

The God Game

by

Mike Hockney

Published by Hyperreality Books

Copyright © Mike Hockney 2012

The right of Mike Hockney to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the author, except in the case of a reviewer, who may quote brief passages embodied in critical articles or in a review.

Quotations

“I will do things no one in the past has dared to do. I will think new thoughts, bring new things into being.” – Leonardo da Vinci

“Occasionally, heaven sends us someone who is not only human but divine, so that through his mind and the excellence of his intellect, we may reach to heaven.” Vasari on Leonardo da Vinci

“He turns not back who is bound to a star.” – Leonardo da Vinci

“There is something addicting about a secret” – J. Edgar Hoover

“A thought, even a possibility, can shatter and transform us.” –Friedrich Nietzsche
Aude sapere! (“Dare to know”): the Kantian Motto of the Enlightenment.

Table of Contents

The God Game

Quotations

The Illuminati

The Rules of the Game

The Myers-Briggs Mathematical Types

Descartes

The Home of the Soul

Kant

Ancient Greece

Something and Nothing

The Arche: the Fundamental Stuff of the Universe

The Emptiness of Matter

Relative versus Absolute Space

The Existence Enigma

“Nothing” versus Non-existence

Pleroma, Hysterema and Horos

The Plenum

The Alternative Big Bang Theory

What Constitutes Existence?

Noumena and Phenomena

Psychological Philosophy

God versus Satan

Phosters and Archons

The Big Picture

Mythos versus Logos

Spinoza and Hegel

Darwin versus Hegel

Perfect Plato

The Language of Life

Teleological versus Mechanistic Questions

Art

Summary

The Illuminati

THIS IS ONE OF A SERIES OF BOOKS outlining the cosmology, philosophy, politics and religion of the ancient and controversial secret society known as the Illuminati, of which the Greek polymath Pythagoras was the first official Grand Master. The society exists to this day and the author is a senior member, working under the pseudonym of “Mike Hockney”.

The Illuminati’s religion is the most highly developed expression of Gnosticism and is called Illumination (alternatively, Illuminism). Dedicated to the pursuit of enlightenment, it has many parallels with the Eastern religions of Hinduism, Buddhism and Taoism. It rejects the Abrahamic religions of faith: Judaism, Christianity and Islam.

The Illuminati formally began as Pythagoras’s mystery school revolving around the secrets of mathematics. Pythagoras elevated mathematics to a religion and asserted that everything was fundamentally mathematical and could only be explained mathematically. To this day, Illumination is grounded entirely in mathematics. It is therefore the world’s only rational religion, and is entirely compatible with science. Indeed, science is but a subset of mathematics and hence of Illumination. Illuminism asserts that mathematics is not science’s tool; on the contrary, science is mathematics’ tool, a way of exploring what we call “ontological” mathematics, the mathematics of existence.

Illuminism is knowledge-based and rejects all “holy” scriptures, prophets, revelations and faith. It is future-oriented, rational, philosophical, scientific, mathematical and dialectical.

Welcome to the religion of light – *Illumination*.

The Rules of the Game

We are not prophets, this is not a “holy” text and we are not going to condemn you to hell and persecute you if you disagree with us. On the other hand, this text and the rest of the books in the series (known as “the God Series”) constitute the most ambitious project in history. In this series, we explain the minutiae of existence in a manner never previously attempted.

We have discovered the “big picture” of existence and the meaning of life. The final answer to the nature of existence is as astounding, unexpected and magnificent as you would expect it to be. When you first encounter the solution, you will be disbelieving, then you will think that it’s obvious that this is how it should be, then you will be filled with wonder. After, disbelief will seize you again. Yet when you have overcome the shock, you will understand that existence is as mathematically beautiful and perfect as it can possibly be, that it is the “best of all possible worlds” and that you yourself can look forward to the greatest experience of all – literally becoming God.

We promise this to you because it’s a mathematical certainty. We will also tell you something that will at first seem preposterous but, when you have fully understood our message, will make perfect sense. It is that you have *already* been God. In fact, you have been God an infinite number of times before, and you will become God an infinite number of times in the future. The same idea is implicit in Hinduism and Jainism.

Your immortal existence is all about the mathematics of divinity, which is based on two numbers, the most mysterious numbers of all – zero and infinity, the “God numbers”. The eternal journey of your soul is a cyclical exploration of these magical numbers, and each cycle always ends in the same way – with your attainment of divinity.

What is the ultimate process of life, the ultimate celebration of life, the process that always ends in the possibility of new life? It is ORGASM. How many orgasms have you ever had? Did you ever reach a climax that made you sated, that was so mind-blowing that you did not desire another? Or are you always in search of the perfect but unattainable orgasm? And what would it mean anyway if you did achieve the perfect climax?

Orgasm is something that no one can get enough of. Everyone wants a high, and they *always* want it, no matter how many times they’ve had it before. That’s what *life* is – the insatiable pursuit of the supreme high, the best high of all.

Existence is perfectly configured to give you the perfect climax not just once but an infinite number of times. Your existential climax is your attainment of divinity. What could be better than the feeling of being God? You are all-knowing, all-seeing, all-powerful; you are *perfect*. Yet perfection is not a state that can be sustained any more than an orgasm can endure forever. It is of the nature of orgasm to cease, of life itself to cease in one form before beginning in another. Even the Gods are not immune to the law of life. Even the Gods die, but they perish of their own volition, knowing that they can plunge headlong once more into the exhilarating rapids of the irrepressible life current, the endless existential flow, the ceaseless ocean of cosmic orgasm. Life can *never* stop. Life can never reach a state of *being* that endures forever. No, life is instead all about *becoming*.

Life is eternal becoming. It can never *be*. Life is movement, change, dynamism. All orgasms end because they must become something else. For there to be highs, there must be lows. For there to be the highest highs, there must be the lowest lows. All of life’s processes are dialectical, concerned with opposites and the resolution of contradictions. They all involve thesis, antithesis and synthesis, over and over again. Each dialectical cycle reaches its omega point – it’s

absolute, perfect condition, its climactic endpoint – and that is a trigger for the dialectic to be reset and for everything to start again in a new dialectical cycle.

We do not expect you to “believe” us. We reject faith and belief and we are interested only in reason and knowledge. What we are presenting in this series of books is the culmination of thousands of years of thinking by the Pythagorean Illuminati.

Our religion – Illumination/Illuminism – is about the optimisation of the self, about turning each individual into God. That can be achieved *solely* through the acquisition of knowledge and the exercise of reason, ultimately all revolving around mathematics. The supreme dialectical barrier to becoming God is in fact faith. You can never realise your divine potential if you are a person of faith. You will always remain the slave of whatever it is in which you have faith. Faith is the abandonment of reason and knowledge in favour of some greatly cherished idea that offers you ultimate solace. It is an emotional crutch for emotional and rational cripples.

Illuminism seeks nothing less than to unify once and for all religion, mathematics, science, psychology, politics, sociology and even the “paranormal” in one super synthesis, a true Grand Unified Theory of Everything. We aim to create the ultimate paradigm shift. Through this series of books, we intend to set humanity on a new and astounding path – going all the way to divinity. In the future, people will refer to the time before and after these books. They mark the dividing line between Old Humanity ruled by superstition, ignorance, faith, and vicious, greedy, selfish power elites and the New Humanity that walks beneath a vast, broad sky of reason, light, and knowledge and has neither masters nor slaves.

We are at the launchpad. Will Mission Control send us to the furthest stars, or will it be a failure to launch – caused by the irrationality and instant gratification of Abrahamism and free-market junk capitalism?

Bringing the light of reason to this world means dispelling the darkness of ignorance. The medieval thinker Roger Bacon wrote in *Open Majus* (Greater Work) that the triumph of *ignorance* had four primary sources:

- 1) Appeals to an unsuited authority.
- 2) The undue influence of custom.
- 3) The opinions of the unlearned crowd.
- 4) Displays of wisdom that simply cover up ignorance.

Bacon, nominally an orthodox Catholic (he was a Franciscan monk based in Oxford in England), was a freethinker, renowned for the stress he placed on science and experimentation. Above all, he celebrated mathematics as the sure foundation of the other sciences.

Bacon, a man of universal learning, was accused by some of being an alchemist (he was rumoured to have invented gunpowder in his laboratory) and black magician. Known as *Doctor Mirabilis* (the doctor of miracles), he was suspected of witchcraft and heresy and ordered to go to Paris where he was placed under surveillance by command of St. Bonaventura, the head of the Franciscan Order. He was forbidden for a time from publishing his writings.

Contemptuous of stupid people, Bacon was later jailed for fourteen years for condemning the general ignorance and prejudice of monks and priests, and died not long after his release. Had he been born in the present day, he certainly wouldn't have been a Christian, and, in truth, he wasn't even a Christian in his own day. He was a secret Illuminatus.

The Illuminati, as advocates of dialectical progress, look to the past for inspiration, but not for higher truths. The knowledge of *now* should always be superior to the knowledge of *then* if humanity has not succumbed to some terrible setback such as the Judaeo-Christian Dark Ages or the rise of Islam.

It's absurd to think that our ancestors knew better than we do, or to think that old and decrepit customs are right. We should never be guided by beliefs simply because they are widely

held and popular. The truth is not democratic. It's not a popularity contest.

In *An Enemy of the People*, Norwegian playwright Henrik Ibsen attacked the notion that the majority is ever on the side of the truth, announcing, on the contrary, that it's the minority that's always in the right. His anti-hero Dr Stockmann declared, "The most dangerous enemy of truth and freedom amongst us is the majority—yes, the damned Liberal majority—that is it!"

