

Ominous Parallels #2

THE HOUR OF THE TIME

Tape No. 548: "The Ominous Parallels - #2"

Tuesday, February 14, 1995

Aristotle is the champion of this world.

This is a continuation in our discussion of the philosophy that is bringing about this collectivism, socialism, communism, one-world, socialistic government--all the lies that are flying across the country. They fly in the face of reason.

Aristotle, the champion of this world, the champion of nature, as against the supernaturalism of Plato. Remember him?

Denying Plato's world of forms, Aristotle, dear listeners, maintains that there is only one reality.

We're talking philosophy here, not religion. It doesn't matter what you believe. Just listen.

The world of particulars in which we live is this reality, this one reality: the world men perceive by means of their physical senses; the only one you're capable of dealing with; the one in which you are surrounded with sensory perceptions.

Universals, Aristotle holds, are merely aspects of existing entities, isolated in thought by a process of selective attention. They have no existence apart from particulars.

"Reality..."

he says:

"...is comprised not of Platonic abstractions, but of concrete individual entities, each with a definite nature, each obeying the laws inherent in its nature. "

It is the outward manifestation of God--if you will--these laws. Aristotle's universe, you see, is the universe of science.

Science, men claim, takes us away from God. But in the proving of a natural order--laws that are never broken in nature--the existence of God is confirmed.

The physical world, in Aristotle's view, is not a shadowy projection controlled by a divine dimension, but an autonomous, self-sufficient realm. It is an orderly, intelligible, natural realm which is open to the mind of man.

In such a universe, knowledge cannot be acquired by special revelations from another dimension. There's no place for ineffable intuitions of the beyond, such as those found in the Lodge. Repudiating the mystical elements in Plato's epistemology, Aristotle, you see, is the father of logic and the champion of reason as man's only means of knowledge.

When you leave the realm of reason, you have entered the world of religion and belief, based upon faith--those things which can never be proven. And there lies the contention developed amongst men between these conflicting belief structures of a world which man cannot see, nor touch, nor smell, nor hear, nor communicate with, and--until man dies--never knows the reality of such a place.

Aristotle holds that knowledge must be based on, and derived from, the data of sense experience. It must be formulated in terms of objectively defined concepts. It must be validated by a process of logic.

For Plato, the good life is essentially one of renunciation and selflessness. Man should flee from the pleasures of this world in the name of fidelity to a higher dimension; just as he should negate his own individuality in the name of union with the collective.

But for Aristotle, the good life is one of personal self-fulfilment. Man should enjoy the values of this world. Using his mind to the fullest, each man should work to achieve his own happiness here on earth, and in the process, he should be conscious of his own value.

"Pride,..."

writes Aristotle:

"...a rational pride in oneself and in one's moral character is, when it is earned,..."

And understand that.

"...when it is earned, the crown of the virtues."

The proud man does not negate his own identity. He doesn't sink selflessly into the community. He is not a promising subject for the Platonic state--and that's why Americans will never make good communists. They will never make good little slaves in a socialist world.

Although Aristotle's writings include a polemic against the more extreme features of Plato's collectivism, Aristotle himself is not a consistent advocate of political individualism. You see, his own politics is a mixture of statist and anti-statist elements.

But the primary significance of Aristotle--or of any philosopher, ladies and gentlemen--does not lie in his politics. It lies in the fundamentals of his system, his metaphysics and epistemology.

It has been said that in his basic attitude toward life, every man is either Platonic or Aristotelian. The same may be said of periods of western history.

The medieval period, under the sway of such philosophers as Platonist St. Augustine, was an era dominated by Platonism. And during much of this period, Aristotle's philosophy was almost unknown in the west. But owing largely to the influence of Thomas Aquinas, Aristotle was rediscovered in the 13th century.

The Renaissance, ladies and gentlemen, represented a re-birth of the Aristotelian spirit. The results of that spirit are written across the

next two centuries which men describe properly as the Age of Reason and the Age of Enlightenment. It's what brought us out of the inconsistencies, and the terrible oppression, and the superstitions of the Dark Ages.

The results include the rise of modern science, the rise of an individualist political philosophy, the work of John Locke and others, which, quite frankly, are responsible--directly responsible--for the ideals and principles upon which America was based.

The consequent spread of freedom across the civilized world is one of the outcomes of the Aristotelian philosophy, and the birth of the freest country in the history of the world--in fact, the only country which ever truly set men free--the United States of America.

