# Nature, Man and God

*by Alvin Moore, Jr.*

> *When I was in the Principle and Ground of Godhead, no one asked me where I was going or what I was doing; there was no one to ask. On my return to the Principle and Ground of Godhead, where I am formless, my breaking through will be far nobler than my going forth; no one will ask me whence I came or whither I went, no one missed me. There, God-as-Other passes away.*
>
> Meister Eckhart

In these words Meister Eckhart enunciates a truth fundamental alike to Christianity and to all orthodox traditions: namely, the Procession and Return of creatures, indeed of all creation or manifestation (essentially equivalent terms), from and to the Godhead. Eckhart speaks of both Procession and Return, and the one is the necessary corollary of the other. But Return is even more essential than Procession from the human perspective, for it defines the human entelechy. In the *Genesis* creation account we read that "God saw everything that He had made, and indeed it was very good." God desires to diffuse His goodness, truth and beauty. But the words of an *hadith qudsi* (a saying of the Prophet Muhammad in which God speaks in the first person) are even more fundamental as regards man's nature and ultimate identity: "I was a hidden treasure and I desired to be known." God wishes to know Himself from the standpoint of creatures. Man's *gnosis* is God—"that awesome Prior"—knowing Himself in us, a knowing that is the consummation of the Return. For "he who knows God becomes God"; only God can know God, it being impossible that finite subject could know Infinite Object.

Now the Return is all too often ignored, misconceived, or inadequately conceived. On a popular level the religions take our present life as the norm for man's posthumous states, though not without reason. Exoterically speaking, the Semitic monotheisms do not look beyond certain postmortem prolongations of the human state and tend to confuse these prolongations with the whole of salvation and immortality. Nevertheless, these extensions remain within the parameters of individual manifestation and are far, one might say "infinitely far," from true immortality and the fullness of salvation. It has been said that "liberation is for the gods," and that "liberation is not *of* the individual, but *from* individuality." In contrast to popular monotheism, certain more metaphysical traditions, Hinduism and Buddhism notably, include for those who are qualified the express aim of liberation not only from individuality but from the very cosmos. In Christianity especially, effective esoterism whose concern was precisely these things, has been all but dead since the Renaissance. We would like to think, however, that a revival of esoterism within Christianity may be possible as we approach the term of this present cycle, the end of *this* world.

Our intention in this essay, *Deo juvante*, is to offer certain major and more accessible elements of a world view that is a very viable alternative to the sterile horizons of secular humanism in which so many of our fellows are imprisoned, without even suspecting that near at hand there may be means of escape. Very likely there will be some who, preferring New Age illusions, will say "no religion, please," in response to such overtures. In the human psyche there is rancor and bitterness towards the Divine which effectively blocks high purposes and upward movement. There is also an inertia relating to new concepts and unfamiliar ways of thinking. In our remarks we shall speak from a perspective superior to confessional parameters, but certainly not superior to religion as such. All orthodox religions begin as initiatives of Heaven towards mankind, or particular segments of mankind. All are true insofar as they are orthodox, that is, insofar as they are faithful to their own internal criteria for integrity. A given religion is incumbent upon those to whom it is addressed and no man can disdain Heaven's initiatives with impunity. No man can maintain a saving equilibrium in this life, especially not in these last times, without Heaven's aid. And certainly no man can find his way out of the cosmic labyrinth without the favour and as-

sistance of Heaven. The great revelations and the traditions flowing from them have an essential role not only in man's liberation from the cosmos, from Nature in her totality, but also in man's well-being within the cosmos; though these roles are not always precisely as popularly conceived.

Before going further, it will be helpful to state in broad lines what we can understand by the word *nature*, which derives from the Latin *natura* and which itself derives from *natus*, to be born. *Nature* implies coming to be and passing away, motion, development. In current usage, the primary meanings of *nature* are: the external world and its phenomena, from greatest to least, as these are manifested to man's sensory awareness—and this is the notion of nature that is often sentimentalized; second, the sum of processes, causes and effects, whether evident or hidden, in the world considered as external to man; and third, the essential properties or characteristics of persons or things which determine what they are, the manner of their existence, and how they act or are acted upon.