Later, he fulminated, "I propose to raise a revolution against the lie that the majority has the monopoly of the truth. What sort of truths are they that the majority usually supports? They are truths that are of such advanced age that they are beginning to break up. And if a truth is as old as that, it is also in a fair way to become a lie, gentlemen. Yes, believe me or not, as you like; but truths are by no means as long-lived as Methuselah—as some folk imagine. A normally constituted truth lives, let us say, as a rule seventeen or eighteen, or at most twenty years—seldom longer. But truths as aged as that are always worn frightfully thin, and nevertheless it is only then that the majority recognises them and recommends them to the community as wholesome moral nourishment. There is no great nutritive value in that sort of fare, I can assure you; and, as a doctor, I ought to know. These 'majority truths' are like last year's cured meat—like rancid, tainted ham; and they are the origin of the moral scurvy that is rampant in our communities."

Dr Stockmann talked of a special few "fighting for truths that are too newly-born into the world of consciousness to have any considerable number of people on their side as yet." In fact, this is always the case with the truth. Each new truth is at first pronounced by a *single* person. That person is then faced with a struggle to persuade others. There was a time when everyone believed the earth was flat. That was "the truth". One man realised the earth was a globe, and eventually managed to convince others. Then everyone believed that the earth was at the centre of the universe, until one man realised it was just a planet orbiting the sun. But for every truth of this type, there are scores of "truths" proclaimed by prophets and such like, and these don't come accompanied by a shred of evidence, yet are often far more solidly believed than the most rigorously tested scientific theories.

Nietzsche said, "There are no facts, only interpretations." His position was that truth is always a matter of perspective, that there are simply no absolute truths. We construct truths that we find useful, or lazily accept truths others have told us and which we find convenient to follow. Nietzsche had an even more extreme formulation: "What, ultimately, are man's truths? Merely his irrefutable errors."

Schopenhauer was equally damning of humanity's strange attitude to truth. He declared, "All truth passes through three stages. First, it is ridiculed. Second, it is violently opposed. Third, it is accepted as being self-evident."

Even "common sense" isn't very sensible. Einstein said, "Common sense is the set of prejudices we have acquired by the age of eighteen."

It seems that truth and humans don't mix well. Without a sensitive instrument for detecting truth, we are left at the prey of crazy fantasies. Many of our most sacrosanct beliefs are certainly false, and not far short of insane. The Abrahamic religions manifestly contain zero truth content. People will always be seduced by nonsense if it seems life enhancing or comforting in some way. The upshot is that without reliable truths we are condemned to be stupid. We are a race of dunces who refuse to wear our pointed caps.

Perhaps the very last human being will dig his own grave and carve an inscription on the headstone he has prepared for himself. It might read, "Here lies the last of humanity, a species that never once came into contact with the truth. It existed for a million years and spent the whole time in a dream. Its only skill was in inventing fantasies about itself. In all the infinite vastness of time and space, it managed to convince itself that it was the most special creation of an

all-powerful, all-knowing Creator that it called God.”

Humanity was born stupid, has stayed stupid, and relies on stupidity to make “sense” of the world. The only certainty is that *not* being stupid would kill most people; they couldn’t endure the world of reason.

Human stupidity is nowhere more obvious than in the Abrahamic religions, which fall foul of everything Bacon warned against. Abrahamists do nothing but appeal to fallacious authorities, whether they are the words of ancient prophets, or “holy books” claiming to be the infallible Word of God. The Torah, the Bible and the Koran are all claimed to be the supreme, eternal and unchallengeable revelation of the same God, even though they all say wildly different and contradictory things.

Abrahamism’s primary task is to get believers to subscribe to the notion that badly written, bizarre and mutually contradictory books that contain no science, philosophy or mathematics are nevertheless the absolute truth. In other words, they have to make you believe that “revelation” trumps reason, and that, sometimes, new revelations (such as Islam) can trump old revelations (such as Judaism and Christianity), but usually they can’t (Muslims believe that nothing can now trump Islam).

Consider the history of Abrahamism. Firstly, God revealed himself to Abraham (the first Jew) and later to Moses (the prophet who defined Judaism via the Torah). The Jews were God’s “Chosen People. Then came the Jewish prophet Yehoshua ben Yosef (aka Jesus Christ) with his New Testament. His followers called him Messiah and even God himself and claimed that they were now the Chosen People and that any Jew who remain wedded to the Torah alone was now damned to hell. To be saved, you had to accept the Torah *and* New Testament. Then along came the Arab prophet Mohammed who said that Jesus Christ was just a prophet and not God, that Abraham was actually the first Muslim rather than the first Jew, that God spoke in Arabic and the Koran was his final word to humanity. Mohammed named himself the “Seal of Prophets”, meaning that he was the last one and that any person claiming in the future to be a prophet was a *false prophet* working for Satan.

Remember that the Jews, Christians and Muslims all claim to worship the same God who communicates infallibly via a sacred text and that anyone who rejects the sacred text will go to hell. The Jews think the Christians and Muslims believe in false sacred texts and are going to hell, the Christians believe that the Jews and Muslims haven’t recognised Jesus Christ as God hence are going to hell and the Muslims think that the Christians and Jews don’t recognise Mohammed and the Koran, hence are going to hell. So, what is the criterion to rely on if revelation trumps reason? Which revelation is right amongst all the different, contradictory revelations that claim to be infallible? You are allowed to use faith alone, and if you place your faith in the wrong “Word of God” then you will burn in hell forever.

Apart from appealing to dubious “authority”, the Abrahamic religions also commit the sin of giving undue influence to customs. The Jews have six hundred and twenty rules and commandments to obey in order to remain Jewish. Muslims have to pray five times a day, including in the night. All three Abrahamic religions do nothing but stuff ancient customs down the believer’s throats. Customs define these religions.

Abrahamism strongly qualifies as expressing the opinions of Bacon’s “unlearned crowd”. Modern-day Muslims are practically retarded. The Koran says that the earth is flat and that there are in fact seven flat earths piled on top of each other, beneath seven semi-domed heavens! The Jews are Creationists and claim that the earth was created out of nothing circa 4004 BCE. Christian Fundamentalists think that the Grand Canyon was created by the Flood and that humans and dinosaurs lived together – because the Bible says nothing about creatures living on earth millions of years before Adam and Eve.

There are absolutely no facts or scientific theories to support these deranged claims (and indeed they contradict all known facts and evidence). They all rely on nothing but revelation, yet they are fanatically accepted by billions of people in preference to the factual findings of science.

It's disturbing that so many human beings should so eagerly embrace manifest nonsense. The reason they do is that Abrahamism makes the crudest assault on people. It promises them heaven for believing and hell for disbelieving. Science, on the other hand, offers nothing but the scientific facts and scientific theories that account for an enormous range of phenomena and which power the modern technological world. It also provides modern medicine that has given life to so many who would otherwise have died, showing that science has the true power over life and death. In every way, science is superior to Abrahamism, yet still the common herd remains faithful to Abrahamism and contemptuous of science.

Abrahamism reveres prophets who claimed to be wise but who never once uttered a single philosophical, scientific or mathematical truth. Why are God's prophets so hostile to philosophy, science and mathematics? Why is their God equally hostile, to the extent that all of his "divine revelations" are scientifically, philosophically and mathematically absurd? No wonder Martin Luther, the founder of Protestantism, described reason as "the Devil's whore" and proclaimed that faith alone was all that mattered. Protestantism is pure irrationalism, an outright assault on reason. Voltaire remarked, "The truths of religion are never so well understood as by those who have lost the power of reasoning."

Reason and Abrahamism do not mix. The European Enlightenment that ushered in the modern world was in every way a rejection of Abrahamism. Sadly, the Enlightenment was a failure. The Enlightenment liberated smart human beings, but to this day the vast majority of people are Endarkened. They cling to the imaginary power of revelation. They remain in thrall to the strange band of men called prophets who claimed to have some uniquely special relationship with God and found legions of people fool enough to believe them. There has never been a prophet who was not severely mentally ill. Indeed, their insanity sanctified their words. Mad and outrageous claims have always been regarded as holy. The Oracle at Delphi was a mad priestess inhaling narcotic fumes and spewing out trippy pronouncements. That is the template for all prophets – crazy people who were proclaimed as vessels of God rather than being put in mental asylums. As Havelock Ellis observed, "The whole religious complexion of the modern world is due to the absence from Jerusalem of a lunatic asylum." Nietzsche declared, "Whatever a theologian regards as true must be false: there you have almost a criterion of truth."

To state it bluntly, mainstream religion is "normalised" madness. It consists of insane claims that are deemed sane simply because large numbers of people hold them. Their popularity and emotional power, not their truth or rationality, is what matters. Humanity has proved that it's capable of believing anything at all. It's hard to imagine any claim that would be more preposterous than those already believed by billions of religious people. Virgins births, people coming back from the dead, God being an Arabic speaker, God ordering a father to murder his son, God ordering Jews not to mix wool and linen (!), God creating humanity and then exterminating all but eight of them in the Great Flood... the list of demented and terrifying religious claims is endless.

Isn't it time reason was given a chance?

So, what *should* the answer to everything look like? According to the Abrahamists, we already have the solution. For them, the whole explanation of existence lies in the Torah or Bible or Koran, depending on preference. For these people, the answer to everything is *God* and it's not for us to ask God how he created the world, why he permitted evil and so forth. In other words, Abrahamists aren't looking for a rational answer to the fundamental questions of existence. Instead, they are looking for an imaginary candidate to have such answers – and what imaginary

candidate could be better than the all powerful, all knowing, all seeing Creator?

Does any Abrahamist think to himself that he will ask God for his design plan, for how he accomplished creating something from nothing, or why he chose to have a universe large beyond our capacity to observe, full of galaxies, stars, planets, moons, comets, asteroids and interstellar dust? Will they ask him about why the speed of light is a constant, why the world of the atom is so weird, why he chose quantum mechanics, how to reconcile general relativity with quantum gravity, the significance of black holes, what a vacuum consists of, the significance of Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle or Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem?

If they are interested in such questions, why aren't they thinking about them now? Since they're not, they plainly don't care what the answers are. They have no intellectual curiosity whatever.