The great corollary of these results, the product of men who were armed with the knowledge of the scientists and who were free at last to act, was the Industrial Revolution, which turned poverty into abundance, and transformed the face of the west.

The Aristotelianism, released by Aquinas in the Renaissance, was sweeping away the dogmas and the shackles of the old world, the past. Reason--reason--freedom--freedom....

How many of you have ever said that word and felt it flow across your lips? Freedom. That's right. Try it, everyone.

Reason, freedom, and production were replacing faith, force, and poverty. The age-old foundations of statism were being challenged and undercut.

The tragedy of the west, however, lies in the fact that the seeds of Platonism had been firmly embedded in philosophy almost from its beginning, and had been growing steadily through the post-Renaissance period.

Thus, while the revolutionary achievements inspired by Aristotelianism were reshaping the life of the west, an intellectual counter-revolution was at work, gradually gathering momentum. A succession of thinkers was striving to reverse the Aristotelian trend and to resurrect the basic

principles of Platonism.

It was the Aristotelian philosophy, ladies and gentlemen, that allowed freedom to work; for in order to have reason, ideas must be expressed. Nothing could be censored. Men were free for the first time in the history of the world to say what was on their mind, to exchange ideas, to freely converse in the market place, and in the meetings where scientists and learned men came together.

And in the halls of churches and great religious organizations, for the first time, old dogmas began to be challenged--and some of them, rightly so; for the universe, as we know now, never did as the Pope declared--spin around the earth. And the earth has never been at the centre of the universe, nor never will it be.

These are the things that our Forefathers knew, and that is why they established the protections in the Constitution for each individual citizen, so that reason would prevail. You don't see that any more, and we're going to talk extensively about it before we're done with our talks on philosophy.

The climax, ladies and gentlemen, of this development--the resurrection of the basic principles of Platonism--actually came in the late 18th century. The man who consummated the successful anti-Aristotelian revolution, the man who, more than any other, put an end to the enlightenment and opened the door to its opposite, was a German philosopher--the most influential German philosopher in history. And his name was Immanuel Kant, spelled K-A-N-T.

There was a very famous Masonic writer who, in one of his editions of the "Masonic Encyclopedia"--his name is Mackey, by the way--he said:

"To understand Freemasonry, one must understand Kant. And if one does not understand Kant, one cannot understand Freemasonry."

A great revelation there. Most of you, no doubt, have never heard of this man.

One of Kant's major goals was to save religion--including the essence of

religious morality--from the onslaughts of science. His system represents a massive effort to raise the principles of Platonism in a somewhat altered form once again to a position of commanding authority over western culture.

Kant, you see, places his primary emphasis on epistemological issues. His method of attack is to wage a campaign against the human mind.

"Man's mind..."

he holds:

"...is unable to acquire any knowledge of reality."

Well, it's clear that Immanuel Kant never in his life listened to "The Hour of the Time"--and it's true because he died a long, long time ago. Just think how it would have changed the world if he could have listened to "The Hour of the Time", and gained a real taste of reality; for it was no different in his time than it is today. The common man was fed lie after lie after lie, and was manipulated as a herd of sheep is manipulated by the dogs and the shepherd into the pens to be sheared, and then up the hill to the slaughter house.

In any process of cognition, according to Kant, whether it be sense experience or abstract thought, the mind automatically alters and distorts the evidence confronting it. It filters or structures the material it receives from reality in accordance with a set of innate and subjective processing devices, whose operation it cannot escape.

Now, remember, this is according to Kant.

He says the world that men perceive, therefore--the world of orderly, spacio-temporal, material entities--is essentially a creation of man's consciousness. What men perceive is not reality as it is, but merely reality as it appears to man, given the special structure of the human mind.

Thus, for Kant--as for Plato--the universe consists of two opposed dimensions: true reality--a super-sensible realm of things in

themselves (in Kant's terminology), and a world of appearances which is not ultimately real--the material world men perceive by means of their physical senses.

And this is where things begin to be twisted around. This is where wrong began to become right, and right began to become wrong; where morals began to disappear.

Plato was more than a Platonist, despite his mysticism, for he was a member of the Mysteries--in fact, he describes his initiation in his writings. He was also a pagan Greek, and as such, he exhibited a certain authentic respect for reason--a respect which was implicit in Greek philosophy, no matter how explicitly irrational it became.