In the opening epigraph Eckhart states the Principle of Procession and Return, though he does not explicitly state the subject. Although this subject encompasses all creation, essentially the subject is man: not man as individual, but man in the fullness of his nature which is infinitely more than the flesh with which we are so familiar. The true subject of Procession and Return is human nature which, transcending individuality, "has nothing to do with time." To develop these themes further, we turn to the ninth century Irish scholar, John Scot Eriugena (c. 810 - c. 877) who with Eckhart (1260 - 1327) is at the summit of western Christian intellectuality. Eriugena bridged the "Greek East and the Latin West" and was deeply nourished by the Greek Fathers, especially Sts. Dionysius the Areopagite and Maximus the Confessor. We turn to his major work, *On the Division of Nature (De divisione naturae)* for a schema grand enough to situate man in his cosmic and extra-cosmic ambience. Eriugena uses the word *nature* in the most comprehensive manner conceivable, including in its bounds as he says "all that is and all that is not," in other words all degrees in the "great chain of being" and also THAT which transcends Being. His division of Nature as set forth in his *De divisione naturae* is fourfold: the uncreated nature that creates; the created nature that creates; the created nature that does not create;

and the uncreated nature that does not create. We shall comment on each of these divisions and endeavour to show how man, human nature, is involved in each of them.

The first division of nature in Eriugena's schema is that nature which creates *all* that is created, or by which is manifested *all* that appears however and wherever it appears. In the monotheistic perspective this is God as Creator and Divine Person, the level of Pure Being or the "relative Absolute" to use the apt phrase of Frithjof Schuon. This is also the level of the Divine Intellect, the Logos or Word. Note that though we speak of "levels" in Divinity, God is preeminently One—an affirmation in no way vitiating Christian Trinitarian doctrine. Pure Being was the supreme concern of Latin Christianity, at least officially and as it flowered in medieval Scolasticism. Whatever the reason for this limitation, Latin Christianity and its derivative Protestantism had not the habit of looking more deeply into the Divine than the ontological level, though this does not mean that in the West there were none who did so—for example Eriugena, Eckhart and Boehme. For its part the Christian East retained the concept of plenary Non-Being or Beyond Being, making the necessary distinctions between the imparticipable Divine Essence and the participable Divine Energies. Pure Being, at the level of the Energies, is the first determination of the Godhead in view of creation/manifestation. In Scholastic idiom, it is the "place of possibilities"; it is the Archetype of archetypes, Form of all forms. It is that creative nature whose idiosyncrasy is eternal creation. In this ultimate sense redemption, which includes lawgiving, is no less implicit as eternal divine act than is creation; and conformity to one's given law is a necessary premise for salvation. From the perspective of the Eternal, creation/manifestation and redemption are totally simultaneous. René Guénon could thus say that he who cannot escape from the standpoint of temporal succession, so as to see all things in their absolute simultaneity, is incapable of the least conception in metaphysics. And Frithjof Schuon observed that "esoterism (the primary concern of which is metaphysics) looks to the nature of things and not primarily to our human eschatology; it views the Universe not merely from the human standpoint but from the 'standpoint' of God." The recognition of these truths and their presence in ones ideas concerning the Divine are salient distinctions between the metaphysical and theological modes of thought. Metaphysic alone is free

of the dilemmas and inconsequences which characterize certain areas of theology, notably theodicy. And as much first rate theology is readily available (as well as much second and third rate material), and as the question is a perennial one that troubles people even today, we think it appropriate to confine our further remarks relating to Eriugena's first division of Nature to theodicy.

To the ever recurring question: "If God is all good and all powerful, whence evil?," theology offers no fully satisfactory response. Traditional (not academic) metaphysics has axiomatic data lacking to theology (indeed, theology is a demarcation or limitation of metaphysics). Examples are the distinction between the Relative and the Absolute *in divinis*; the doctrine of Universal Possibility; degrees of reality and *maya* or *hijab* (veil); cosmic rhythms and cycles; the equivalence of knowing and being; and especially the nature of consciousness and intelligence and man's ultimate identity. But specific to theodicy: on pain of contradiction, Universal Possibility must include the possibility of its own denial. In the nature of things, however, this denial can be realized only as a tendency or direction; obviously, pure nothingness cannot be created or manifested, or explicitly realized. The world is not God and cannot share in the divine perfections in a divine manner. Creation means remotion from the Divine, and the greater the removal the greater the ontic impoverishment, which privations may be experienced as evil at the individual level. But evil is parasitic; not only does it have no existence in its own right, it is in no way symmetrical with God even if one might think differently in times such as our own. Frithjof Schuon, who has carried theodicy to the highest levels of possible expression, affirms that there are, as it were, two wills in the Divine. In the Absolute there is the will to creation/manifestation as such, which necessarily implies all the diminution and indigence to which fallen creation and men as fallen creatures are subject and which they experience as evil in whatever degree. These are givens which man has no choice but to accept. The other Divine will is more narrowly focused within particular worlds, and adapted to their structure, circumstances and conditions and reaching into particular lives ("not one sparrow shall fall to the ground without your Father").