For these people, the meaning of life resides in an all-powerful Creator who must, by definition, know what he's doing. His existence is all that matters to them, not the details of how he carried out Creation. To a thinking person, the mere existence of a divine being with all the answers is not enough. The answers themselves are what counts, and if "God" refuses to furnish them then the thinker is as dissatisfied as he was before. To a thinker, God's existence is irrelevant unless God can and does provide an explanation of existence.

To reiterate, for a thinker, the explanation of existence is what matters, and is actually more important than the existence of God. Is this not the profoundest of all ideas? For non-thinkers, the explanation of existence IS God, and no further explanations are sought.

So, we see that humanity is divided into two groups – the religious non-thinkers who seek meaning solely in the existence of God and the thinkers who will never be content until they comprehend the mind of God.

To wish to understand God's mind is the same as wishing to be God, and that is the radical dividing line between the two types of human being. Believers are submissives who want to be dominated by an all powerful being. Thinkers are dominants who will never rest until they know every last detail of how the world works. A God who remained silent in the face of probing questions would never satisfy a thinker. A believer, on the other hand, would be on his knees or prostrate, eyes cast downwards, begging for God's mercy. A believer would never dare to ask a question, and is not in any case interested in the answers.

All heretics, atheists, agnostics, skeptics and Gnostics have been thinkers and dominants. They dared to ask the deadly questions that the believers were too afraid and credulous to ask.

All believers throughout history have been non-thinking submissives. They believe BECAUSE they are non-thinking submissives. That's what belief is – non-thinking submission to a higher power.

In other words, religion has never been anything other than a tale of dominants and submissives. Dominants are incapable of simple beliefs and submissives are incapable of complex questions. Submissives are stupid and dominants are clever. It's Hegel's master-slave dialectic come to life with the submissives as the slaves and the dominants as the masters.

No thinking person could read the Torah, Bible or Koran without finding them nauseating and an insult to his intelligence. They contain no answers to anything at all. All they contain is the formula for getting submissives to kneel and bow to an invisible power, represented by his powerful earthly representatives – the priest caste. This evil caste are dominants who prey on submissives. They exploit the weakness, superstition and credulity of the believers. The submissives are content to be dominated by the priest caste because being dominated is what they seek above all else.

The Abrahamic "holy" books are all about submission and domination. The founding myth of Abrahamism is that God dominates Abraham to such an extent that Abraham is willing

to murder his own innocent son for no other reason than to show how obedient he is to God's will. To any sane person, it is unimaginable that a would-be child killer such as Abraham could be held in anything other than contempt. Abraham is a coward who would kill his own flesh and blood in his zeal to obey orders. He is no role model for humanity. He's the opposite: the *last* person you would want to emulate is Abraham. Yet a submissive looking at exactly the same facts is irresistibly drawn to Abraham's example. To kill for God – to obey to the extremest degree possible – is his ultimate dream.

Abrahamism is incomprehensible to any thinking person, but of course thinking people aren't its intended audience. Abrahamism is a work of psychological genius because it knows perfectly how to target submissives. It preys on their deepest fears, superstitions and irrational beliefs, and it gives them what they most crave: a supreme dominant, a perfect Torture God, to worship. Submissives can't get enough of Abrahamism, the religion that debases, degrades and humiliates them. All of the physical postures required by Abrahamism are those of submission: on your knees, on your belly, eyes averted downwards, head bowed, hands with palms upward. No Abrahamist is permitted to stand up straight, to look up, to be human. Abrahamism is simply a sublimated sado-masochistic sexual ritual where the masochists revel in being tortured by their Lord and Master.

Abrahamism proved so successful because it pandered to the craving of countless people to be slaves of a higher power that would reward them with paradise for obedience and punish them with eternal suffering for disobedience. Abrahamism is about submission and nothing else. Abraham is praised for showing unconditional obedience to God. Adam and Eve are condemned for disobedience. Moses was prevented from entering the "Holy Land" because of some trivial yet apparently unforgivable act of disobedience. Jesus Christ's elaborate suicide is often spoken of as an act of perfect submission to God. As for Islam, it actually means *Submission*. Mohammed does nothing other than preach submission.

Unthinking submissives are not looking for answers. This book would fill them with horror. Instead of allowing God to explain the world, this book explains God. Only dominant thinkers – authentic truth seekers – will grasp what we are saying. Our work will be meaningless to submissives. It doesn't "press their buttons".

The question of what constitutes the "answer" to life, the universe and everything is a fascinating one. What will satisfy a thinking person? How will they know they've found what they've always been seeking?

We know what submissives want – some proof that "God" exists. God is their perfect answer. There's another group of people who think that some sort of proof of God has been physically coded into the universe – as signs and patterns – and if only they could decipher the "God Code", they would uncover the proof of God's existence. They measure distances between planets in search of some supernatural regularity, and they seek elaborate star patterns, and they measure the time between stellar events and so forth in their pursuit of some tell-tale sign of God's brand on the cosmos, just as SETI (Search for Extra-Terrestrial Intelligence) look for some regular signal that must indicate the presence of an intelligence. A sub-group of these people is convinced that the Giza Plateau is where the answers to the proof of God's existence are to be found. They speak of a "Hall of Records" and "The Book of Knowledge." The pyramid itself is supposed to embody the number π .

Rumour has it that an ancient time capsule is hidden at Giza that has infinitely more significance than the treasures of Tutankhamen. The "Hall of Records" in which the time capsule resides supposedly has secret chambers filled with technological wonders of an Atlantis-like civilization, much older than the Egyptian one, and enormously more advanced. The time capsule will allegedly reveal the true origins of humanity and the meaning of our existence.

It was the American “seer” Edgar Cayce who predicted the discovery of an Atlantean “Hall of Records”, a library containing papyrus scrolls that add up to a Book of Knowledge of all things, located between the Sphinx and the river Nile with a connecting entrance under the right, front paw of the Sphinx. Others say that the Hall is directly beneath the Great Sphinx of Giza.

We received a message from “DB” saying, “It now appears, at least to me, that all the things written about Giza and the Pyramids are true and it’s a record of mankind and the harbinger and holder of all the knowledge of mankind. It is for lack of a better word, the Hall of Records and thus indirectly, my personal Holy Grail. Elizabeth Newton feels that Giza is the control point of a closing of a Time Loop that will culminate in 2012. I am starting to agree with her or that the Giza Plateau seems to be at the very least the control point OF MY REALITY! In a bizarre twist on reality, I am starting to think I BUILT IT!!! I built it you might say? How so? Well it seems to be revealing itself to me way beyond what most individuals have been able to find and thus it is almost as if I am awakening to its secrets ALONE. My understanding of this plateau seems to be increasing and each day, no in fact each hour, no make that each minute brings a new revelation and a new discovery. So, I begin to think that it is indeed a gift from the future but also from the past as we go through our time loops together, or at least I am doing so. I begin to feel that The Giza Plateau, no in fact all the 3rd and 4th Dynasty Pyramids are a legacy from MYSELF, a memento of sorts to try to help me understand I have been this way before. I am now on the verge of totally translating this ancient ‘Book of Knowledge’ and becoming convinced beyond a shadow of a doubt that The Giza Plateau AND The Great Pyramid are this ‘Book of Knowledge’ AND are the fabled and once lost ‘Hall of Records’. Here are my assertions:

- a) There is a God
- b) He left his calling card in The Solar System
- c) Early man knew this
- d) Early man “talked to god”

There is no longer any doubt of an earlier civilization. There is no longer any doubt that Giza represents the Solar System OR that the Solar System represents Giza.

Was I this god who did all of this?

Do I really want the answer to that?

Was The Earth the primal mound? Did it all originate from Giza?

Did all the universe originate from the Giza Plateau?

So maybe some of the early ones were correct. Maybe the Earth IS the centre of it all.”

Well, to what extent do such tales help with the “ultimate answer”? Imagine that the Hall of Records was indeed discovered. What would the papyrus scrolls tell us (assuming they were written in a decipherable language)? Wouldn’t they add just another layer of myths and legends? In what way would they provide us with the knowledge of the secrets of existence itself?

These “archaeological seekers” have become so gripped by their pursuit of the Hall of Records and Book of Knowledge that they have failed to ask themselves exactly what they are expecting from their discoveries. They think that the discoveries themselves will somehow be sufficient. To make the discovery is somehow to obtain the answer. But let’s say that the Hall of Records contained a set of extremely abstract mathematical equations and declared that these constituted the Grand Unified Theory of Everything. Would any of the searchers – not a mathematician amongst them – be satisfied? If they couldn’t understand the equations then they would be as far as ever from the final answer. If an archaeologist discovered some ancient version of M-theory in the Hall of Records, would that be *the* answer? Why should the fact that

something was discovered at the Giza Plateau make it any more important than the work of some Russian mathematical genius working on his own in a flat in Moscow in the present day?

Even if DB was convinced of God's existence, even if it was somehow encoded in the stars or the pyramids, DB would still have to ask himself, "And now what? What does God expect of me? What do I have to do? How am I supposed to live my life? Have I really got all the answers I need?" In a sense, proof of God's existence changes nothing, especially if it's not linked to knowledge of what God seeks from humanity. And the mere fact of his existence is not of course the "answer" anyway. Only the cosmic design plan itself is the answer – the Platonic blueprint used by the Demiurge. For Plato, the "Creator" was secondary to absolute knowledge itself – the eternal, perfect Forms. Proving the existence of the Platonic Demiurge wouldn't help you one iota if you were wholly ignorant of the Platonic Forms.

What Plato did was truly fascinating. He separated absolute knowledge from "God" and made it freestanding. God, like any other being, had to understand the Forms, and he had no power to change the Forms. God was as subject to the laws of absolute knowledge as anyone else. To know TRUTH is to know the Forms, NOT to know "God". This is the position of all thinkers. For believers, on the other hand, the truth is to know God, and the Forms are neither here nor there. The Jewish philosopher Philo was the person who made the fateful choice of moving the Forms into the Mind of God, and thus fatally confused the person with the Forms. The Platonic distinction should have been preserved at all costs. Each of us is a seeker of the Forms, not a seeker of "God". The Forms are the final answer – absolute knowledge – not God. And the Forms are, finally, pure mathematics.