But the Kantian mysticism, however, suffers from no such pagan restraints. Kant threw reason out the window. His mysticism flows forth triumphantly, sweeping the prostrate human mind before it. Since man can never escape the distorting agents inherent in the structure of his consciousness, says Kant, quote:

"...things in themselves..."

End quote, are, in principle, unknowable.

Reason is impotent to discover anything about reality. If it tries, it can only bog down in impenetrable contradictions. Logic is merely a subjective human device, devoid of reference to, or basis in, reality; for, according to Kant, the world around us is not real.

Science, while useful as a means of ordering the data of the world of appearances, is limited to describing a surface world of man's own creation and says nothing about things as they really are.

Man's own creation?

Must men then resign themselves to a total scepticism?

No, says Kant.

There is one means of perceiving the barrier between man and existence. Since reason, logic, and science are denied access to reality, the door is now open for men to approach reality by a different, non-rational method.

Non-rational!

The door is now open to faith.

Faith!

Taking their cue from their needs, men can properly believe, for instance, in God and in an after-life, even though they cannot prove the truth of their beliefs, and even though two different men, no matter that they believe the same thing, will argue amongst their own belief what is real and what is not real. And neither can prove to the other, except by force of personality or argument.

And no matter how powerful the rational argument against their faith, that argument can always be dismissed out of hand; for one need merely remind its advocate that rational knowledge and rational concepts are applicable only to the world of appearances, not to reality.

Upside down! Backwards! Kant was looking in a mirror.

In a word, reason, having been silenced, the way is cleared once more for an orgy of mystic fantasy. And that is what you see around you in the world today; for Kant swayed the minds of many.

The name of this orgy--the philosophic term for the 19th century intellectuals' revolt against Reason and the Enlightenment--is, ladies and gentlemen, Romanticism.

See, many of you have been wondering for a long time what that meant, or you thought you knew what it meant.

The name of the orgy--the philosophic term for the 19th century intellectuals' revolt against Reason and the Enlightenment--is Romanticism.

"I have..."

writes Kant:

"...therefore found it necessary to deny knowledge in order to make room for faith."

When I was a child, I had faith that Santa Claus was real. I had faith that the Tooth Fairy was real. I had faith that the Easter Bunny laid eggs.

Kant also found it necessary to deny happiness, to deny happiness.

Socialism denies happiness. If you don't believe that, take a trip to eastern Europe, or to what used to be the old Soviet Union, or to Russia, and talk to those people about what it was like to live under total socialism in the form of communism.

And don't let anybody fool you. There is not much difference between the two, if any.

Deny happiness.

Kant found it necessary to deny happiness in order to make room for duty.

Duty!

And if you know anything about Hitler's Germany, you can already see where he got at least a part of his philosophy.

The trains must run on time, even if we have to kill everybody who runs the trains to make them run on time!

"The essence of moral virtue..."

he says:

"...is selflessness."

Selfless. Life-long obedience to duty, without any expectation of reward, and regardless of how much it might make one suffer.

And if that's true, what is the purpose?

Kant's attack on reason, this world, and man's happiness was the decisive turning point. As the main line of modern philosophy rapidly absorbed his basic tenets, the last elements of the Aristotelian approach were abandoned, particularly in Germany.

Philosophers turned, as a group, to variants of Platonism--this time, an extreme, militant Platonism--a Platonism shorn of its last vestiges of respect for reason.

You see, it is Kant--Kant--who made possible the sudden mushrooming of the Platonic collectivism in the modern world, and especially in Germany.

Kant is not a full-fledged statist, but a philosopher's political views--to the extent that they contradict the essentials of his system--have little historical significance.

Kant accepts certain elements of individualism, not because of his basic approach, but in spite of it--as a legacy of the Enlightenment period in which he lived.

This merely suggests, ladies and gentlemen, that Kant did not ever grasp the political implications of his own metaphysics and epistemology. He didn't understand the effects of his own thinking.

His heirs, however, did.

A line of German Romanticist philosophers followed Kant in the 19th century, each claiming to be his true follower; each avid for a reality beyond this world, and a means of knowledge beyond reason; each contributing his share to the growth of an impassioned collectivism that poisoned--poisoned--the intellectual atmosphere of Germany.

The most famous of these men, the most influential, the ruling figure of 19th century philosophy, whose name you have heard me mention over and over and over again on this broadcast, was Hegel. Hegel. Hegel, you see, is a post-Kantian Platonist.

Taking full advantage of the anti-Aristotelianism sanctioned by Kant, Hegel launches an attack on the root principles of Aristotle's philosophy, on the principles of Aristotelian logic, which even Kant had not dared to challenge directly. He didn't dare.

