



The Secret Tradition

Mircea A Tamas

In 1888, Madame Blavatsky's work **The Secret Doctrine** was published, being considered one of her best. In those times, like today, it is hard to understand why healthy and apparently intelligent people would take Mme Blavatsky seriously. She was a charlatan and her "secret doctrine" a fraud.

Nevertheless, we notice today a stubborn determination in promoting the syntagm "secret tradition," where two fundamental words "secret" and "tradition" were put together with obvious anti-traditional and anti-secret purposes. We don't have to insist here and remind what René Guénon explained regarding the secret and the tradition, yet we stress that everything traditional has a "non-human" element, which means that all the invented doctrines are just human fantasies, and the secret refers mainly and primary to the fact that the supreme knowledge is beyond words and belongs to the domain of silence.

A Masonic formula regarding the location of a Lodge points out how any "secret and silent location" could be a setting for the Lodge,¹ and here both the secret and the silence allude to the non-manifestation, since secret and silence, together with *wu-wei* (non-action) and darkness, and similar to void, are possibilities of non-manifestation.² In other words, the secret is something unutterable, and this is the highest significance of the "initiatory secret" because, in contrast with what the modern people think, not everything must and can be explained, not everything must and can be unveiled, and especially not everything was registered in written documents, documents which the modern and dubious authors strive to make us considered as the body of the "secret tradition."

It is true – and this is an objective law of our world – that the mystery which covered the esoteric domain inflamed the fantasy of numerous individuals and there were many attempts to solve the enigma for the public, since for modern man it is impossible to understand that the mystery refers to the spiritual domain, namely, to something completely opposite to the worldly realm³; for this reason, various modern works assumed that the secret was about a hidden material treasure, or a political secret, or some made up phantasmagorias.

¹ Denys Roman, **Réflexions d'un chrétien sur la Franc-Maçonnerie**, Éd. Traditionnelles, 1995, p. 125

² See our work **René Guénon et le Centre du Monde**, Rose-Cross Books, Toronto, 2007, p. 127.

³ Of course, we consider "spiritual" in a traditional sense, that is, something divine.

The Secret Tradition

The “law of secretiveness” is important from both points of view, outer and inner. From an outer point of view, it is important the uninitiated not to have access to some elements which, in their hands, would become dangerous for themselves first, and then for the others. From an inner point of view, any revealing would have produced a weakening of the esoteric aspect, and there are sufficient proofs regarding some Western initiatory organizations, which, admitting as members, without any discrimination, all kind of unqualified individuals, decayed without any chance of recovery. For this reason, those admitted inside an initiatory organization had to utter a very strong oath regarding the “law of secretiveness,” and this oath was not only formal, because the initiates who betrayed it were as guilty as the profane ones that “stole” the mystery. “Conceal it, then, from those who are unfit to receive the depth of knowledge, and so cover the pit. The owner of the pit, then, the Gnostic, shall himself be punished, incurring the blame of the others stumbling” (Clement V, 8). And also: “They say, then, that Hipparchus the Pythagorean, being guilty of writing the tenets of Pythagoras in plain language, was expelled from the school, and a pillar raised for him as if he had been dead” (Clement V, 9). The death penalty was the punishment for anyone who revealed the Eleusinian Mysteries.⁴ Hermetism stated the same thing: “For it would be impiety to make public through the presence of many witnesses a discussion which is replete with God in all his majesty” (**Corpus Hermeticum, Asclepius I**).⁵

However, there are three reasons above all that make the present unbelievable extensive assault of the modern authors, with respect to the unveiling of the traditional secrets, an immense hoax: first, the immutable fact that the initiatory secret belongs to non-manifestation; second, the doctrinal secrets contain a “non-human” element and their transmission has to be orally; third, contrary to the modern perspective with respect to the keeping a secret secret, a secret traditional organization will remain secret to the profane world.

We would like to mention the titles of some of the books published in the recent years: Alexandre de Dánann, **Les secrets de la Tara Blanche**, Archè, Milano, 2003 ; Mark Sedgwick, **Traditionalism and the Secret Intellectual History of the Twentieth Century**, 2004 ; Paul Naudon’s **Les origines de la Franc-Maçonnerie** (Dervy, 1991) was published in USA as **The Secret History of Freemasonry**, Inner Traditions, 2005; Laurence Gardner, **The Shadow of Solomon, The lost secrets of the Freemasons revealed**, 2005; Robert Lomas, **The Secrets of Freemasonry**, Magpie Books, 2006 ; Pat Morgan, **The Secrets of Freemasonry**, Capella, 2006 ; W. Kirk MacNulty, **Freemasonry, Symbols, Secrets, Significance**, Thames and Hudson, 2006 ; Lionel & Patricia Fanthorpe, **Mysteries and Secrets of the Masons**, The Dundurn Group, 2006 ; not to mention lamentable books like **The Da Vinci Code**, where the author joyful swims in an ocean of so called secrets.⁶

Since *Oriens* is an on-line journal, we should conclude our note with the question of the “secret name” that the Internet promoted in a more than exaggerated way. There were in the past authors who used pseudonyms to sign their work (René Guénon did the same

⁴ George E. Mylonas, **Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries**, Princeton Univ. Press, 1974, pp. 224-225.

⁵ **Hermetica**, ed. and transl. by Walter Scott, Shambhala, 1993, p. 289.

⁶ **René Guénon et le Centre du Monde**, p. 103.

The Secret Tradition

thing in his youth) and today, on the Internet, we can observe a ridiculous proliferation of such fictitious and sometimes droll names, many Internet utilizers possessing two, three or more addresses. In the domain related to Guénon and Tradition, the people interested in such a subject are few so we witness same individuals activating under different addresses and names, which creates a distressing confusion and a kind of a circus. But even more annoying is the “hunt” for the “secret name”; there is a continuous research and effort from the part of various individuals trying to discover the “secret name” of other various individuals acting on the Internet; yet the “secret name” is nothing more than an individual token, which characterizes the person’s individuality that is of no interest for any traditional seeker. Beyond the fact that it is preposterous to consider the profane name as a “secret name,” knowing this name, which will facilitate to find out the person’s biography, is no one’s business. We heard also that some people tried to justify their “secret name” kept secret by taking Guénon as an example, and saying how Guénon himself regretted that he did not use a pseudonym and keep his real name “secret,” which is simple not true. What Guénon declared was that because people were so obsessed with his individuality he would maybe just erase this individual name; he never cared to keep it “secret,” even though some malicious individuals tried to associate his name with the name “guenon” of the monkey belonging to the genus *Cercopithecus*.⁷

We end with the saying of a Guénon’s “follower,” who used to say about these types of individuals: “Good for them!” concluding that there is nothing you can do to help them out.

⁷ We mention just as an illustration that similar individuals tried to associate our name with the Sanskrit name of the guna *tamas*, ignoring on purpose that Tamas is an East-European appellative for Thomas (derived from the name of the apostle); no doubt, these individuals are enough punished by their own maliciousness and foolishness, since they have to live with them and we don’t.