We have always asserted that the Abrahamists worship the Devil. How does anyone know that "God" is what he is claimed to be? The God of Abraham certainly never acted like a moral being, so how can he be God? Even if "God" behaved in a Godlike way for a time (and what exactly is a Godlike way anyway?), how would you know that his behaviour wouldn't change in the future? As soon as you place the Forms within a personality, you have made absolute knowledge and standards subject to all of the foibles of living beings, hence no longer absolute and no longer infallible.

As we have said, the absolute, objective truth never resides in a person but in a system – a Platonic system of immutable, perfect, unarguable, absolute, eternal truths. That's why Plato was extremely clear about placing the Truth with a capital T in a domain of eternal perfection rather than in a person of allegedly eternal perfection (God). He simply couldn't imagine a perfect, eternal Creator. The logical difficulties are insurmountable. If God is perfect then his Creation must be perfect. It really is that simple. In Plato's system, there is a perfect domain, but this world is a flawed copy of it, and that's why it's imperfect. The perfect world is immaterial while this world is material and it's material itself that causes imperfection and degradation. Plato's system is logical. Any system relying on a Creator is not. When Philo took the disastrous decision to put Plato's perfect Forms in the Mind of God, he paved the way for the Christian synthesis of Platonism (paganism) and Judaism, which went on capture the imagination of the world. (Christianity can also be thought of as St Paul's hybrid of Mithraism and Jewish Messianism.)

It cannot be stressed enough that eternal perfection does not reside in people but in existential laws – those of mathematics. A person can evolve towards perfection, but that means that they are not presently perfect hence are not *eternally* perfect. Only the laws of mathematics are eternally perfect. Nothing can ever change them. No person can change them. They can be neither created nor destroyed, nor transformed. They are immortal and imperishable. They are flawless and will *always* be flawless. The laws of mathematics never change under any circumstances. Insofar as anything called "being" (unchangingness) exists, it's the laws of

mathematics. Where Heraclitus said, “There is nothing permanent except change”, the modern Illuminati would say, “The laws of mathematics are permanent (pure being), and govern the endless process of change (becoming). There is nothing permanent except the laws of mathematics, and the laws of mathematics give rise to permanent change.”

Why should the ultimate answer of existence be anything that any ordinary human being can grasp? Why shouldn't it be extremely complex mathematics, philosophy or science that is far beyond the ability of all but a few geniuses to comprehend? If science's M-theory were indeed proclaimed as the final answer, how many people would be able to understand it, given that it's the most complex theory in human history, reconciling two ultra complex theories (general relativity and quantum mechanics) that are already far beyond non-scientists' abilities.

Why should the ultimate answer be “democratic”? Why should it be accessible to all? Why should it be simple and straightforward? Isn't it, of necessity, the most complex thing of all, even more complex than God himself since it actually explains God?

Well, you can judge for yourself because we are going to reveal in this series of books the answers to life, the universe and everything. Douglas Adams' famous answer of “42” isn't, as it turns out, so ridiculous. It's one part of the answer because the answer is all about numbers and mathematics.

Our claims to knowing ultimate truth may sound ridiculously far-fetched, even comical. Have not endless charlatans peddled their wares over the centuries and lured the unwary and gullible into their malevolent webs of deceit and exploitation? What makes us different from them? Why should you take us seriously? Well, as we stated at the outset, we are not prophets proclaiming these books to be the sacred word of God. We don't ask you to believe a single thing we say. In fact, we insist that you don't since we have contempt for the world of faith and belief. We don't threaten you with hellfire if you disagree with us, though we do offer paradise if you follow our long, intellectual road. Above all, what makes us different is that we have understood the true ontological basis of reality – i.e. the truth of existence – and it does not involve faith, mysticism, mumbo jumbo, obscurantism, mystery, magic or woo woo.

The universe has in some sense played the ultimate joke on the human race – and is that not somehow supremely appropriate? – because it has hidden the secrets of existence in the most terrifying, difficult, intimidating, off-putting, emotionally unappealing and indeed place imaginable, the place where almost all of humanity fears to tread or lacks the wherewithal to tread.

If you wanted to hide the Holy Grail, where would you put it so that it was right in front of everyone's faces – hidden in plain sight – but no one could detect it other than those with the “eyes to see”?

The answer was given over 2,500 years by one of the greatest figures in human history – the ancient Greek philosopher and mathematician, Pythagoras. He was the first person to use the term “philosopher” and the first true deductive and systematic mathematician. Showman, mystic, magician, wonder worker and formal founder of a secret society of adepts that has come to be known as the Illuminati – “the enlightened ones” – Pythagoras made perhaps the most enigmatic and mysterious declaration there has ever been: the universe is made of numbers!

The modern Illuminati make an almost identical statement: the universe is *mathematical*. Existence is mathematical; reality is mathematical; knowledge is mathematical; information is mathematical, the mind is mathematical; consciousness is mathematical; life is mathematical; God is mathematical, the soul is mathematical; the afterlife is mathematical; religion is mathematical; psychology is mathematical; science is mathematical; the paranormal is mathematical. Even art, emotion and irrationality are mathematical.

The universe is intelligible, organised and unified because there is not any part of it that is

not completely and utterly mathematical. All phenomena are just manifestations of mathematics. There is nothing other than mathematics. You, the reader, are nothing but mathematics, as is this book, the words, the ideas, the concepts. Wherever you look, wherever you go, whatever you do, you are engaged in mathematics – and yet that’s the LAST thing you imagine to be true.

So, our task is the most radically ambitious ever undertaken – to reveal to you the mathematical nature of everything without boring you to tears with lots of incomprehensible mathematical formulae (though, one day, no mathematical formula will ever bore you).

Like the ancient Alexandrian mathematician Euclid whose book of geometrical axioms ruled supreme for millennia, we will provide the mathematical axioms that underlie everything. We will be using philosophy as much as mathematics since philosophy is the best way of interpreting mathematical concepts in relatively precise yet non-mathematical language. We will also employ some scientific concepts, although we will often be engaged in showing that the foundations of science do not rest on solid ground – because they are *insufficiently* mathematical and philosophical.

Science, despite all of its success, is the junior partner of mathematics and philosophy. Mathematics is not known as the queen of the sciences for nothing, and philosophy has always been far more aligned to answering the big questions of existence than science. Science is still mute when it comes to addressing the whys of existence. It does “how” quite well, but that’s never enough.

Before we begin in earnest, we must draw a few mathematical distinctions so that there is no ambiguity about what we are setting out to prove.

Mathematics is often regarded as an abstraction, a wonderful tool of the mind that just happens to prove remarkably useful in science. Most scientists are “instrumentalists” meaning that they use mathematics as a tool to get the right answers and don’t spend too much time pondering why mathematics should correspond so astoundingly accurately with scientific reality. Some philosophers have proposed that we simply “construct” a reality based on science and mathematics that has no necessary connection with “real reality”. This is reminiscent of Kant’s philosophy of a mind-created phenomenal reality that is somehow based on an underlying and completely unknowable noumenal reality. In this view of mathematics as a construct, science and mathematics are partners in a kind of gigantic fraud and illusion and actively conceal the true nature of things. We use them to invent “reality”.

Our position is that there is no fraud. Mathematics so accurately describes our world because the world IS mathematical and can’t be otherwise. Try to imagine the alternative: a “true reality” that has absolutely no connection with mathematics. How could an “invented” mathematical description of reality possibly coincide with such a non-mathematical reality? That would imply some correspondence between the two that was even more baffling than Cartesian mind-matter dualism. Two radically different substances such as mind and matter cannot interact unless there is a hidden unity between them. How can mathematics and non-mathematics share any possible commonality? How could they possibly map to each other and correspond to each other? Moreover, if mathematics has nothing to do with reality and is not embedded in reality, how did the mind manage to construct something as staggeringly complex as mathematics? What are the mental origins of mathematics? Mathematics would become as much a mystery as existence itself. However, if we are all inherently mathematical objects in a mathematical universe, there is no mystery whatever.

Distinguished mathematical physicist Roger Penrose placed so much significance on mathematics that he proposed that there are three kinds of reality: physical, mental and mathematical, all connected in an unknown and deeply puzzling way. Such a proposition is even worse than Cartesian dualism. Now we have three apparently separate “substances” with which to

deal and to make them communicate with each other and work in perfect harmony. What we will show is that there is only *one* reality – that of mathematics – and mind and matter are its two expressions.

Consider again the concept of a non-mathematical universe. How would it be organised and ordered in the absence of mathematics? What non-mathematical rules would it obey? Is it possible to have any non-mathematical set of rules complex enough to organise a universe? Indeed, are any rules possible at all in the absence of mathematics? How could stars and atoms, quantum mechanics and relativity theory make any sense non-mathematically?

Order and organisation are inherently mathematical. Logic is simply a branch of mathematics (although the mathematical philosophers Russell and Whitehead bravely tried but failed to prove that pure mathematics is only a branch of logic). It is impossible to order or organise anything without mathematics and logic. Language and grammar only make sense because of logical syntax and are themselves just expressions of mathematics.

Let's just emphasize this point. Without mathematics, there can be no cosmos, no ordered universe obeying regular patterns and which is organised in particular ways as in planets, stars and galaxies, atoms and molecules. What is the periodic table upon which chemistry is based if not a set of mathematical relations? It tells us the number of protons, neutrons and electrons an atom of each element has. It tells how the electrons are ordered around the nucleus of each element. It tells us how chemical reactivity is determined by how stable the outer electron orbits are. All of this is underpinned by quantum mechanics, an enormously mathematical theory. If you removed mathematics from reality, you would not only remove our ability to understand the universe, you would actually abolish reality since it is impossible for a non-mathematical universe to exist.

There was one extremely simple way for Kant to reconcile the “knowable” phenomenal universe and the “unknowable” noumenal universe and that was to make them both mathematical. Then the whole universe could be known mathematically. In this context, we shall introduce the mathematical concept of the TRANSFORM.

