

## David Myatt, A Rural Homeland, And The Pursuit Of The Numinous

### Preface

A recent essay by an academic concerning Myatt's idea of an Aryan homeland, which Myatt described toward the end of his years (1968-1998) as a neo-nazi activist, has renewed interest in the idea. Given the use by the author of that essay of fairly recent manufactured abstractions, <sup>1</sup> based on theories such as "emotionology" to (re)interpret Myatt's idea and Myatt himself in a particular, political and dehumanizing way, we present here (i) an overview of Myatt's idea as evident in his writings; (ii) how, in our view, that idea manifested his non-racist (re)interpretation of National Socialism as evident in his Reichsfolk organization <sup>2</sup> and such writings as his 111yf (2000) article *Why National-Socialism is Not Racist* written while he was on bail following his arrest in 1998, by Special Branch (SO12) as part of Operation Periphery, on suspicion of incitement/conspiracy to murder and incitement to racial hatred; and (iii) how that idea was ethically developed and finally, post-2010, rejected by Myatt along with his rejection of National Socialism.

ooo

1. Refer to Appendix One for an explanation of what is philosophically meant and implied by the term 'abstraction'.

2. Reichsfolk is mentioned by Jeffrey Kaplan in his *Encyclopedia of White Power: A Sourcebook on the Radical Racist Right*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2000. pp.251-253

ooo ooo ooo

### A Return To The Land

In March of 1998 Myatt devoted the whole of issue 30 of his *The National-Socialist* newsletter to an article titled *The Final Solution* the beginning of which we quote in full since it provides the necessary, albeit neglected, context for his homeland idea:

We need to be open and honest about the final solution - the correct solution - to the fundamental problem which afflicts our race.

First, however, it is necessary to clearly state what the fundamental problem is. The fundamental problem is not "the Jews"; the fundamental problem is not "Zionist power"; the fundamental problem is not "immigration" nor even non-Aryan races. The fundamental problem which afflicts our race is, quite simply, we ourselves: our egotism, our selfishness.

This egotism manifests itself in the following: (1) a lack of racial awareness - a total and utter lack of any sense of racial identity, of racial solidarity and a total unawareness of our own Aryan heritage and culture; (2) a desire for material comfort and pleasure; (3) the attitude - of "me first!", "me right!" - which makes us dishonourable, disloyal, and disruptive and which causes us to shirk our duty to our folk and Nature herself when, that is, we are aware we have such a duty.

The basic cause of this egotism is our un-Aryan, un-civilized modern way of life. The modern world we Aryans live in is, for most of us, the urban world - the world of cities and large towns. It is this urban world which has created our modern way of life. This way of life is the way of fast, easy travel, of readily available entertainment, of readily available opinions in newspapers and on television, of motor vehicles, of "office work", of "factory work", of housing estates, of Banks.

The people of this world of cities and large towns spend most of their lives enclosed - in houses, in offices, in factories, in motor vehicles. The world outside - Nature herself in all her primal power and majesty - is experienced only rarely, for this outside world is merely "passed through" on a journey in some vehicle or used for a safe, tame "tourism" of a few days or weeks. In the same way, the food which the people of this world eat is packaged for them - rarely grown by their own hands, rarely nurtured and killed by them. Even the work that most of the people of this world do is not too hard - not physically demanding hour after hour, day after day, week after week. For the most part, it is "indoor" work, and the change of seasons, the change of day to night, makes very little difference.

The result of all this enclosure - this distancing from Nature - is the modern attitude of urban people with their egotism and their total loss of contact with their own racial heritage, traditions and culture.

It is this urban attitude - the materialism of the urban way of life - which has brought us to where we are now, living in a multi-racial society with millions of non-Aryans around us. It is this urban attitude which has allowed this anti-Aryan society to flourish so that now those who control this society can actively suppresses any dissent to their anti-Aryan policies without the majority of Aryans even noticing what is really going on.

Since this urban attitude - this egotism - is the cause of our fundamental problem, it is this urban attitude

which we must change.

The real solution - the final solution - to this urban attitude is for us to live in a different way. Basically, in the long term, we need a totally new type of society: a rural-based one, not an urban one as at present. We need hard physical or manual work. We need to live among our own kind in small communities where we personally know our neighbours, and where we help them, and them us, in hard or difficult times and where we cooperate with them for our mutual benefit. We need to be in contact again with Nature - with the changes brought about by the seasons and the changes which Nature herself causes and which we cannot foresee or control. We need to grow and nurture the food that we eat - or at the very least participate in some way in its production, its harvesting. "

In a later essay, *Why We Must Return To The Land*, Myatt explained what was ethically involved and necessary, and it is no surprise that critics, politically motivated or otherwise, ignore such early writings of his which deal with ethics:

We should know and act upon the truth that every act of bad-manners by us toward another human being is an act of exploitation.

We human beings - and particularly those in the developed Western world - have become like a plague sweeping over the face of this planet, leaving devastation and destruction in our wake. Our treatment of our fellow human beings is appalling: at every level, people are exploited, seen as some sort of commodity, or as some sort of enemy or threat. Where is decency? Where are manners? Where is the slow, quiet, reflection that marks the real rural way of living?

Our treatment of the other life-forms with whom we share this planet is equally appalling, if not more so. We ruthlessly exploit them, as we ruthlessly slaughter them, considering them just another commodity, to be priced and traded and consumed.