"Reality..."

declares Hegel:

"...is inherently contradictory. It is a systematic progression of colliding contradictions organized in triads..."

Triads! Triads! Trilateral!

"...of thesis, anti-thesis, synthesis, and men must think accordingly."

Thesis, anti-thesis, synthesis.

They should not strive for old-fashioned, static consistency. They should not be limited by the one-sided Aristotelian view that every existence has a specific identity; that things are what they are; that A is A.

"On the contrary..."

he says:

"...they owe their ultimate allegiance to a higher principle--the principle of the identity of opposites."

As above, so below: the principle that things are not what they are; that A is non-A. It was the mysticism that brought about the German SS, the new religion of Germany, dedication to duty and the Volk. All a

deception to bring the mass under control, and to make the trains run on time. [laughter]

Hegel describes the above as a new conception of reason and as a new dialectic logic. On its basis, he proceeds to erect his own version of Platonism. Like Plato and Kant, he is an idealist in metaphysics.

"True reality..."

he holds:

"...is a non-material dimension, beyond time and space and human sense perception."

And if that is true, how in the hell did HE find it?

He didn't.

He invented it.

In Hegel's version, reality is a dynamic, cosmic mind--or thought process--which, in various contexts, is referred to as "the Absolute", "the spirit", "the world reason", "God", etc.

According to Hegel, it is in the essential nature of this entity to undergo a constant process of evolution, or development, unfolding itself in various stages.

Pantheism! Pantheism!

In one of these stages, the Absolute externalizes itself, assuming the form of a material world.

And if you read Blavatsky, she writes and talks about the externalization of the hierarchy.

Continuing its career, it takes on the appearance of a multiplicity of human beings, each seemingly distinct from the others; each seemingly an autonomous individual with his own personal thoughts and desires.

But according to Hegel--uh-uh.

The appearance of such separate individuals represents, however, to Hegel, merely a comparatively low stage in the Absolute's career. It is not the final truth about reality. It does not represent the culmination of the Absolute's development.

At that stage, in effect, at the apex or climax of reality, it turns out, in Hegel's view, that distinctions of any kind--including the distinctions between mind and matter, and between one man and another--are unreal. Opposites are identical. A is non-A.

It turns out that everything is one, and that the things of this world which appear to us to be individual, self-contained entities, each real in its own right--you, sitting there on that couch, or in that chair, or on that floor--are merely so many partial aspects of one, all-inclusive, all-consuming whole--the Absolute--which alone has full reality.

And in Hegel's projection of this, it becomes *der Führer, der Staat, der Volk*.

Ein Reich, ein Volk, ein Führer.

Do you understand where we're headed now?

Do you understand what this philosophy brings into being?

It is the base upon which is built communism, socialism, collectivism.

And why am I one of the few who really understands this?--for what I just said isn't written anywhere.

The ethics and politics which Hegel derives from his fundamental philosophy can be indicated by two sentences from his "Philosophy of Right". Quote:

"A single person, I need hardly say, is something subordinate, and as such, he must dedicate himself to the ethical whole. Hence, if the

state claims life, the individual must surrender it."

End quote. Hegel's collectivism and state worship are more explicit than anything to be found in Plato's writings. Since everything is ultimately one:

"The group..."

he holds:

"...has primacy over the individual."

If each man learns to suppress his identity, and coalesce with his fellows, the resulting collective entity--the state--will be a truer reflection of reality, a higher manifestation of the Absolute.

The state, in Hegel's view, is not an association of autonomous individuals. It is, itself, an individual--a mystic person--that swallows up the citizen and transcends them an independent, self-sustaining organism made of human beings, with a will and purpose of its own.

"All the worth which the human being possesses,..."

writes Hegel:

"...all spiritual reality he possesses only through the state."

So, what is, and what lives, and what breathes on an individual reality; what thinks, what has, what is, becomes non-existent in the light of the formation of these individuals into what is collectively called "the state"--a non-entity brought about by these individuals, which, by its very formation, makes them non-existent; for the _____ and the furtherance of this non-existent entity, which they brought about for their own mutual benefit and protection, now supersedes their reality, and they are subject to its every whim.

Their task: duty to the state.

Ein reich, ein volk, ein Fuhrer.

The state organism is no more a secular entity as a manifestation of the Absolute.

"It is a creature of God,..."