A transform converts a function from one mathematical domain (such as space or time) to another (such as frequency) with no loss of information (to be more precise, there is always a loss but it is so small as to be negligible and can be dismissed in situations we ordinarily encounter). Transforms form the basis of signal processing and underpin all modern technologies based on images and sounds.

Wikipedia says, “Signal processing is an area of systems engineering, electrical engineering and applied mathematics that deals with operations on or analysis of signals, in either discrete or continuous time. Signals of interest can include sound, images, time-varying measurement values and sensor data, for example biological data such as electrocardiograms, control system signals, telecommunication transmission signals, and many others. Signals are analogue or digital electrical representations of time-varying or spatial-varying physical quantities.”

Wikipedia lists the four main applications as:

- 1) Audio signal processing – for electrical signals representing sound, such as speech or music.
- 2) Speech signal processing – for processing and interpreting spoken words.
- 3) Image processing – in digital cameras, computers, and various imaging systems.

Image processing is any form of signal processing for which the input is an image, such as a photograph or video frame; the output of image processing may be either an image or, a set of characteristics or parameters related to the image. Most image-processing techniques involve treating the image as a two-dimensional signal and applying standard signal-processing

techniques to it. Image processing usually refers to digital image processing, but optical and analogue image processing also are possible.

4) Video processing – for interpreting moving pictures. Video processing is a particular case of signal processing, which often employs video filters and where the input and output signals are video files or video streams. Video processing techniques are used in television sets, VCRs, DVDs, video codecs, video players, video scalers and other devices.

“In Digital Signal Processing, engineers usually study digital signals in one of the following domains: time domain (one-dimensional signals), spatial domain (multidimensional signals), frequency domain, autocorrelation domain, and wavelet domains. They choose the domain in which to process a signal by making an informed guess (or by trying different possibilities) as to which domain best represents the essential characteristics of the signal. A sequence of samples from a measuring device produces a time or spatial domain representation, whereas a discrete Fourier transform produces the frequency domain information, that is the frequency spectrum. ... Signals are converted from time or space domain to the frequency domain usually through the Fourier transform. The Fourier transform converts the signal information to a magnitude and phase component of each frequency. Often the Fourier transform is converted to the power spectrum, which is the magnitude of each frequency component squared. The most common purpose for analysis of signals in the frequency domain is analysis of signal properties. The engineer can study the spectrum to determine which frequencies are present in the input signal and which are missing. In addition to frequency information, phase information is often needed. This can be obtained from the Fourier transform. With some applications, how the phase varies with frequency can be a significant consideration.” – Wikipedia

The world is presented to us mostly as visual and auditory phenomena. This is the province of signal processing based, above all, on the Fourier Transform. Visual and auditory signals that we experience in space and time can be represented in an entirely different domain called the frequency domain. The frequency domain, a domain that exists outside space and time, is none other than the domain of mind. ALL signals, all sensory information, all information gathered via smell, taste or touch as well as sight and hearing is in fact convertible into a frequency domain representation i.e. the whole sensory domain that links us to the physical world of science is in fact just a transform of the frequency domain of mind.

The mathematical transform – in particular the Fourier Transform – is what links mind and matter. The material world of time and space is one side of the transform and the mental world of frequencies outside space and time is the other side of the transform, and each domain can be translated into the other. That is the solution to the brain-mind conundrum. The brain is, in a manner of speaking, just the mind represented as a material object in space and time gathering space-time information. The mind is, correspondingly, just the brain transformed into the frequency domain. Our subjective experience of mind is located in the timeless and spaceless frequency domain, which is why we don't experience our thoughts in space and time and we have no sense of our mind ageing even if we see our bodies ageing. A fifty-year-old will often say that in terms of his mind he still feels like a twenty-year-old. The mind does not “age” directly but only via the physical deterioration of the brain to which it is harnessed, and until the brain has reached a very unhealthy state, the mind effectively remains the same one you had when you first became an adult, no matter how long ago that was. A healthy 100-year-old might well think that his current mind is identical to his mind of eight decades earlier, though his physical body might be almost unrecognisable to the one he had all those years ago. Is it not truly extraordinary how,

year after year, our minds stay the same while our bodies do not.

The key point about a transform is that the respective domains in which the information is held are both equally real. Neither is privileged over the other. One isn't "real" and the other a construct. Both are as real as each other. Two apparently different domains are reflecting a single reality in two radically different but completely convertible ways. Does that not sound suggestive of a baffling dualism with which we are all familiar: mind and matter? Are mind and matter simply the two sides of a mathematical transform, and fully interconvertible? Matter is a representation in space and time: mind is the equivalent representation outside space and time. The Fourier transform provides a basic explanation of the human condition and in particular the otherwise baffling mind-body interaction.

At a stroke, mind-matter dualism is resolved. And can we not apply exactly the same principle to Kant's famous division of reality into phenomenon and noumenon? Far from being unknowable, the noumenal universe is simply the other side of a mathematical transform. All of the information encoded in the phenomenal universe is fully available in the noumenal universe and vice versa, just as in the world of signal processing all of the information in the time domain is equally available in the frequency domain.

Before the advent of Fourier mathematics, the time and frequency domains would have seemed like two separate domains with nothing in common. In fact, they are the same domain presented in two different but equivalent ways. Kant, had he been aware of transforms, might well have concluded that the noumenal universe is not unknowable in principle but is merely provisionally unknowable until we have identified the relevant transform that link phenomenon and noumenon. Thanks to the transform, we can obtain total information about another apparently mysterious and unknowable domain from the information readily accessible to us in a domain with which we are entirely familiar and comfortable. The material world with which scientists are so comfortable is actually a transform of an independent mental domain (the existence of which scientists completely deny), and vice versa.

The Myers-Briggs Mathematical Types

What type of people can hope to understand mathematics? We contend that as a generality only four of the sixteen Myers-Briggs personality types can be seriously mathematically literate.

First of all, to be mathematically skilled you have to be an introvert. Our definition of introvert is a simple one. An introvert is someone who enjoys his own company and does not go out of his way to seek the company of others. An extravert, on the other hand, enjoys the company of others and goes out of his way to avoid being on his own. To be a mathematician, you must have tremendous concentration, which implies being on your own without distractions. An extravert, continually distracted by the company he cultivates, never has the time and opportunity to be a deep thinker. Profound thinking is almost exclusively reserved for people capable of being solitary for long periods.

Secondly, mathematicians are usually highly intuitive. They can tune in, so to speak, to the mathematical fabric of the universe. Numbers, shapes and patterns present themselves as gifts to intuitives.

Thirdly, mathematicians are highly likely to be thinkers. While entertainment is the terrain that appeals to feeling and sensing types, mathematics, science and philosophy appeal to thinkers. Thinkers like cold abstractions, vast patterns, ordered lists, organised building blocks, while entertainment types wallow in the sensations and feelings that words, images and action summon in their imagination.

The four psychological types that predominantly fill the ranks of mathematicians are: INTJ, INTP, INFP and ISTP.

ISTPs and INFPs are the second rank of mathematicians. In the ISTP case, these mathematicians are highly observant about the world they detect with their eyes and ears (they often love music), but they have a severe deficiency through their lack of intuition. INFPs are highly intuitive and can even feel mathematics to some extent, but they are hindered by their deficiency in terms of high-powered thinking.

INTJs and INTPs are the first rank of mathematicians. INTJs are incredibly intuitive and have enormous thinking power to accompany those intuitions. Similarly, INTPs have vast thinking capacity supported by great intuition. The difference between the INTJs and INTPs is that the former reach judgments much more quickly. They grasp the significance of an intuition almost instantly. Almost effortlessly, they see vast patterns forming in their minds, linking things that would seem to have no connection at all as far as other Myers-Briggs types are concerned. However, their certainty that they are right means that they are not overly concerned with proving their assertions, and proof is of course essential to the mathematical project. INTPs are the “details” people, the thinkers willing to dot the i’s and cross the t’s. They are mathematicians in the truest sense of the word, but they are not as quick to see and understand patterns as the INTJs. The ideal mathematician would be someone who was a perfect hybrid of INTJ and INTP.

In this series of books, we are not committed to providing laborious and intimidating mathematical proofs. Instead, we want to use just enough mathematics to provide solid conceptual foundations. In other words, this series is written from the INTJ perspective and we invite any INTPs who may be reading this to fill in all of the details we will of necessity omit. This book is about broad-stroke mathematical concepts, not mathematical proofs. If we adopted the INTP approach, this book would be the most daunting ever written and incomprehensible to anyone other than mathematicians. Our aim is to give an intelligent person, without a

mathematical background, enough information to glimpse and grasp the mathematical basis of reality, and to appreciate its astonishing power, beauty and simplicity.

Although the mathematical foundations of existence are indeed simple, the concepts that flow from them are mind-bogglingly difficult and baffling. The contents of this series will provide the greatest intellectual challenge of your life.

Gottfried Leibniz, a Grand Master of the Illuminati and perhaps the greatest thinker of all time, declared that the best world is the one which is “simplest in hypotheses and richest in phenomena”. This is not just the formula for the best world but for the ONLY world. The world pursues the path of least resistance. It takes the shortest path it can between two points. It never expends energy gratuitously. From the world’s point of view, everything is as simple as it could possibly be. That might not seem the case from our perspective as human beings, but that’s the way it is.

By the end of this series, you will hopefully have a full understanding of the simple “hypotheses” from which the world is built and you will marvel at the astonishing complexity and richness that flows from them. Yet the apparent complexity is a product not of Nature but of the false “common sense” view of the world that humanity has constructed based on numerous fallacies. Even science, humanity’s most successful endeavour, is packed with errors caused by paying too much attention to our unreliable senses and not enough to our potentially infallible reason. For example, we see colours all around us yet a logical deconstruction of the concept of colour shows that the world does not objectively contain any colour at all. As neuroscientist Beau Lotto said, “Colour doesn’t exist. It is a construct of your brain. There is nothing literal about colour in the world.” If all human beings had the genes for total colour blindness, it would never even have occurred to anyone that the sky was blue or that there was any such phenomenon as colour.

