unless and until we human beings, *en masse*, evolve to become empathic beings. From my perspective - that of The Numinous Way - those examples and/or suggestions, from Buddhism, to Sufism, to traditional Catholicism, are some temporal forms which can or which could presence or which (importantly) have presenced something more honourable than currently exists, and which can or which could also bring some intimation of the numinous as a reminder of the folly, the dishonour, of *ὑβρις* and the need for a personal humility.

The simple reality is that all that we can do, according to the ethics of the Numinous Way, is to change ourselves - to try to be moral beings, living by honour and *wu-wei*, and if others ask us questions, then we answer from our own experience, outline the ethics of the Numinous Way, and explain that our answers and suggestions are only our own fallible answers and suggestions, and are intended not for guidance but to be, if possible, a cause of interior reflexion for those asking the questions. For it for each and every individual to discover their own answers, in their own way, in their own time, guided by their own *πάθει μάθος*.

In addition, to attempt to interfere in the non-personal - in matters that do not directly concern or affect us, as individuals - seems or might be morally wrong, at least according to the ethics of the Numinous Way.

This is the letting-be that is the essence of *wu-wei* - and a letting-be because we are aware of the transient, the causal, the un-numinous nature of all forms, including all mortal human beings. Such interference in non-personal matters only perpetuates suffering, whatever the intention, be it good or bad.

In this way, we of and sympathetic to The Numinous Way are quite Buddhist - but of course diverge from Buddhism since we have no praxis such as

meditation and uphold personal honour and which honour allows for and even encourages self-defence and the limited employment of force, including lethal force, in such an honourable self-defence. That is, we hope that others will be well-mannered toward us and treat us in a noble and respectful way - and respect our individuality as we respect theirs. Sometimes, they may not, and if they then act in an uncivilized aggressive manner toward us, we are prepared to defend ourselves in an honourable manner, as we should act valorously in defence of others in a personal situation if those others are being dishonourably treated.

*Question:*

Can you expand upon your criticism of Hitler and National-Socialism?

*Reply:*

Natura nihil frustra facit. By which I mean, in this context, that Hitler's Germany was an intuitive attempt, by a tyrannos and his followers, to transfer a traditional collective way of living to a modern State and nation, using ideations, abstractions, such as *Blud und Boden* and asserting that the individual should be - must be - subservient to the 'collective will' of the nation as embodied by der Führer and his appointed representatives. Thus, for National-Socialism, honour meant - was redefined to be - something beyond the individual instinct for disliking rotten deeds and disliking those rotten individuals who did such rotten deeds. Similarly, justice was redefined to mean 'what served the interests of *Blud und Boden*' rather than being a balanced personal judgement deriving from personal honour, pathei-mathos, and an understanding of the error of ὑβρις.

Or, as Heidegger attempted to express it in some controversial writings - for instance regarding the *Volksgemeinschaft* and by quoting from a Greek tragedy attributed to Aeschylus [6] - National-Socialism was considered by its adherents to be a modern means to engender a will-to-existence for the German volk grounded in the truth and the essence that was that German volk.

For The Numinous Way, National-Socialist Germany is judged in diverse ways. For instance:

(1) In respect of the use of particular ideations and causal abstractions - such as the ideations of State and Nation, and the immoral abstraction of race [7]. That is, by the use of such forms to try to constrain or limit or impose boundary conditions upon (to usurp) the numinous, and also upon the individual (to usurp, or to demean, the empathy, and the pathei-mathos, of individuals).

The use of the abstraction of race (or any abstraction) - codified by abstract laws - to judge others, and interfere in and with their lives, personal and/or

professional, is contrary to both empathy and honour.

(2) In respect of the use or the threat of the use of force to stifle dissent, encourage cohesion and enforce policies, with the threat or the reality of imprisonment/death for dissenters. This is a dishonourable, an uncompassionate, an unempathic, thing to do.

(3) Because National-Socialism and thus NS Germany, became synonymous with the will, the judgement, the instinct, of one man - and human beings are mortal, and one man, however gifted he may appear to be or believes himself to be, is fallible, can and will make mistakes, and sooner or later will suffer death or be defeated by his enemies, especially if those enemies be legion. Sic Transit Gloria.