We do not have to live as we now live, and as most of us want to live. We do not have to exploit other human beings, and other life-forms, and the Earth itself. We can control ourselves; we can exercise restraint; we can choose to restrain our greed, our emotions, our desire for material goods and luxuries. We can behave in a reasoned and well-mannered way toward other human beings.

Such self-control, such restraint, such well-mannered behaviour, is the human thing to do. Thus, we can choose to live in a simple rural way, toiling in harmony and in rhythm with Nature in order to produce what food we need for ourselves and our family, just as others can work in honest trades supplying the essential things we need (such as clothes) which we ourselves cannot make or produce. And all this without the evil of usury or the exploitation caused by factories and industries. Everything that we really need can be made by hand in a natural way in a natural community in a small area. Everything that we do not need requires industry, commerce, business, factories and exploitation.

We all have a choice, as we all have the capacity to change ourselves for the better by using our will: by restraining our desires, our emotions, our needs. We all have the capacity to behave in a rational, civilized, way toward our fellow human beings, and toward the other life-forms which share this planet which is our home.

The real question is: will we do this? Will we strive to become human and so restrain ourselves? Or will we just carry on as we are, exploiting other human beings, other life-forms, and the Earth itself? {1}

Also ignored by his critics is the salient fact that all his talk about hard physical or manual work is neither romanticism nor ideological idealism by some intellectual but based on his own practical experience, for at the time of these writings he was working outdoors on rural farms. It is thus not, as has been pejoratively alleged, something 'imaginary'.

Myatt's idea of such a return to the land was a development of his earlier view regarding what he termed the spirituality of the National Socialist weltanschauung, writing in his 109yf (1998) essay *The Spirituality of National-Socialism: A Reply to Criticism*,

"What has hitherto not been very well understood in respect of National-Socialism, is that it is not race which defines our humanity - it is honour and reason. Race is our relation to Nature: how Nature is expressed, is manifest, in us. As such race is important and indeed vital; but so is honour. It is the combination of an acceptance of both race and honour which is National-Socialism.

An affirmation of race without an affirmation honour is not National-Socialism, just as an affirmation of honour without an affirmation of race is not National-Socialism. It is this living, organic, dialectic of honour and race which defines National-Socialism itself, and a National-Socialist is an individual who strives to do their honourable duty to both their own race and Nature herself, of which other human races are a part. That is, a National-Socialist must always be honourable, whatever the consequences, or the perceived consequences." {2}

This criteria of honour formed the basis of his *A Brief Criticism of William Pierce* in which he wrote:

The main weakness of the theorizing of Pierce is that he has failed to see that it is a combination of race and honour which defines National-Socialism, and which should define the racist movement in general. Without the evolutionary, moral, concept of honour, there is only the inhuman ethics of the past, and in practice this leads to the creation of people who are ignoble and societies which are anti-evolutionary. Thus, Pierce is firmly stuck in the past: an ignoble past of unreason and dishonour.

This lack of an ethical dimension to his thinking leads to him supporting the old concept of racial struggle and the inhuman consequence of considering that some races are superior to others. In contrast, in my own works I have again and again stressed that while race is important - and our connection to Nature - honour is also important, and in particular honour defines how we view ourselves, others and the world. According to Pierce, race is how we should define ourselves.

Thus, I do not consider the Aryan race as "superior" - only different. Honour demands that we treat other races with respect, and our aim should be the creation of independent ethnic nations which co-operate together, for their mutual benefit, on the basis of honour, respect and reason and not on the basis of some barbaric "struggle" to see who is the strongest. In this sense, I have evolved the ideas of National-Socialism. {2}

### **Pursuit Of The Numinous**

As Myatt developed his idea of an 'Aryan homeland' based on virtues such as honour and a rejection of racism, two things came to dominate his thinking. What he termed 'the numinous' {3} and how he differentiated a folk from the idea, the abstraction, of race, as in his essay *In Pursuit of the Numinous*:

What matters for us at this crucial time are understanding the importance of personal honour; changing our own lives by upholding honour; acquiring an understanding and knowledge of both our own folk, our own culture, and of the situation that faces us and other peoples because of such things as the NWO [New World Order]. Then each individual who has such understanding must make a conscious, honourable decision - based on a true knowledge of our own abilities and strengths - about what they can do to aid our folk, and what they can do which continues their own evolution, that of their folk, and of our species in general.

For some, this might be to live the way of the warrior; for others, it might be to strive to live on the land, creating for themselves, and their family and perhaps some folk-comrades, a rural way of life; for others, it might be to seek to inform others, through words and personal example, about the truths concerning the importance of the folk, the importance of honour, of the Cosmic perspective. For others, it might be extending the culture of their folk through such things as Art, music, literature and Science. {4}

In terms of the difference between a folk and race, he wrote in his *Does Race Matter? A Controversial Answer and a New Ethical Beginning*,

If we assume, for the moment, that we can or could give a satisfactory definition of "race", then the simple, ethical, answer to the question Does Race Matter? is no. No - because "race" (however we attempt to define it) is not, or should not be, the basis for judging, or making any decisions about, any individual. To make such a judgement on such a basis would be immoral, against the ethic of honour.

This is so because "race" itself is an abstraction, an ideal: that is, a manufactured concept which we have imposed upon the reality of individuals. As a manufactured concept, a construct, an abstraction, an ideal, it is something which we impose upon, or project onto, Reality - that is, we give it or assign to it a value which is subjective, not objective. This particular concept itself is subjective because it depends on how it is defined, and on what we extrapolate, or assume, from and based upon that definition.