There are also the divine initiatives towards mankind, already mentioned; these are the great Revelations and the religious traditions flow-

ing from them which include a Law appropriate to each tradition and which extend to nuances for each creature, all this being an expression of the will to redeem. This is the orbit of Pure Being, the Divine Person (note, however, that *Person* can be metaphysically transposed so that it coincides with the Self) with Whom one has an obligation to form a relationship; and grief to him who spurns this possibility. Frithjof Schuon has specified that though one can relate to the Divine Person, one cannot realize Him; but that one cannot objectively relate to the Self, the Ultimate Subject, but one can realize It, at Heaven's good pleasure needless to say.

Against what may appear as a kind of cosmic ruthlessness, it must be affirmed that there is Mercy at the heart of things, all contrary appearances notwithstanding. All traditions, each in its appropriate manner, make this same affirmation.

In summary, God the Uncreate, is necessary Being. He is not subject to the category of existence; though the structures of our language almost compel us to say, "God exists," we do so only by extension. We must say simply HE IS. All else, from angels to gnats, are contingent and entirely dependent upon Another for existence, life, consciousness and intelligence, at whatever levels of their participation. The obvious lesson for men here is the need for self-knowledge: to recognize our own contingency, that we possess neither our own being nor our existence, and in consequence to take the first steps towards the fundamental and indispensable virtue of humility.

The second division of Nature, following Eriugena's schema, is that nature which is created and which also creates. This is the realm of the Divine Archetypes, seminal reasons or exemplary causes of things, apart from which nothing could possibly be existentiated. The archetypes are eternally present in the Divine Intellect; "fused but not confused," they are coeval with the Logos (the Divine Intellect); as the number *one*, analogously, potentially contains all other numbers. The Greek roots of the word *archetype* suggest the notions of "forge" or "mint," and provide precious insight into the act of creation. Αρχετμπου, archetypon, means "pattern" or "model"; "arche" meaning "first" or "original," and "typos" meanings "impression" or "stamp." If from the human perspective, the archetypes seem indefinitely numerous, nevertheless ontologically they are one with and not distinct from the Divine Substance. As with the

angelic states, we cannot grasp the archetypes discursively, though there is this difference as regards the angels: on missions to men, angels (who are of the created order) are perceptible to men; whereas by definition the archetypes are uncreate. One may wonder why Eriugena adopted this as second category in his *De divisione naturae*, given that the archetypes as divine ideas and exemplary causes, are intrinsic to the Divine Intellect. Perhaps it was to emphasize the doctrine of exemplarism: that all that exists (exist="stand forth" or "appear," implying desire), however it exists, and through all its permutations, derives from and participates in the Principal order and is entirely dependent upon this order, apart from which there could only be non-existence in the privative sense, that is, pure nothingness. In any case, we can say the archetypes are created only in the sense that, intrinsic to the Logos, they proceed forth in the eternal generation of the Logos. The priority of the Divine Intellect or Logos is a logical and not an ontological priority. Let us note also that the Divine Intellect, the creative Principle, is not diminished by the eternal act of creation, but is as a Fountain, simultaneously "fontal and inflowing." The causative mode of the Divine Archetypes is an exemplary causality; they are One in principle, but multiple (metaphysically transposing this word) in relation to what is existentiated in the created order.