What does it mean to assert that our genes are the “cause” of colour perception? The genes belong to us and not to the objects that allegedly exhibit the colour. Is Kant therefore right that our minds are creating their own reality independent of the true world? But no one can question the rational mathematical statement that $1 + 1 = 2$. That is an eternal, incontestable, immutable truth. Reason, not our senses, reveals the absolute truths of existence. Our senses continually deceive us. They were not designed as organs of truth but as means for allowing us to adapt successfully to life on earth.

We see only a tiny portion of the electromagnetic spectrum – “visible light”. The rest of the spectrum is invisible to us. Until Scotsman James Clerk Maxwell’s revolutionary theory of electromagnetism arrived in the second half of the 19th century, we had no idea what light really was and knew nothing about any electromagnetic spectrum. Our senses failed to detect any such spectrum because it’s not what they were designed for. They evolved for reasons of survival, not reasons of truth or completeness. So why do scientists so slavishly revere the evidence of our senses and have such contempt for the exercise of the highest and purest reason?

Reason alone can reveal the absolute truth of existence, and what subject is the essence of reason? – *Mathematics*.

Although mathematics is conventionally regarded as an abstract tool, we shall introduce a second type of mathematics that we have labelled “ontological mathematics”. This means that it does not treat mathematical entities as mere paper abstractions and symbols but as things with real existence. Ontological mathematics might also be called the mathematics of energy since that’s what it’s fundamentally about. Numbers written on paper have no energy content. Numbers written in spacetime most certainly do. Manipulation of numbers on paper has no energy implications, but it does in spacetime. Things that can be done effortlessly on paper may not be possible ontologically because of these energy considerations: this is the fundamental difference

between abstract and ontological mathematics.

Think of all the sub-atomic particles listed by scientists. Do any of these particles have any properties that cannot be characterised mathematically? There isn't a single thing about them that isn't defined by numbers, shapes, quantities, dimensions and mathematical formulae i.e. all the stuff of mathematics. So in what way are these objects of science rather than objects of mathematics? It's only because we (humanity) have chosen to think of mathematics as fundamentally unreal and abstract that we perversely regard objects that are in every way defined mathematically, and which have no non-mathematical features, as objects of science rather than of mathematics.

Quantum mechanics, relativity theory and M-theory (the theory that is trying to harmonise quantum mechanics and relativity) are all astoundingly mathematical. Are these scientific theories or ontological mathematical theories? If we rebrand science as ontological mathematics then it becomes much clearer why abstract mathematics reflects science so well: "science" is just mathematics as reality rather than as abstraction.

There's a gulf between conventional science and ontological mathematics in terms of three critical numbers: zero, infinity and the imaginary number, i . Conventional science, an expression of extreme philosophical materialism, asserts that zero, infinity and the imaginary number have no ontological reality within any region of space and time. Conventional science involves a hypothesis that only real numbers are ontological or have any bearing on reality. There is not a single rational reason why this should be the case: it is pure empiricist materialist dogmatism. Science refuses to address the issue of why it accepts only real numbers greater than zero and less than infinity. It gives no rational reason for rejecting zero, infinity, negative numbers and imaginary numbers beyond the simplistic one that they are not empirically detectable. Science thus enshrines empiricist materialism in how it regards mathematics. This is not a scientific but a philosophical stance, and indeed a faith-based position since the ontology of mathematics is not something that can be determined via fallible human senses.

Abstract mathematics – which has no ideological hostility to zero, infinity and the imaginary number (or negative numbers for that matter) – is considered irrelevant to science in respect of these key numbers. Any scientist will tell you that nothing infinite can exist within any localised region of reality because it would literally destroy the fabric of existence in that region, and no such catastrophic tears are observed except, arguably, in the specific cases of the mysterious singularities associated with black holes and the Big Bang. Scientists maintain that there is something wrong with the existing scientific theories regarding singularities and their dreaded infinities and that these problems will be resolved by some new theory such as M-theory.

Scientists will also tell you that they associate zero with non-existence i.e. it is devoid of ontological significance. Descartes defined *res cogitans* (thinking substance) as having no extension i.e. it had no presence in the extended world of matter. Scientists, as strict materialists, have dismissed the Cartesian concept of independent thinking substance (mind). Mind, for scientists, is a mysterious aspect of matter. It cannot exist separately from matter, hence is some kind of material phenomenon or epiphenomenon. According to science, the Cartesian mind, the domain of zero, is pure nonsense. It simply isn't there. Of all the catastrophic errors of science, this is the greatest because it turns out that zero is the quintessence of existence and completely defines it.

As for the imaginary number, i , this appears in a vast number of scientific equations, yet scientists regard it as purely instrumental i.e. it helps to produce the right answers but has no ontological reality. Mathematician Marcus du Sautoy declared, "Calculating with imaginary numbers is the mathematical equivalent of believing in fairies." It seems extraordinary that extremely highly qualified individuals should accept "fairies" in the midst of some of the most

successful theories and equations of all time and not conclude that either these theories and equations are the purest moonshine, or else imaginary numbers are anything but imaginary. It is poverty of both reason and imagination that makes mainstream scientists and mathematicians so blind to the ontological reality of imaginary numbers. There are no “fairies” in mathematics. Neither zero, infinity nor imaginary numbers are fairies. On the contrary, they are essential to existence. They are the most solid, substantial entities of them all, every bit as solid and ontological as real numbers.

So, Illuminism defines two types of mathematics: abstract (conducted purely in the mind or on paper) and ontological (that unfolds as reality itself) – the two are of course extremely closely related, with energy being what separates them. Ontological mathematics can be further divided into ontological mathematical materialism (science) and ontological mathematical idealism (the mathematics of zero and infinity).

The imaginary number belongs to mathematical materialism (though scientists haven’t grasped this yet). What this means is that the imaginary number has real existence in the physical world – which is why it appears in so many key equations of science. It is not an instrument for getting the right answer: it is part of the fabric of reality. In fact, it is the basis of time.

The two branches of ontological mathematics constitute a complete account of reality – a grand unified theory if you will. What the two branches achieve is the resolution of Cartesian dualism.

Descartes divided reality into two separate domains of mind and matter but could not give any plausible explanation of how the two domains interact. Despite being a brilliant mathematician and acknowledging that mathematical knowledge is the primary source of truth, Descartes failed to make the intuitive leap that would have made him a god amongst men. He didn’t grasp that mind belongs to the mathematical domain of zero and infinity while matter belongs to the mathematical domain of everything that exists between those two numbers, and that together they embrace everything that can possibly exist from zero to infinity in all directions. There is therefore no dualism at all between mind and matter: they are part of a seamless mathematical continuum and they communicate and interact effortlessly via their common language of mathematics. It’s the unique properties and qualities of zero and infinity that separate them from the rest of mathematics and make mind seem radically different from matter. In fact, the two domains are just different manifestations of ontological mathematics. There is no dualism, no mystery, no magic, no baffling enigma of how mind and matter interact. They are not two different substances but the same substance – mathematical substance.

Where science regards mathematics as an invaluable tool for revealing the secrets of the scientific world, Illuminism regards science as an invaluable tool for helping to reveal the secrets of the mathematical world. Mathematics is not only the answer to Cartesian dualism but also to the Kantian dualism of noumenon and phenomenon. In fact, these two dualisms are ultimately the same.

The noumenal realm was originally defined by Plato as the world of ideas apprehended by the philosophical, rational mind while the phenomenal realm was the world of sensory reality in which the unphilosophical and animalistic were permanently trapped i.e. their primitive minds could never take them to the noumenal domain. The tendency of modern philosophy is to support science in denying the possibility of knowledge gained independently of the senses. Kant famously asserted that although the noumenal world exists, it is entirely unknowable; we can only ever grasp phenomenal reality. Science agreed that we can know only the material world and simply denied that there was any noumenal world at all, just as it had previously denied that there was any Cartesian domain of mind and any religious domain of soul. Science, like Doubting Thomas, says no to anything it can’t empirically detect.

Illuminism, on the other hand, asserts that the noumenal domain not only exists, it is primary, the ground of existence. Moreover, phenomenal and noumenal reality are both fully knowable via mathematics – because all phenomena and noumena are mathematical entities.

Science, hitherto, has been the tool for probing the empirical, material, phenomenal world while metaphysics (literally “what comes after physics”) is the term traditionally applied to the study of the noumenal universe. Religion also makes comments about the noumenal universe but in a faith-based, irrational, idiotic way where the statements of prophets and holy texts are regarded as some sort of absolute “truth” revealed by “God”. We shall ignore the claims of mainstream religion since they are more or less absurd. The Western Abrahamic religions of faith quite literally have zero truth content, and the Eastern religions are far too mystical and imprecise. The “God” of Abrahamism is as far from truth, reason, logic, enlightenment and reality as you could get. He is the false God, the God of the stupid and irrational and all those who have contempt for the truth. “The truth shall set you free” is the most ironic statement conceivable in the mouth of an Abrahamist.

Science has proved spectacularly successful while metaphysics has been speculative and resulted in no definitive view or consensus, hence science has become the basis of modern rational thinking and has relentlessly promoted empiricism, materialism and atheism.

Illuminism asserts that the only way to save metaphysics is via mathematics since a) mathematics IS reality and b) mathematics is the only subject about which anything precise can be said. Science’s power derives from the fact that it uses mathematics and metaphysics doesn’t. Metaphysics should be rebranded as the “philosophy of ontological mathematics”, along the same lines as the philosophy of science.

One of the greatest tragedies of science is that most scientists are not only ignorant of philosophy but also actively hostile towards it. Such scientists dismiss the philosophy of science which seeks to philosophically clarify what the findings of science actually mean. One of the greatest philosophers of science was Thomas Kuhn and his book *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* is a full-scale assault on the pretensions and delusions of scientists. It was Kuhn who introduced the famous concept of the “paradigm shift”. Even today, the vast majority of scientists have never read Kuhn, hence don’t realise how he fatally undermined much of the ideology and dogmatism of science.