Thus, this concept of race - like all abstractions - tends to undermine, if not replace, that empathy which I personally consider to be an expression of our humanity and which I personally believe is the basis for our human evolution. That is, like all abstract constructs race is a generalization, which generalization should not be applied to individuals in order to judge them or assign some type of value to them. In contrast, empathy deals directly with individuals - and perceives those individuals (or tends toward perceiving those individuals) - as those individuals are.

However, if instead of asking whether "race" is important we asked whether "the folk" is important, the answer - or at least my own answer - would be both yes, and no: (1) Yes, the folk is important, because I, and Ethical National-Socialism (which represents my own thinking) regard "the folk" as a type of living-being, a manifestation of the life of Nature and thus a presencing of the very Life of the Cosmos. Thus, the folk is not considered to be an abstraction, an ideal, or a constructed, manufactured lifeless "thing"; (2) No, the folk as such is not that important because it is not, and should not be, the or a criteria by which to judge individuals; and because even "the folk" cannot, or should not be, used in any way whatsoever to justify causing any suffering to any other individual.

That is, our ethical criteria are and must be independent of anything and everything - they cannot be qualified, or have any conditions or restrictions imposed upon them: to accept "the folk" or not (and thus to accept whether to belong to some folk community) is thus an entirely individual decision. {4}

He went on to elaborate on the distinction:

"A folk is not an abstract, easily defined, static, 'thing' like the concept of race. It is a living, changing, evolving, being - a unique type of life. What defines a folk is thus far more than a certain set of physical or physiological or genetic characteristics. A folk is a symbiotic being - in symbiosis with the being which is the homeland of that folk, with that community or that collection of folkish communities. All this makes the culture, the Way of Life, the ethos (or soul) of that folk living as well. And it is this living which is numinous, which presences the numinous.

Thus, a folk community cannot be created by some political ideology, nor by some law or laws, or even by a large State. It exists; it lives, already; it dwells in a particular place; it has come into being - or comes into being - over a period of time. Hence, to create a new folk community we begin with what has already come-into-being: the people of the same folk and culture who dwell in what was once their homeland, or whose ancestors came from that homeland. There is then a natural change and evolution - not a politically forced, abstract ideological change - within that community, which natural change and evolution arises over time through such things as following, upholding, the ethic of honour, through responding to the challenges which that community will face, through developing empathy via a dwelling on and working with the land, and through developing reason and understanding. What will result will be a new coming-into-being: a new folk." {5}

Myatt had thus ethically developed his idea of a homeland from one based on preserving an 'Aryan race' in accord with his interpretation of German National Socialism to one of small folk communities. This evolution of Myatt's concept with its ethical foundation, its rejection of racism, and its notion of the numinous and of abstractions would lead, a few years later to him rejecting National Socialism and politics as a means of social change and developing his individualistic philosophy of *pathei-mathos* founded on the virtue of compassion. {6}

### **The Long-Term Context**

To consider Myatt's early writings about an Aryan homeland, and indeed, his National Socialist writings in general, without an appreciation of the long-term context is to misunderstand not only those writings but also Myatt himself, with the long-term context his ultimate rejection of National Socialism in favour of his post-2012 philosophy of *pathei-mathos* which he slowly developed from his post-2010 'numinous way'. {7}

Which philosophy is the result of his experiences and involvements and learning over five decades, from his thirty years as a neo-nazi activist and ideologue, to his decade as a supporter of Muslim Jihad, to his experiences as a Catholic monk, to his years of working on farms, to the tragic loss of two partners, one through cancer, the other by suicide.

In regard to National Socialism Myatt wrote, in 2012:

"For a long time, I regarded Adolf Hitler as a good man, an honourable man, and National-Socialism - especially my 'revised version' of National-Socialism manifest in Reichsfolk - as either an intimation of the numinous or as an expression of what is noble and honourable.

Now, in respect of Hitler, I ask two questions: (1) 'what is good' and my answer, manifest in *The Numinous Way*, is that what is good is what is compassionate; what alleviates suffering; what does not cause or contribute to suffering; what manifests love, empathy; and (2) 'what is honourable' and my answer is what is dignified, what manifests self-control, fairness; a balanced judgement. How then does Hitler fare according to these criteria? Do his actions - manifest for example in the *Nürnberger Gesetze* and their consequences, in his use of *krieg* in pursuit of some supra-personal aim, and in the use of the abstractions of race and nation - reveal a man of compassion, of balanced judgement, of fairness? Someone who feels and understands the error that is *ὕβρις* and is therefore circumspect, in touch with and respectful of the numinous? Who knows the limits of appropriate human behaviour? No.

For example, there is nothing honourable in the *Nürnberger Gesetze* and their consequences; in the personal suffering, the deaths, they caused, in the prejudice and the hatred they engendered and codified. Nothing good in the use of *krieg* in pursuit of some supra-personal aim; in the suffering and the deaths caused. Nothing good or honourable in the demand for obedience and in the manipulation of people's emotions by rhetoric and propaganda; nothing good or honourable in the punishment of those who were inclined, as is morally right and justified, not to surrender their individual judgement and who thus refused to be obedient in such supra-personal matters, especially in relation to certain 'political' abstractions, such as 'race', nation, and the *führerprinzip*." {8}

It is interesting and perhaps indicative of our iniquitous era that from 1998 to the present day almost without exception every article or academic paper about or which mentions Myatt from decades ago to the present day includes a section concerning or mentioning certain allegations which have been made about him from 1998. None of which articles or academic papers provide any evidence from primary sources to support such allegations. Instead, the authors rely on secondary and tertiary sources, committing as they do fallacies of reasoning such as the appeal to authority.