We must digress briefly to consider the so-called Jungian archetypes, currently so much in fashion; for the word archetype is another of those that have been hijacked to serve subversive ends. Out of simple regard for truth, Jungian archetypes should never be confused with the infinitely superior Divine Archetypes of which they are but grotesque and sinister parodies reflected in the "nether waters" of the subtle or psychic realm. Genuine archetypes are sources of "being and knowledge," in the words of Titus Burckhardt. An example is Dante vis-a-vis Beatrice. Dante was drawn to Beatrice because she represented his archetype *in divinis*. Man approaches genuine archetypes through rigorous and intelligent discipline, purification, and concentration which open onto high intellection or gnosis; not by slackening and sinking beneath the human entelechy. Jung held that his "archetypes" are eidolons outside the spatio-temporal order. It hardly need be added that his notions of "non-spatial" and "non-temporal" are really quite limited and restricted to the psychic realm, and no more than a caricature of metaphysical transcendence. Jung limited his interest and studies to the psychic or subtle realm, in-

deed to the inferior registers of this realm. The subtle order is vast—it is frequently compared to an ocean—and its upper degrees are far superior to our common experience. In its lower registers, however, it is *par excellence* the realm of deceit, malice, illusion and fleeting change, the phenomena of which were aptly characterized by Dante as "lying waves." Jung's "archetypes," instead of being sources of knowledge and being, are often forces of madness and dissolution. We should note that these distinctions are particularly critical for our contemporaries who, wrongly believing that all that is not material is spiritual, all too often fail to discriminate between the psychic and the properly spiritual which is necessarily beyond form.

Eriugena's third division of Nature is that nature which is created and which does not create. This is the world of this present life; the world of phenomena, both corporeal and subtle or psychic; the world of energies manifested from something beyond our ken. "You have seen the kettle of thought boiling," said Rumi; "what of the fire?" This third division is that of the permutation of the elements, of generation and corruption, of coming to be and passing away; of earth, atmosphere, and sky; of the rhythmic seasons and inexhaustibly variegated life forms; in short, of nature as the word is most commonly used. This earth, our temporary abode, is indeed beautiful, especially when not despoiled by the hand of arrogant men; or when it has been long and lovingly tended for generations, as can be seen in parts of Asia and Europe and even North America. Most traditional symbols are drawn from this natural order, so there is obviously an epiphanic or theophanic aspect intrinsic to it. Profane man, however, looks upon nature as a rapist might look on a potential victim. The vision of the innocent stands in sharp contrast; one among many of these was Blessed Anne Catherine Emmerich who could say:

> when I… was a child, every leaf, every tiny flower, was a book which I could read. I perceived the beauty and signification of color and form; but when I spoke of it, my hearers only laughed at me. I could entertain myself with everything that I met in the fields. I understood everything. I could even see into flowers and animals…

Indeed, "God saw everything that He had made and, behold, it was very good." Nevertheless, there are fundamental ambiguities in our own

existence and in that of nature. "Cursed is the ground for thy sake," God said to Adam:

> In sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life… in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread until thou return into the ground, for out of it thou was taken… dust thou art and unto dust thou shalt return.

Man's central state is implicit in this pronouncement: it is because of *man's* misdeeds that the earth is accursed. This relationship between man and earth is intrinsic to man's existential situation. The ecological crisis, or crises—for there are many—have grown dramatically more acute with man's increasing numbers which are themselves made possible by ever increasing industrial activity—which activity entails further consequential damage to the natural habitat.

Ancient man saw the phenomena of nature as theophanies, or at least as expressions of noetic energies. Modern man sees only appearances, brute facts and what immediately affects the senses. Ancient man, understanding first principles, knew that nothing comes from nothing, and that nothing acts upon itself. Modern man believes that water can be poured from an empty bucket. Ancient man believed that intelligence always has priority. Modern man, reversing the natural and necessary order of things, believes he can trace intelligence to biological, chemical or even physical causes; he is oblivious to the contradiction inherent in the notion that intelligence is in final analysis the product of unintelligence and unconsciousness. Ancient man saw his origins either in an eponymous demigod ancestor, in his high gods, or ultimately in a divine First Principle. Modern man imagines his origins in subhuman life forms and ultimately in unconscious matter (itself an illusory notion). In appetite-driven exercises of self-delusion, modern man wants to believe that all life, all consciousness, all intelligence are the products of blind forces. Ancient man believed not only that he should think with the gods but that there are Heaven-given norms for thinking and for behavior. Modern man, incredibly myopic, nominalistic, and never far from solipsism, believes his consciousness and faculties are uniquely his own to use as he pleases and that he can do whatever he pleases without adverse consequences. In modern man, extroversion and introversion take on new meaning; man is extroverted by definition and by nature; but never be-

fore has extroversion been pushed to such reckless extremes, and never before has introversion ended in such short-sighted morbidity. *Quos Deus vult perdere prius dementat.*