(4) Because the use and the ignoble acceptance of a particular abstraction - *kampf* - as an embodiment and expression of human nature, and which acceptance and use was not only a rejection of thousands of years of culture (of our collective, human, *pathei-mathos*) but also led to immense suffering for millions of human beings as the result of the Second World War, a war that Hitler - because of his *ὑβρις* - began, expanded, and continued, even when it was obvious that Germany could not win.

Thus, National-Socialist Germany was inherently flawed, ignoble, and transient, due to the use of abstractions, such as race, State, abstract dishonourable laws enforced by threat of imprisonment and death; due to the notion of a supra-personal and a arrogant destiny; and due to using war as a means of trying to resolve conflicts and implement the hubris that masqueraded as the 'destiny' of the Volk, as the 'destiny' of Hitler, and as the 'destiny' of National-Socialism itself.

There is also the truth, contrary to what Hitler and National-Socialists believed, that the communal way can only and ever live, and thus be the genesis of and nurture the healthy symbiosis necessary between individual and community, when it is local, small, ancestral, and of families, and thus involves a personal knowing of others and a personal love. To try to extend it and - worse - contain and restrain it within an abstract State or nation, is to sever the connexion it is - by virtue of such personal knowing and love - to the numinous, and cause its decline, decay, and extinction. This is *ὑβρις*, because it upsets, and destroys, the natural balance between local dwelling (soil), individuals, extended family, locality (region and community), personal love, personal knowing, and empathy with Nature, an empathy with Nature developed through a personal, direct, years-long experience.

Hence, The Numinous Way - philosophically, ethically - has no affinity whatsoever with National-Socialism just as those striving to live by the ethics of empathy have no *συμπάθεια* with that particular causal form and the immoral

abstractions that make it what it is. There is thus a reasoned judgement of National-Socialism, based on personal honour, *pathei-mathos*, and an understanding of the error of *ὑβρις*. And which judgement is that National-Socialist Germany was a manifestation of the *ὑβρις* of a tyrannos, and thus - perhaps for others as well as for those of the Western tradition - was a cultural *πάθει μάθος*; an opportunity for us to learn and so avoid making that error again. For that period of history, and that man Hitler, should lead us to ask, as an ancient Greek once did, the important question: *τίς οὖν ἀνάγκης ἐστὶν οἰακοστρόφος*. To which my own reply, as his, is *Μοῖραι τρίμορφοι μνήμονές τ' Ἐρινύες* [8].

David Myatt  
April 2011

### Notes

[1] Since writing this, I have endeavoured to outline my position in my lengthy three-part philosophical essay [Recuyle of the Philosophy of Pathei-Mathos](#).

[2] See Parts Two (Some Personal Musings On Empathy), Three (Enantiodromia and The Reformation of The Individual) and Four (Society, Politics, Social Reform, and Pathei-Mathos) of *Recuyle of the Philosophy of Pathei-Mathos*.

[3] For a brief overview, refer to my essays *Some Philosophical and Moral Problems of National-Socialism*, and *Hitler, National-Socialism, and Politics - A Personal Reappraisal*.

[4] By traditional Catholicism I refer to the rites, liturgy, culture, and customs, which existed before the reforms of the Second Vatican Council - and which rites included the Latin Tridentine Mass and the Latin Opus Dei of monasticism.

[5]

Before the gods! How great is the need here for the absent Odysseus -  
For him to set about these disrespectful ones with his fists!

*Homer, The Odyssey, Book I, 253-254*

[6] *τέχνη δ' ἀνάγκης ἀσθενεστέρα μακρῶ.*

How so very feeble Craft is before Compulsion!

Aeschylus (attributed), *Prometheus Bound*, 514. Quoted by Heidegger in his 1933 speech at the University of Freiburg.

[7] Refer to my *Empathy and the Immoral Abstraction of Race*. For a general overview of abstractions, see *On The Nature of Abstractions*.

[8]

Who then compels to steer us?  
Trimorphed Moirai with their ever-heedful Furies!

*Aeschylus* [attributed], *Prometheus Bound*, 515-6

---

**cc David Myatt 2011**

(Third Edition)



This article is covered by the Creative Commons (Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0) License

and can be freely copied and distributed, under the terms of that license.

---