Recently one academic even went so far as to question the legitimacy of Myatt's writings about National Socialism

based not only on such unproven allegations but also on his assumptions regarding the personality and intentions of Myatt himself, thus bringing into question the objectivity of that academic given his selective choice of Myatt's writings, his neglect of the long-term context of those National Socialist writings and his unsourced assumptions about Myatt's intentions and his use of abstractions, based on theories such as "emotionology", to categorize and thus dehumanize Myatt.

However, such questioning of the legitimacy of Myatt's National Socialist writings is apparently part of a larger campaign to discredit Myatt's later, post-2012, writings about not only his rejection of extremism and National Socialism, but his philosophy of pathei-mathos with one strident, long-term Establishment critic, awarded an MBE by the British government in 2016, publicly and repeatedly stating, without providing any evidential facts, that such post-2012 writings are Myatt "lying through his teeth" and that "nothing in Myatt's sanitized autobiography should be taken too seriously".{9}

In regard to his writings about National Socialism and such allegations Myatt wrote in his *A Reply to Allegations* dated 111yf [2000] and following his "door-stepping" interview by the BBC Panorama team in June 2000 {10} when he was living in a village near Malvern, England, and working on a nearby farm:

"For over twenty years, journalists, those opposed to National-Socialism, and dishonourable, egotistical weak-willed rumour-mongers among the so-called racial-nationalist 'Movement', have been circulating rumours and making allegations about my personal involvement with Occultism and Satanism. This is despite the fact that I have denied and do deny ever having been a 'Satanist', and despite the fact that I have stated many times that I regard Satanism as decadent and morally wrong.

These rumours and allegations were started by, and are still circulated by, my enemies for one simple reason - to try and discredit me personally. For, if I can be discredited in such a way, people will not take seriously what I have written about National-Socialism..." {4}

Three years earlier in 1997, Myatt had written his essay *Occultism and National-Socialism* in which he stated:

"National-Socialism and Occultism are fundamentally, and irretrievably, incompatible and opposed to each other. National-Socialism is fundamentally opposed to Occultism for two reasons. Firstly, because National-Socialism is an expression of what is civilized - that is, it represents the reason, order and noble enquiring attitude which gives rise to and which maintains civilization. Philosophically, the foundations of National-Socialism lie in the civilization of ancient Greece, and particularly in the work of Aristotle for whom the cosmos, and thus Nature, were an ordered, awesome and wonderful creation which we, as human beings, could understand, or apprehend, through Thought: through the power of reason.

Furthermore, the cosmos, and thus Nature, are understood as working - as being manifest to us - in accord with certain ordered processes or laws. What exists, obeys such natural laws, and all phenomena - all that we as human beings can observe or know - can be explained in terms of such processes or laws. Understanding arises from a knowledge of these laws, with such laws having to be discovered, by us, through observation and practical experimentation. " {11}

Over twenty years later, in 2022, Myatt was asked about some of the allegations made since 2012:

RS: [Y]our many vociferous politically motivated opponents have not accepted that you have rejected extremism with many still considering you a neo-nazi. Does that bother you?

DM: No. For judging by their deeds and words they live in a different world from the one I now inhabit or rather that I now perceive. My perceivation is a very local and personal one; of my locality, of Nature and its local emanations; of my relatives and friends and my interactions with and concern for them. That other world beyond - or should that be those other worlds beyond - this local personal world no longer concern me given my plenitude of past mistakes, my past hubriatic suffering-causing interference, and my recently discovered Uncertitude Of Knowing.

They, those opponents, in comparison seem to have that Certitude Of Knowing that I for many decades had, breeding as it did and does prejudice, intolerance, hatred, and discouraging as it did and does empathy, forgiveness, and a personal Uncertitude Of Knowing.

RS: One of your politically motivated opponents recently claimed that "nothing in Myatt's sanitized autobiography [Myngath] should be taken too seriously."

Would you care to comment?

DM: The opinion or claim of someone - politically motivated or otherwise - is just their personal opinion or claim at a particular moment. The passing of causal Time - decades, centuries - often places such personal opinions and claims into context often because of some information having become revealed through scholarly research or otherwise, or because of the collapse of the society in which such a personal opinion or claim was propagated and believed by others. {12}

In another interview, also in 2022, Myatt was asked similar questions:

Question:

[They] claim you are still a neo-nazi; that what you write and have written since 2010 such as your autobiography should be treated with suspicion and not taken seriously; that unless you come out in public to attend some sort of 'media circus' and directly answer their questions, they will never believe you; and that you are so concerned about your reputation that you continually search 'social media' sites and anonymously try to not only engage with them but try to cover-up your past. How do you react to such claims?

Reply:

φημί ἐγώ, Μαθεῖν θέλω τὰ ὄντα καὶ νοῆσαι τὴν τούτων φύσιν καὶ γινῶναι τὸν θεόν. Such a seeking to apprehend such things is what now and for the past twenty or so years has occupied me. As for trying to cover-up my past almost everything I wrote during my neo-nazi decades and my decade as a Muslim is archived somewhere. In the case of my neo-nazi decades by what used to be called 'Special Branch' as I learned following my arrest by them in 1998, and also archived on the 'world-wide web' [...]

Therefore, any attempt by me or by anyone to 'cover-up' my past would be pointless. In addition, I have no desire whatsoever to do so since what exists documents my mistakes, failings, extremism, and arrogance which I want those who may be interested to know, and which acknowledgment of my past by me led to that 'change of heart'. One person has used such archives to document my extremism and the weltanschauung I developed after my rejection of that extremism.