Kuhn believed that scientists had a great deal to learn from the study of the history of science and Illuminism agrees entirely with this. In fact, the same is true of every subject. Unless you understand something’s history, you don’t have any deep understanding of it at all. You don’t know how it came to be where it is and what debates, controversies, dilemmas, difficulties and dialectics fuelled the journey. Scientists, sadly, are as ignorant of the history of science as they are of the philosophy of science – hence are much less effective at science itself. The teaching of science should always begin with the history and philosophy of the subject before people start learning science itself. The same is true of mathematics.

Although we are asserting that mathematics is the truth of reality, this book (and series) is not primarily a mathematics textbook. Rather, we will be examining the philosophy of particular mathematical concepts and showing how they define such apparently scientific phenomena as space and time.

Space and time go right to the heart of ontological mathematics and not a thing can be truly understood about the material world if a person is ignorant of the mathematical origins of space and time. It’s a fact that no one outside the Illuminati has ever understood space and time and, in this series, we will reveal the truth to everyone.

The primary tools for understanding ontological mathematics are abstract mathematics, science and philosophy. Ontological mathematics should be regarded as the grand synthesis of

mathematics, science and philosophy, turning them into one unified subject rather than three separate subjects. In doing so, it addresses all of the questions of religion. It brings religion into the domain of facts, evidence, reason, logic and, above all, mathematics. All faith-based elements of religion are exposed as ignorant, irrational, superstitious, crazy nonsense that feeds the madness of stupid fanatics, with whom our world is plagued – particularly in the case of Orthodox Jews, Muslims (more or less all of them) and Christian Fundamentalists.

Descartes

“The visible world is merely an illusion that hides the real mathematical reality of things. Mathematics exists separately from human beings and is prior to the creation of the universe itself.” – Descartes

This is the classic Platonist view of mathematics that it pre-exists everything else i.e. is the cause of everything else. It implies, for those of a Creationist inclination, that God is a mathematician and uses mathematics to create something from nothing and order it into the cosmos, although mathematics is of course entirely absent from Abrahamic texts, notwithstanding the laughable claims of Kabbalists that the Torah is full of mathematics (what they mean is that numerology can be applied to the words of the text).

“I shall bring to light the true riches of our souls, opening up to each of us the means whereby we can find within ourselves all the knowledge we may need for the conduct of life and the means of using it in order to acquire all the knowledge that the human mind is capable of possessing.” -- Descartes

Descartes was the first modern philosopher and declared of himself, “I am a spectator rather than an actor in the comedies of life.”

In terms of revealing the secrets of the universe, his greatest contribution was to divide the universe into mind and matter, distinguished in terms of what he called “extension” (length, breadth and height). While the material world was entirely concerned with extension, the mental world was unextended, hence “outside” the material world. Although this definition worked wonderfully in terms of clarifying the difference between mind and matter – and remains the ultimate definition – it created an enormous problem: how could they interact since they were so different and did not occupy the same space?

This conundrum created two radically different philosophical schools: materialism and idealism. Materialism was championed by science and denied that the independent mental domain existed at all: it wasn't extended hence it wasn't there. After all, it was impossible to detect with the human senses. No one could see it, hear it, touch it, smell it or taste it. What experiment could possibly reveal its existence? How could you collect any scientific data regarding it? Wasn't it just exposing the reality that the immaterial, unextended domain of the soul and God was a fantasy?

Science is, at core, pure empiricism, materialism and atheism. These terms are all effectively synonymous. Although there are scientists who profess their belief in God, these are intellectually dishonest individuals who are trying to have their cake and eat it. If you accept the materialist paradigm, you have left no room for God, the soul or even for free will. You have placed the whole universe, including human beings, within an inexorable chain of physical cause and effect determined by scientific forces. Since no one claims that the laws of science have free will and can “do their own thing” whenever they feel like it, there is therefore no conceivable mechanism by which free will can operate.

Kant, an idealist, addressed the Cartesian problem by declaring that while there was only one universe (the mental one), it had two aspects: a noumenal universe of “things in themselves”, which was entirely unknowable, and a phenomenal universe of these things in themselves as they *appeared* to our senses, which had all the characteristics of the material world, without of course being material. We understand the world so well because it is in fact created by our own minds. Since we can't ever escape from our minds, we can never see things as they truly are, free of the constructions our minds have imposed on them, free of the systemic illusion to which we are

prey.

So, for Kant, the phenomenal world corresponded to the world of science ruled by deterministic laws of cause and effect (created by our minds and NOT inherent in any alleged external material world). However, the unknowable noumenal domain afforded Kant the opportunity to claim that it was there that God, the soul and free will existed, although, as he admitted, we could never know anything about them. This was an ingenious and highly influential scheme that explained the scientific world while, unlike scientific materialism, leaving legitimate room for the free will that we all believe ourselves to have.

Scientists of course dismissed Kant's dualistic philosophy, just as they had previously dismissed Descartes'. They said that the so-called noumenal universe was, by definition, unknowable and beyond any form of detection, hence was an entirely spurious, redundant and empty concept. They also rejected the notion that the scientific universe was a creation of our minds rather than exactly what it seemed to be: an external material world obeying scientific laws that come from outside rather than inside our minds.

What Kant had effectively done was to recast the Cartesian philosophy in slightly different terminology, and with one radical twist. Descartes had proposed two domains, mental and physical. The physical domain was exactly as scientific materialists conceived it: an objective, external reality subject to inexorable scientific laws. The mental domain, on the other hand, was unextended and scientifically undetectable. Scientific materialism immediately dispensed with it altogether – especially since no one who supported Descartes could convincingly explain how mind and matter interacted.

Kant's noumenal universe is much the same as Descartes' mental domain – outside space and time, unextended and undetectable. However, whereas the mental domain, for Descartes, was strictly for consciousness (“I think therefore I am.”), the mental, noumenal domain for Kant is for *everything*. Every phenomenal object has a noumenal counterpart. Kant's extraordinary innovation was to say that our minds operate mentally on these mental objects (noumena) in a coherent, systematic and predictable way that turns them all (other than minds themselves) into phenomenal rather than noumenal objects i.e. into objects in space and time, subject to the inexorable cause and effect of scientific law.

Kant said that space and time provide the *conditions* for sensory experience: “The formal principle of our intuition (space and time) is the condition under which anything can be an object of our senses.” This means that spatial and temporal relations are only experienced by the passive, receptive part of the mind, which Kant called *intuition*, as opposed to the active part concerned with *intellect*.

In other words, everything, for Kant, is actually mental, including space and time. Minds impose the systematic illusion of a scientific, lawful, objective, material universe.

One way of thinking about Kant's noumena and phenomena is within the context of Plato's domain of Forms and his Demiurge (“the public craftsman”). For Plato, the Demiurge took the eternal Forms and imprinted them on the universal clay (matter) to fashion a material copy of the perfect domain of mental Forms. For Kant, Plato's well-defined Forms are replaced by the mysterious noumena – seeds of ideas, we might say. Our own minds take the role of the Demiurge. We fashion the noumena into the stuff of the phenomenal world not by stamping them on matter but by applying mental categories and intuitions to them, most especially of causality, space and time.

Rather than have a strict Cartesian mind-matter dualism, Kant has *one* mental world that manifests itself dualistically: 1) things as they mentally are in themselves (which are never observed and are unknowable, especially minds themselves), and 2) things as they appear to our senses – as material objects of science located in space and time and subject to causality.

Kant had thus unified mind and matter by claiming that everything is in fact mental, but then divided them again as knowable mind-created, “material” phenomena and unknowable mental noumena. He had resurrected the material world but it was no longer actually material but “phenomenal” – of the order of appearance rather than reality i.e. a grand illusion.

As we have observed, scientific materialists were unimpressed and ignored all such talk. For them, the scientific world was absolutely real and no kind of mind-created phenomenon. Nevertheless, Kant’s scheme – known as transcendental idealism because it pointed to the existence of higher truths that transcended our experience – was so intellectually ingenious and imposing that it caused an explosion of interest in idealism, led by great German geniuses, and culminating in the awesome Illuminatus Hegel.

Idealism addresses the Cartesian problem of mind-matter dualism by taking the opposite stance to materialism. Idealists say that the only reality we actually experience is the mental one. The only knowledge we have about the world is mental. We are nothing but entities that experience ideas, thoughts, feelings, sensations, impressions, intuitions: all mental rather than material states. If you removed our ideas of the world, you would have removed the world. Our ideas of the world ARE the world. So, whereas the materialists abolished the Cartesian mental world, the idealists abolished the Cartesian material world.

According to materialism, there is an objective world independent of our minds controlled by scientific laws of cause and effect that are equally independent of our minds. A scientific materialist can happily think of the universe as containing no minds at all, including his own. Science is about revealing the “objective truth” of a kind of dead, mindless, mechanical universe. Science has made no inroads at all into explaining life, mind or consciousness. All of its great successes concern the universe as a cemetery, or as a great clockwork mechanism incapable of exhibiting free will, desire or passion.

According to idealism, our minds create the universe and there is no objective universe “out there”. The laws of science are created by our minds and do not exist outside them. (It is in fact extremely difficult for materialists to account for the existence of scientific laws – if they are part of the extended material world, they must somehow be material. So where are they are? What are they? Where are they stored? How can they affect everything all over the universe? How can any material thing “know” what laws to obey and indeed how to obey them? Where did these laws come from? Where were they before the Big Bang? In fact, how can laws exist at all? Why shouldn’t the material world be a completely random, lawless place?