Toxic waste sites and all such abuses of nature mirror the condition of man's soul, the qualitative condition of which inevitably resonates in humanity's natural habitat; for nature is an extension of and dependent upon the creature who is midmost and omphalic in this world. Man no longer understands or wants to understand his own constitution—what can it mean for a new college graduate to be told that man consists of body, soul and spirit?—and thus he does not understand his own constitution or his vocation as man. Hence he no longer fulfils his Heaven-given function of vicar or *khalifah* for this world which is his temporary abode. He exacerbates the very cosmogonic process by turning his back on his Principle and pushing centrifugal sensory experience to extremes. There result an accelerating fragility and instability in all his works and activities as he moves in seeming helplessness towards the periphery of his world, all of which is only too evident to those who have "eyes to see." Man cannot escape the Heaven-set boundaries of his faculties. Already in 1842, Tennyson in his capacity as modernist and sentimental Victorian wrote a poem named after its central character, *Ulysses.* In it, he extolled the terminal exploits of the elderly Ulysses and his aged companions. But of the same episode, Dante, one of the last European *jivan mukthas,* in his great *Commedia* had Ulysses, now dead and in one of the lower pits of Hell, utter these words:

> We joyed, but soon our joy was turned to grief:
> for a tempest arose from the new land, and
> struck the forepart of our ship.
>
> Three times it made her whirl round with all
> the waters; at the fourth, the poop rose up
> and the prow went down, as pleased Another,
> till the sea was closed above us.

*O voi, che avete gl'intelleti sani, mirate la dottrina che s'asconde sotto il velame degli versi strani.**

* (O ye who have sane intellects for guide, consider well the doctrines that for cloak beneath the strangeness of the verses hide. *Inferno* IX, 61-63.)

Neither man's destiny and certainly not his final Destination are confined within *this* world. Our intelligence and will, all our nobler faculties are cut to a finer cloth, shaped to a divine measure. But we have attempted to deny our better parts and erect an unprincipled civilization, or one erected on pseudo-principles; one having no reference either to our Origin, our Destination, or to our own more profound nature. Now we are reaping the consequences of our reckless hubris. As with Ulysses and his companions, the Sea is about to close over us and all we have sought to build.

But there is a way of egress as there has always been, though it is neither to the right nor to the left, but upwards. Great hope remains at least for those who happily are in the process of finding right belief and right orientation—seldom an easy but never an impossible task. Indeed, this terminal phase of the human cycle has remarkable compensations, chiefly of the intellectual order, which in certain respects make the task before us easier than ever before. Never before has so much illumination of the Heaven-given traditions been so easily accessible, though to be sure much of it is set amidst a deluge of misinformation and rubbish. Nevertheless, to men of good will the Gospels advise: "Ask and ye shall receive, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened to you."

There remains Eriugena's fourth division of Nature: that Nature which is uncreated and which does not create, for it does not enter into relationship with anything created. It is absolutely all-inclusive; and all that is, all that exists, is entirely dependent upon It. This is the *Principle and Ground of Godhead* of which Eckhart said:

> the Godhead gave all things up to God… The gift of the Father is the positive existence of all creatures in the Person of His Son… [the Godhead] is as poor, as naked and as idle as though It were not; It has not, wills not, wants not, gets not… the Godhead is as void as though It were not.

This is the Absolute, plenary Non-Being or Beyond Being, Reality so inconceivably exalted that Pure Being is limitation by comparison—though strictly speaking comparison is impossible. This is the *Brahma-nirguna* of Hindu doctrine, *Parinirvana* of Buddhism, the *Dhat* of Sufism, the *Ein-Sof* of certain Kabbalist schools, and the unknowable and imparticipable Essence of Palamite theology. As said previously,

this is the Prior of Pure Being, and from Being proceed all existence and all existences in an eternal and inexhaustible creative act. Man can enter into relationship with God but not with the Godhead, and though he can realize the Godhead there is an unfathomable abyss between the human person and the Divine Person. This marks another vital distinction between the exoteric perspective which, by and large, is that of the religions, and the esoteric perspective which envisions realization of identity with the Godhead as man's ultimate Destination and as the fullness of salvation.