As for what they or others claim or believe about me now and the past, it is their burden howsoever brought-into-being, howsoever nurtured and howsoever it might be described by them or by others. Occupied by the aforementioned seeking, I am now too near death, too wearied by my own hubris and acknowledgment of it, too saddened by how so much suffering is still caused despite our human culture of *pathei-mathos*, to be concerned about what others claim or believe about me let alone try to change anyone's beliefs or attitudes by engaging with them in whatever way. {12}

## Conclusion

Is it indicative that the long-term perspective of Myatt's National Socialist writings and activism have been neglected, with particular unproven allegations made and repeated for decades leading to not only a public denigration and dehumanizing of him but also to a neglect in academia of his post-2012 writings, in which writings he explains his rejection of National Socialism and of extremism in general, and describes his non-political individualistic philosophy of *pathei-mathos*?

Rationally considered, it might seem to be indicative of an implacable hatred based on his past neo-nazi and Islamic activities and writings {13} or possibly on a certain prejudice which manifests the *Zeitgeist* of our iniquitous era where meticulous scholarly research using primary sources is deprecated with fallacies of reasoning and propaganda and deception the norm because they aid the Western status quo with its hypocritical politicians and its desire to maintain a hegemony based on the abstraction of nation-States and enforced by the military might of America with compliance from its allies.

Created as it was from his strange experiential life, perhaps Myatt's non-political individualistic philosophy of *pathei-mathos*, with its virtues of compassion, personal honour and empathy and its understanding and rejection of abstractions such as the nation-State is somehow perceived as a threat, existential or otherwise. Which may be why he was included on a 2021 list of the twenty most dangerous extremists in the world. {14}

Whatever the reason, his hard-won understanding and appreciation of the numinous and of expiation seems to be beyond their comprehension, manifest as that understanding and appreciation was in his 2023 missive *Weltschmerz And The Conflict In Gaza*, from which this is a quotation:

"Does the term *Weltschmerz* express what I feel after decades of experiencing and inciting extremism and a decade of reflexion on and rejection of such extremism? Possibly, at least in some ways; for in respect of the current (2023) conflict in Gaza I feel sadness, and am not surprised that such a conflict has arisen with the subsequent destruction of infrastructure, of homes, and the injuries, the deaths, including of women and children.

Not surprised, given what I understand is our human physis and our seemingly inability to avoid the error of hubris and our obvious ability to favour our own certitude-of-knowing. Will we, can we, as a species learn to develop empathy and thus be compassionate and appreciative of the numinous breeding as such empathy and appreciation of the numinous do a certain personal humility and thus an uncertainty-of-knowing? Will we, can we, as a species learn from our thousands of years old human culture of *pathei-mathos*?

It would seem not since we in the West, en masse, apparently have not learned from the horrors of the First and Second World wars; from the Vietnam war; from the invasions and occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq. Instead, hatred and certitude-of-knowing have triumphed again over personal empathy aided as in all those previous conflicts by propaganda both emotive and cunning.

Contra the *bellum iustum* of Augustine, since adopted as a principle by modern nation-States and others, where some elected or unelected official or President or Prime Minister or Congress or Parliament or potentate or whatever assumes or believe they have the authority to declare war, my understanding is that impersonal war, whenever wherever, whatever the alleged or assumed justification by whomsoever, is contrary to empathy, compassion, awareness of the numinous, and the personal learning that pathei-mathos engenders.

For such impersonal war with its necessary obedience to a chain-of-command abrogates personal judgement and what I have described as personal honour in the immediacy of the moment." {15}

R.S.  
February 2024  
v.1.05

ooo ooo ooo

{1} David Myatt, *Why We Must Return To The Land*, e-text, dated JD2452043.173 [May 13, 2001]

The date of this essay, and of some other essays or revisions of essays relating to National Socialism, is after Myatt's conversion to Islam, which Myatt explained in a 2023 interview with an Australian journalist, admitting that he

"kept certain channels of communication open particularly concerning Reichsfolk, and, in anticipation of a forthcoming criminal trial following my arrest in 1998 by SO12, I was preparing a defence since their criminal investigation was ongoing only ending in the Summer of 2001 when I released from my bail after it was found that there was insufficient evidence to bring me to trial.

This preparation included having some of my National-Socialist writings re-issued, one of which was the essay *Why National-Socialism is Not Racist*, and another *The Theology Of National-Socialism: An Examination of National-Socialism, Christianity and Islam*, in which I had written,

Honour demands that we treat people, regardless of their race, their culture, their religion, their 'political views' with fairness and respect. That is, honour demands that we have manners and are polite: that we strive to act with nobility of character; that we judge people by their deeds and in particular by how they act toward us [...] It really is about time that we who uphold the noble way of life which is National-Socialism lived according to our own ethics and began to explain, openly and in clear words, the noble reality of National-Socialism. No matter how dire our situation may be, or appears to be, and no matter how many non-Aryans may live in what were once our own nations, we must hold fast to our own ethics and not allow ourselves be tricked into accepting the Zionist version of 'National Socialism' with its hate-filled, irrational, Hollywood 'nazis'.

It was during this time that I wrote *The Question of National-Socialism, Racism and Tolerance* which led me later that year (2001) to conceive a practical plan to try and bring National-Socialists and Muslims together in order to combat, in various ways, what I considered were our mutual enemies. In furtherance of which I wrote tracts such as the multipart *The National-Socialist Guide to Understanding Islam*, in which I broached the subject of 'martyrdom operations' by Muslims, the last edition of which 'guide' was published in 1424 AH."