Hegel says:

"...and thus demands not merely obedience from its citizens, but reverential worship."

And remember, this is not just Hegel. It began with Plato. It was expounded upon by Kant. And it was brought to its present form by Hegel.

Reverential worship.

The state is the divine idea as it exists on earth, the march of God in the world--that is what the state is. The purpose of the state, therefore, is not the protection of its citizens. The state is not a means to any human end. As an entity with supernatural credentials, it is an absolute, unmoved end in itself. And it has supreme right against the individual whose supreme duty it is to be a member of the state.

And those who adhere to these ideas and ideals don't even understand what it is that they are doing, or bringing about, or even are a part of.

These are the kinds of political ideas which Hegel, more than any other man, injected into the mind of early 19th century Germany, perpetuated in a variety of forms--perpetuated in a variety of forms--by a long chain of secondary figures, and derivative influences. These ideas gradually became commonplace in Germany and in other countries, including Italy, and are, at the present time, in full bloom behind the symbol of the rose in the United States of America.

The aspiring dictators of the 20th century and their intellectual defenders moved with alacrity to embrace such common places and to cash

in on them. Both the fascists and the Nazis were in the forefront of this trend.

In the fascist literature, the influence of Hegel is generally acknowledged. Prominent neo-Hegelian philosophers, such as Mario Palmieri and Giovanni Gentile, upheld fascism on a Hegelian foundation, and earned a formal endorsement from Mussolini.

"The world seen through fascism..."

writes Mussolini:

"...is not this material world which appears on the surface, in which man is an individual separated from all others and standing by himself. The man of fascism is an individual who is nation and fatherland, which is a moral law binding together individuals and the generations into a tradition and a mission, suppressing the instinct for a life enclosed within the brief round of pleasure, in order to restore within duty a higher life, free from the limits of time and space."

End quote.

Total bullshit!

The Nazi literature is not so overtly Hegelian in its formulations. Posing as the spokesman for a higher biological truth, the Nazis generally dropped the idealistic metaphysics of Hegel and even attacked him.

Admittedly or not, however, the Nazis, like the fascists, rely completely on the ideas of Hegel--not only for their basic collectivist approach, but for many of the more specific political theories necessary to implement it in practice.

Hegel, for instance, seeks to undercut any individualist opponents by proclaiming that statism represents a passion for human liberty--when in practice, human liberty is not allowed.

"A man is free..."

Hegel explains:

"...when he acts as he himself wills to act. But since the state is the true self of the individual, what a man really wills--even though he may not know it--is what the state wills. Liberty, therefore, is obedience to the orders of the government. Such obedience guarantees true freedom for the real self...."

Even if the illusory self is being sent to Auschwitz.

"The masses of men..."

notes Hegel:

"...do not understand this view point. The people, therefore, to not know what it wills. To know what one wills--and still more to know what the Absolute wills, Reason, wills--is the fruit of profound apprehension and insight, precisely the things which are not popular."

Hence, Hegel, like Plato, is opposed to the theory of popularly elected representative government. Instead, he calls for an authoritarian state resembling a Prussian monarchy, and the monarch's decrees, we are told, embody the true will of the people.

Ha!

"And if liberty is to be the attribute of the real man,..."

says Mussolini:

"...and not of the scarecrow invented by the individualistic liberalism, then fascism is for liberty. It is for the only kind of liberty that is serious--the liberty of the state."

Of the state!

"There is no freedom of the individual;..."

says the Nazi Otto Dietrich <sp?>:

"...there is only freedom of peoples, nations, or races; for these are the only material and historical realities through which the life of the individual exists. "

"The Fuhrer Reich of the people..."

says Huber <sp?>:

"...is founded on the recognition that the true will of the people cannot be disclosed through parliamentary votes and plebiscites, but that the will of the people, in its pure and uncorrupted form, can only be expressed through der Fuhrer."

Ein reich, ein volk, ein Fuhrer.

And that--that--that is really what racism is all about.

It is totally opposed to the American ideal of the rights of the individual, and the protection of those rights, through a written Constitutional contract between the government and the states, and another written contract between the states and the people, to protect the individuality and the right of every single citizen to be an individual, and worship at the altar of his or her choice, and to do, or say, or speak, or feel anything that he or she wishes, as long as they do not infringe upon the rights of others, or hurt the person or property of any other citizen.

Good night. God bless you all. And God save this Republic.

Copyright © 1997 Harvest Trust. All rights reserved.

Revised:June 19, 1998.