It is true that very little can be said of the Godhead except that HE IS, and even this affirmation must be drastically qualified. We say the Godhead "is" Beyond-Being, or "is" plenary Non-Being; but we know all the while that "words fall back" in their inadequacy and that negative language, "not thus, not so," "not this, not this," brings us nearer the ineffable and unutterable Truth. The Godhead, nevertheless, is what all creatures, especially man and his analogous central-state beings, desire above all else. This is implicit in Christ's words: "No man cometh to the Father but by Me"; and elsewhere in the Gospels where, for example, the Apostle Philip says to Jesus: "Lord, show us the Father and it sufficeth." And the Upanishads tell us that

> It is not for the sake of the bride that the bride is dear; it is for the sake of the Self that the bride is dear. It is not for the sake of the son that the son is dear; it is for the sake of the Self that the son is dear.

We close this brief survey with a return to Eriugena's third division of Nature: our world, that of man or human nature as we presently know it. In earlier ages, it was commonly held that man is composed of body, soul and Spirit—*corpus, anima, Spiritus* (though for Spirit we can read both created and uncreated Intellect). From this it can be seen that in a manner man recapitulates in his own being all elements of creation/manifestation, the "three worlds" of traditional doctrine; and not only the "three worlds," but as well what lies beyond the "three worlds." Man's position in creation brings with it great privileges but also commensurate responsibilities. The human state is where we find ourselves and is thus the starting point for any degree of realization we may accomplish—with Heaven's aid, to be sure. The human state "hard to obtain" and what we make of our brief sojourn here will determine our post-mortem

destiny, for life does not end with the dissolution of the body. In the opening epigraph Eckhart spoke of the Procession and Return and implicitly of the degrees of reality, the "great chain of being." Man's Procession is not as an individual; individuality commences with the subtle order. We must conceive of the centrifugal flight that defines creation/manifestation as movement through degrees of diminishing reality with remotion from the Divine and passage towards nothingness. Contrariwise the Return implies increasing ontic increments and burgeoning enfranchisement into the actual, the real, as the being remounts "the great chain of being," retracing the steps of manifestation. If "the Kingdom of God is for none but the thoroughly dead," it is because one must die to one's present degree of reality before being enfranchised into that immediately superior. This is true for each discrete degree as also for creation in its totality. It is in the nature of things that men should be saved, for image must return to its Archetype. The Return can be accomplished happily or in misery, depending on ones entanglements. If salvation seems a doubtful possibility, this may result from the qualitatively degraded nature of our times; but one should not forget that there is Mercy at the heart of things. But salvation in the sense of prolonged life in one of the posthumous extensions of the human state, or a sojourn of long duration in one of the Paradises is not to be confused with final liberation—which in no way implies that deferred liberation and the stations through which the soul may thus pass are not most desirable. Though the intelligent creature chooses salvation, he cannot "choose" liberation because of the absence of reciprocity between the Absolute and the contingent. "You have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you," said Christ. If liberation is a possibility it is because, as Eckhart and Eriugena and numerous others affirm, there is in man something that is "uncreated and uncreatable." This primeval and essential link to the Godhead is the secret of the nobility of humanity, of man's vocation, and of his ultimate identity. When man proceeds forth, his better part (though of course the Divine is impartite) remains within and "at home"; this is his Divine Archetype, and "all that is *in* God *is* God."

If the individual does not "choose" liberation, there is nevertheless the *apocatastasis*, the ultimate reintegration of all creation and all elements of creation into their Divine Source. "When" will this occur? The question cannot be answered; it is essentially meaningless because, as

said above, there is no reciprocity of relationship between the contingent and the Absolute. In any case, our final realization already *is* in the eternal Now where all possibilities are simultaneously present. Finally, and lest acquaintance with man's high destiny lead to psychic inflation, let it be remembered that, in words of Muhyi-ud-Din Ibn 'Arabi, "the servant remains the servant and the Lord remains the Lord."

*Nihil habeo quod non accepi*, we have nothing we have not received: first of all and obviously, from Heaven; then via Ananda Coomaraswamy, René Guénon, and Frithjof Schuon, especially the last named. We strongly recommend the written work of these "three wise men" of the twentieth century whose respective roles in these end times have been not only Providential and restorative but also eloquent testimony, not only that God is not dead, but rather that He is the Primal Reality. All that exists, exists by some measure of derivative reality received from the One. And all that exists, considered solely in and of itself, amounts to so many nullities. Or in the Vedantin idiom: "God is true, the world is a lie."

This essay was first published in Volume 2 (1998) of the journal, Sacred Web (www.sacredweb.com), and is reproduced here with the kind permission of Sacred Web Publishing.

The Matheson Trust