The interview is included in *An Uncertainty Of Knowing: Four Interviews*, ISBN 979-8394746574. Gratis open access pdf: <https://archive.org/download/myatt-four-interviews/myatt-four-interviews.pdf>

{2} Included in *Selected National Socialist Writings Of David Myatt*, <https://archive.org/download/myatt-selected-ns-writings1/myatt-selected-ns-writings1.pdf>

{3} During his National Socialist years Myatt defined the numinous in the following way:

"Something is numinous if it has beauty and awe. Something which is divinely-inspired or divinely-representative is numinous. What is numinous is generally what is revered, or regarded as sacred - as spiritual or divine. Nature herself is numinous - a wonderful, awe-inspiring mystery. The numinous is an expression of the acausal - of the Unity behind causal, temporal, appearance." *A National-Socialist Glossary*, in *The Meaning of National-Socialism*, Third Edition, 114yf, and included in *Selected National Socialist Writings Of David Myatt*, <https://archive.org/download/myatt-selected-ns-writings1/myatt-selected-ns-writings1.pdf>

Post-2012 he wrote:

"The numinous is what manifests or can manifest or remind us of (what can reveal) the natural balance of ψυχή; a balance which ὕβρις upsets. This natural balance - our being as human beings - is or can be manifest to us in or by what is harmonious, or what reminds us of what is harmonious and beautiful. In a practical

way, it is what predisposes us not to commit ὕβρις, and thus what we regard or come to appreciate as 'sacred' and dignified; what expresses our developed humanity and thus places us, as individuals, in our correct relation to ψυχή, and which relation is that we are but one mortal emanation of ψυχή." *Glossary of Terms*, in his text *The Numinous Way Of Pathei-Mathos*, <https://davidmyatt.files.wordpress.com/2022/10/numinous-way-pathei-mathos-v7.pdf>

In that text he wrote (p.34) that what he means by ψυχή

"is derived from the usage of Homer, Aeschylus, Aristotle, etcetera, and implies Life qua being. Or, expressed another way, living beings are emanations of, and thus manifest, ψυχή. This sense of ψυχή is beautifully expressed in a, in my view, rather mis-understood fragment attributed to Heraclitus: ψυχῆισιν θάνατος ὕδωρ γενέσθαι, ὕδατι δὲ θάνατος γῆν γενέσθαι, ἐκ γῆς δὲ ὕδωρ γίνεται, ἐξ ὕδατος δὲ ψυχή. Where the water begins our living ends and where earth begins water ends, and yet earth nurtures water and from that water, Life."

{4} The essay is included in the Reichsfolk compilation titled *Ethical National-Socialism*, <https://cosmicreich.files.wordpress.com/2011/03/ethical-ns.pdf>

Archive link: <https://web.archive.org/web/20200813172457/https://cosmicreich.wordpress.com/ethical-national-socialism/>

{5} *The Mythos Of Vindex*, <https://archive.org/download/david-myatt-the-mythos-of-vindex/david-myatt-mythos-of-vindex-3.pdf>

{6} An overview of Myatt's philosophy is provided in the third edition of *The Mystic Philosophy Of David Myatt*, <https://davidmyatt.files.wordpress.com/2021/09/myatt-philosophy-third-edition.pdf>

- I. A Modern Mystic: David Myatt And The Way of Pathei-Mathos
- II. A Modern Pagan Philosophy
- III. Honour In The Philosophy Of Pathei-Mathos
- IV. An Overview of The Philosophy of Pathei-Mathos
  - Part One: Anti-Racism, Extremism, Honour, and Culture
  - Part Two: Humility, Empathy, and Pathei-Mathos
- V. Classical Paganism And A New Metaphysics
- Appendix I. A Note On Greek Terms In The Philosophy Of Pathei-Mathos
- Appendix II. Towards Understanding Ancestral Culture
- Appendix III. From Mythoi To Empathy
- Appendix IV. One Perceivoration
- Appendix V. Appreciating Classical Literature
- Appendix VI. Physis And Being
- Appendix VII. The Concept of Physis

{7} qv. *Concerning The Development Of The Numinous Way*, <https://davidmyatt.files.wordpress.com/2013/01/development-of-the-numinous-way.pdf>

The philosophy is described in *The Numinous Way Of Pathei-Mathos*, <https://davidmyatt.files.wordpress.com/2022/10/numinous-way-pathei-mathos-v7.pdf>

{8} *Hitler, National-Socialism, and Politics - A Personal Reappraisal*, <https://davidmyatt.files.wordpress.com/2019/06/dwm-problems-ns.pdf>

{9} The pejorative comments were made to journalist Justin Ling and published in March 2022. Myatt's autobiography *Myngath* is available as a printed book - ISBN 9781484110744 - and as a gratis open access pdf, <https://davidmyatt.files.wordpress.com/2013/04/david-myatt-myngath.pdf>

{10} [https://web.archive.org/web/20150908040728/http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/static/audio\\_video/programmes/panorama/transcripts/transcript\\_30\\_06\\_00.txt](https://web.archive.org/web/20150908040728/http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/static/audio_video/programmes/panorama/transcripts/transcript_30_06_00.txt)

{11} *Occultism and National-Socialism*, [https://archive.org/download/myatt-occult-ns\\_202303/myatt-occult-ns.pdf](https://archive.org/download/myatt-occult-ns_202303/myatt-occult-ns.pdf)

{12} *An Uncertainty Of Knowing: Four Interviews*, ISBN 979-8394746574. Gratis open access pdf, <https://archive.org/download/myatt-four-interviews/myatt-four-interviews.pdf>

{13} A copy of Myatt's *The Significance of the Taliban for the Muslim Ummah* was found among the possessions of Osama bin Laden after his killing by US Navy Seals in the Abbottabad compound in 2011 and which copy is now in the CIA archives.

CIA archive: <https://www.cia.gov/library/abbottabad-compound>. The copy is at <http://tinyurl.com/22zb4389>

The original is archived at [https://web.archive.org/web/20080611081331/http://www.davidmyatt.info/significance\\_taliban.html](https://web.archive.org/web/20080611081331/http://www.davidmyatt.info/significance_taliban.html)



{14} <https://web.archive.org/web/20210126120934/https://www.counterextremism.com/content/top-20-extremists>

{15} The complete text is included in Appendix Two.

---

## Appendix One

### Abstractions And Ontology

The philosophical use of the term 'abstraction' is explained by Myatt in his *The Numinous Way Of Pathei-Mathos*,

"An abstraction is a manufactured generalization, a hypothesis, a posited thing, an assumption or assumptions about, an extrapolation of or from some-thing, or some assumed or extrapolated ideal 'form' of some-thing. Sometimes, abstractions are generalization based on some sample(s), or on some median (average) value or sets of values, observed, sampled, or assumed.

Abstractions can be of some-thing past, in the present, or described as a goal or an ideal which it is assumed could be attained or achieved in the future. All abstractions involve a causal perception, based as they are on the presumption of a linear cause-and-effect (and/or a dialectic) and on a posited or an assumed category or classification which differs in some way from some other assumed or posited categories/classifications, past, present or future. When applied to or used to describe/classify/distinguish/motivate living beings, abstractions involve a causal separation-of-otherness; and when worth/value/identity (and exclusion/inclusion) is or are assigned to such a causal separation-of-otherness then there is or there arises hubris.

Abstractions are often assumed to provide some 'knowledge' or some 'understanding' of some-thing assigned to or described by a particular abstraction. For example, in respect of the abstraction of 'race' applied to human beings, and which categorization of human beings describes a median set of values said or assumed to exist 'now' or in some recent historical past.

According to the philosophy of pathei-mathos, this presumption of knowledge and understanding by the application of abstractions to beings - living and otherwise - is false, for abstractions are considered as a primary means by which the nature of Being and beings are and have been concealed, requiring as abstractions do the positing and the continuation of abstractive opposites in relation to Being and the separation of beings from Being by the process of ideation and opposites."

<https://davidmyatt.files.wordpress.com/2022/10/numinous-way-pathei-mathos-v7.pdf>, p.49

In his Introduction to *The Numinous Way Of Pathei-Mathos* he writes that:

"empathy and pathei-mathos lead us away from the abstractions we have constructed and manufactured and which abstractions we often tend to impose, or project, upon other human beings, upon ourselves, often in the belief that such abstractions can aid our understanding of others and of ourselves, with a feature of all abstractions being inclusion and exclusion; that is, certain individuals are considered as belonging to or as defined by a particular category while others are not.

Over millennia we have manufactured certain abstractions and their assumed opposites and classified many of them according to particular moral standards so that a particular abstraction is considered good and/or beneficial and/or as necessary and/or as healthy, while its assumed dialectical opposite is considered bad (or evil), or unnecessary, or unhealthy, and/or as unwarranted [...]

We human beings have continued to manufacture abstractions and continue to assign individuals to them, a useful example being the abstraction denoted by the terms The State and The Nation-State and which abstraction, with its government, its supra-personal authority, its laws, its economy, and its inclusion/exclusion (citizenship or lack of it) has come to dominate and influence the life of the majority of people in the West.

Ontologically, abstractions - ancient and modern - usurp our connexion to Being and to other living beings so that instead of using wordless empathy and pathei-mathos as a guide to Reality we tend to define ourselves or are defined by others according to an abstraction or according to various abstractions. In the matter of the abstraction that is The State there is a tendency to define or to try to understand our relation to Reality by for example whether we belong, are a citizen of a particular State; by whether or not we have an acceptable standard of living because of the opportunities and employment and/or the assistance afforded by the economy and the policies of the State; by whether or not we agree or disagree with the policies of the government in power, and often by whether or not we have transgressed some State-made law or laws. Similarly, in the matter of belief in a revealed religion such as Christianity or Islam we tend to define or understand our relation to Reality by means of such an abstraction: that is, according to the revelation (or a particular interpretation of it) and its eschatology, and thus by how the promise of Heaven/Jannah may be personally obtained.

Empathy and *pathei-mathos*, however, wordlessly – sans denotatum, sans abstractions, sans a dialectic of contradictory opposites – uncover *physis*: our *physis*, that of other mortals, that of other living beings, and that of Being/Reality itself. Which *physis*, howsoever presented – in ourselves, in other living beings, in Being – is fluxive, a balance between the being that it now is, that it was, and that it has the inherent (the acausal) quality to be."

---

## Appendix Two

### Weltschmerz And The Conflict In Gaza

Question: Given your past, which included anti-Zionist tirades when you were a neo-nazi and then when you were a supporter of al-Qaeda, I would be interested in your view of recent events in Palestine.

Reply: Does the term *Weltschmerz* express what I feel after decades of experiencing and inciting extremism and a decade of reflexion on and rejection of such extremism? Possibly, at least in some ways; [1] for in respect of the current (2023) conflict in Gaza I feel sadness, and am not surprised that such a conflict has arisen with the subsequent destruction of infrastructure, of homes, and the injuries, the deaths, including of women and children.

Not surprised, given what I understand is our human *physis* and our seemingly inability to avoid the error of hubris and our obvious ability to favour our own certitude-of-knowing. Will we, can we, as a species learn to develop empathy and thus be compassionate and appreciative of the numinous breeding as such empathy and appreciation of the numinous do a certain personal humility and thus an uncertitude-of-knowing? Will we, can we, as a species learn from our thousands of years old human culture of *pathei-mathos*?

It would seem not since we in the West, en masse, apparently have not learned from the horrors of the First and Second World wars; from the Vietnam war; from the invasions and occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq. Instead, hatred and certitude-of-knowing have triumphed again over personal empathy aided as in all those previous conflicts by propaganda both emotive and cunning.

Contra the *bellum iustum* of Augustine, since adopted as a principle by modern nation-States and others, where some elected or unelected official or President or Prime Minister or Congress or Parliament or potentate or whatever assumes or believe they have the authority to declare war, my understanding is that impersonal war, whenever wherever, whatever the alleged or assumed justification by whomsoever, is contrary to empathy, compassion, awareness of the numinous, and the personal learning that *pathei-mathos* engenders.

For such impersonal war with its necessary obedience to a chain-of-command abrogates personal judgement and what I have described as 'personal honour in the immediacy of the moment'. As I wrote in *One Vagabond In Exile From The Gods*, personal honour

"presences the virtues of fairness, tolerance, compassion, humility, and εὐταξία - as (i) a natural intuitive (wordless) expression of the numinous ('the good', δίκη, συμπάθεια) and (ii) of both what the culture of *pathei-mathos* and the acausal-knowing of empathy reveal we should do (or incline us toward doing) in the immediacy of the personal moment when personally confronted by what is unfair, unjust, and extreme.

Of how such honour - by its and our φύσις - is and can only ever be personal, and thus cannot be extracted out from the 'living moment' and our participation in the moment; for it [is] only through such things as a personal study of the culture of *pathei-mathos* and the development of the faculty of empathy that a person who does not naturally possess the instinct for δίκη can develop what is essentially 'the human faculty of honour', and which faculty is often appreciated and/or discovered via our own personal *pathei-mathos*." [2]

Hence, my fallible understanding now is that honour cannot be abstracted out from a personal moment and enshrined in some supra-personal written or aural code. Which, of course, is the exact opposite of what I believed during my thirty years as a neo-nazi extremist. Such a change of view was a painful, sorrowful, learning from experience:

"There are no excuses for my extremist past, for the suffering I caused [...] No excuses because the extremism, the intolerance, the hatred, the violence, the inhumanity, the prejudice were mine; my responsibility, born from and expressive of my character; and because the discovery of, the learning of, the need to live, to regain, my humanity arose because of and from others and not because of me.

Thus what exposed my hubris - what for me broke down that certitude-of-knowing which extremism breeds and re-presents - was not something I did; not something I achieved; not something related to my character, my nature, at all. Instead, it was a gift offered to me by others..." [3]

A gift, a Phoenix, from the deaths of Sue and Francis who

"died - thirteen years apart - leaving me bereft of love, replete with sorrow, and somewhat perplexed [...] A debt somehow and in some way - beyond a simple remembrance of them - to especially make the life and death of Sue and Fran worthwhile and full of meaning, as if their tragic early dying meant something to both me, and through my words, my deeds, to others. A debt of change, of learning - in me, so that from my

pathei-mathos I might be, should be, a better person; presencing through words, living, thought, and deeds, that simple purity of life felt, touched, known, in those stark moments of the immediacy of their loss." [4]

In further explanation all I have now are the words of TS Eliot in his poem Little Gidding:

And what you thought you came for  
Is only a shell, a husk of meaning  
From which the purpose breaks only when it is fulfilled  
If at all. Either you had no purpose  
Or the purpose is beyond the end you figured  
And is altered in fulfilment.

In respect of wars and supra-personal conflicts, are we then, as a species, doomed to repeat the errors, the hubris, of the past? Almost a decade ago I asked myself a rhetorical question: what opinion would a hypothetical visiting alien from another star-system form about us? [5] My answer then was that the alien would probably consider us an aggressive, still rather primitive and very violent, species best avoided until such time as we might outwardly demonstrate otherwise.

Have we, since the outbreak of World War One in 1914 to the 2023 conflict in Gaza, demonstrated otherwise?

David Myatt  
17<sup>th</sup> December 2023

Extract from a letter to a personal correspondent.

[1] Postscriptum: "in some ways" as Weltschmerz might be applied to some of the poems and letters of TS Eliot.

[2] *One Vagabond In Exile From The Gods*. <https://davidmyatt.files.wordpress.com/2023/12/viator.pdf>

[3] *Pathei-Mathos, Genesis of My Unknowing*. The essay is included in <https://davidmyatt.files.wordpress.com/2019/09/reformation-extremism-v3b.pdf>

[4] *Myngath*. <https://davidmyatt.files.wordpress.com/2013/04/david-myatt-myngath.pdf>

[5] <https://davidmyatt.files.wordpress.com/2022/03/non-terrestrial-view.pdf>

ooo

Source:

<https://davidmyatt.files.wordpress.com/2023/12/dwm-gaza.pdf>

---

Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivs 4.0 license

---