Everything in the material world decays and runs down, but not the laws themselves which always stay the same, hence are of a totally different and alien kind from the rest of the material world. Why are they immune to change when nothing is? No materialist has ever accounted for the laws of matter. Scientists talk of the heat death of the universe being caused by entropy and the Second law of Thermodynamics, but of course the Second Law of Thermodynamics is not itself subject to any decay and heat death i.e. laws are of a wholly category from what they control. *Why?*

A Platonic dualism has been invalidly introduced by science: eternal, immutable, perfect laws contrasted with transient, physical, imperfect objects relentlessly running out of usable energy. But scientific materialism rejects Plato, so it is therefore presented with a challenge so great that it has never once addressed it: *are the laws of materialism themselves material?* If they’re not then how can they exist since only matter exists? If they are then why aren’t they subject to material decay like all other matter? It’s not clear that any scientist has ever grasped the magnitude of this problem. By itself, this philosophical problem destroys the whole ideology of scientific materialism. Scientific materialism *cannot* be true because it cannot explain its own laws. It can’t explain what they are ontologically, hence they are like magic. They’re from

fairyland!

People take scientific materialism seriously not because of its philosophical coherence but because it works pragmatically and its successes have indeed been wondrous.

Materialism and idealism can both make strong cases that the opposing school is false, yet neither has ever landed a knockout blow. Isn't that astonishing? How can two so radically different views somehow *both* be powerfully true and persuasive? Surely this points to the need for a *tertium quid* – a third thing – that reconciles the opposing schools. Illuminism is precisely that *tertium quid*, and it fulfils the task through the ultimate truth: *mathematics*.

Unfortunately, Illuminism has two immense obstacles to overcome. On the one hand, scientific materialism has been staggeringly successful in terms of technology, manufacturing, the military-industrial complex and medicine. It has authentically changed our world beyond recognition. To any thinking person, science is immensely persuasive. It's no surprise that someone like Richard Dawkins, a fervent atheist and materialist, is so widely admired. Yet even Dawkins and his followers can do nothing to dent the confidence of the second obstacle, the irrationalists i.e. the Jews, Christians, Muslims and Karmists.

The Abrahamists have actually become more fanatical and irrational as science has grown stronger. They are in much greater denial than ever before. They hate reason and prize irrational faith with a great passion. A medieval thinker such as Dante was aware of no serious conflict between science and religion. In fact, the two disciplines seemed in beautiful and perfect harmony, united by reason. It is in the present day that the gulf between mainstream religion and science has become unbridgeable. It is no longer rationally possible to think that Abrahamism has anything in common with science. If you accept the scientific facts then you cannot be an Abrahamist. Abrahamism has been formally refuted as a logical possibility in the scientific world. Many Abrahamists have therefore cultivated an extreme distaste for science. They are perfectly aware that if science is true their beliefs are false. Rather than abandon the beliefs with which they were brainwashed since birth, they have chosen to abandon reason. Like Luther, they have declared that reason is the Devil's whore.

Nowhere is the abyss between science and Abrahamism clearer than in the case of Darwinian evolution. The situation couldn't be simpler. If evolution is true, the Creator God of Abrahamism does not exist. The whole point of evolution is that it requires no Creator. It is a self-propelling process. Natural selection has nothing to do with truth or morality. It cares only about reproductive success, about the passing on and spread of particular genes, hence Dawkins' famous and brilliant book *The Selfish Gene*.

Now, some Abrahamists seek to claim that their Creator God created the evolutionary process. But this is untenable, and indeed spectacularly so. Why would a Creator God establish a process so savage, so amoral, so far from truth and goodness, that it looks like pure evil? The brutal and bloody law of the jungle is what you would expect in hell, not heaven. If "God" were responsible for evolution then he would be Satan, not God. He would have created an arena of endless killing and pain, for no apparent reason. How can a moral God create a process devoid of morality?

Is a shark an immoral serial killer, or does it simply kill to live? Humans are killers par excellence. They kill for fun! A God who sets in motion a perpetual death machine of mind-boggling cruelty cannot be God. When "God" ordered Abraham to kill his own innocent son for no reason at all, he made it clear to all people possessed of reason that he was not God.

Since evolution requires no one to get it started – it's just part of the fabric of the universe – why would God invent a system that makes him look superfluous? Is he actively trying to baffle and bewilder people? Is he perverse? If so, he cannot be God.

If God is the true Creator, why didn't he simply *create*, just as it says in the Bible? Why

didn't he create one planet, one moon and one sun, and put humanity on the planet? What point in Creation is served by the countless planets, moons, stars and galaxies that litter the infinite universe? The universe is so incomprehensibly large (and expanding) that there are things out there that humanity will NEVER see. So why are they there? For whose benefit? What do they have to do with Adam and Eve on Earth, the alleged centrepiece of God's universe?

The hypothesis of a Creator God cannot be sustained in the face of evolution and an infinite universe. Only someone insanely opposed to reason would continue to support the concept of a Creator God. What's the difference between irrational people and mad people? Can we distinguish between the two? If you reject reason, can you even be called human or are you just an animal?

Descartes, a supreme rationalist, expressed the view that mathematics provides the fundamental structure shared by all branches of knowledge. That being the case, why does neither the Torah, Bible nor Koran refer at all to mathematics? If mathematics is the key to existence, the last place where you will discover the secrets of reality is in the Abrahamic holy texts. Can anyone point to even one item of worthwhile knowledge offered by the three books allegedly authored by the Creator of the universe? Does God hate knowledge, or does he hate the idea of human beings having knowledge? The books of Abrahamism are irrational texts of anti-knowledge and hatred of intellect. They contain no intellectual sustenance at all. They are books of Pavlovian dominance and submission.

Reason

Given that Descartes believed in two essentially separate domains of matter (extended) and mind (unextended), he could not conceive of a vacuum existing in the material world. If a vacuum contained "nothing", it would be unextended, hence mind-like: an impossibility in the physical world of extension. Therefore, Descartes argued for the existence of a "plenum" – a completely full material universe, with no empty space whatever. He also rejected the concept of indivisible atoms. If they existed in the material world then, no matter how small, they were extended, hence divisible. Instead, he referred to infinitely divisible "corpuscles" (although he never considered what should happen if they reached their indivisible limit: Leibniz did and made them his dimensionless "monads").

These corpuscles, Descartes said, had "primary", objective qualities, intrinsic to themselves, of extension, motion, mass, volume, position, number etc. They also had "secondary", subjective qualities that were not intrinsic to them but resulted from the effects they had on the human senses. These secondary qualities were colour, smell, taste, the sounds they caused us to hear and the way they felt to touch. In other words, all of our sensory information is secondary, subjective and unreliable. Think of colour. It can be radically changed by the prevailing conditions. In a red-lit room, everything appears reddish. As it gets darker, our colour vision fades to black and white (just look around your room before you go to sleep – there's no colour!)

Descartes' material universe was thoroughly mechanistic, mathematical and predictable, and gave a huge boost to scientific thinking. He advised researchers to divide all big problems into smaller ones (the reductive, analytical approach), to argue from the simple to the complex and to check everything carefully.

As a rationalist, Descartes thought that only pure reason yielded reliable knowledge, and reason relied on mathematics and logic. He was dismissive of the knowledge we get from our unreliable senses. No sure knowledge could come from such a dubious source.

The opposing school to rationalism is empiricism, which asserts that only our senses can yield knowledge about the external world. How can staying in a room using your pure reason tell

you anything about a frog? You can learn about frogs only by gathering information about them via your senses. Without that information, reason is superfluous.

Rationalism and idealism are a natural alliance while empiricism and materialism represent the opposite alliance.

In order to explain the source of *irrationality*, Descartes contrasted will and intellect. He asserted that, driven by will, we often choose to believe confused, unclear ideas. Will power, it seems, has primacy over reason. This is a critical point. Abrahamists are irrational because reason, it appears to them, takes them down the road of atheism and certain death whereas Abrahamism promises them eternal life in paradise, albeit without any rational basis. Is it any wonder that legions of ill-educated, fearful people find reason rather less appealing than irrational faith? Our free will often leads us into absolute irrationality. It is never emphasized enough that only a small proportion of humanity is guided by reason. The rest are controlled by will. Therefore, there's little point addressing the masses with rational arguments. You must target their emotions and will if you want to win the debate. Moses, Jesus and Mohammed were classic irrationalists making crude appeals to emotion and will, and using threats of extreme and indeed eternal pain for anyone who disobeyed them.

Humans are creatures of will, not of reason and intellect. Will is emotional and full of desire. If we want to evolve as a species, we must learn to moderate our will and increase our reason.

Imagine we were programming artificial intelligences that we wanted to be something like us. We certainly wouldn't make them exclusively logical and rational. But here is the big question – how do you programme will into a machine? How do you make machines *irrational*? Aren't will and irrationality what truly separate man and machine?

How can humanity progress without increased reliance on reason? Can increased will lead to any evolution? Or does it just drag us back to the jungle, and even further back to the primordial slime? A huge amount of capitalist advertising is directed straight at the will and emotions. Capitalism revolves around the will and emotions, not around reason. Abrahamism revolves around the will and emotions.

We can't take the path to divinity unless we embrace reason. We have no choice.

Platonism

“Platonism”, derived from Pythagoreanism, is used to describe the stance of those mathematicians who assert that mathematics pre-exists humanity, is indeed eternally coded into the universe, and determines its structure. Mathematics is thus “real” and has independent existence. As far as Descartes was concerned, all human knowledge might one day be mathematized. Although Descartes wasn't an Illuminatus, he shared exactly the same vision as the Illuminati – a complete mathematical explanation of existence. If mathematics is indeed universal and integral to existence, any rational alien race would also be mathematical. The only language in which we would be able to infallibly communicate with them would be mathematics.

So, is mathematics something that rational people discover about the universe, or is something that rational minds invent? The latter option seems inconceivable and yet if it were true it would surely lend maximum support to Kant's hypothesis that minds create reality. If a mind can construct something as complex as mathematics, what couldn't it invent?

The position that mathematics is an invention of mind is known as “formalism” or “relativism”. It asserts that mathematics is something akin to an enormously more elaborate version of chess. It has its rules and immensely complex games can be played, but they have no connection with reality. We use the initial rules to create additional yet consistent rules, but all we are ever doing is playing a more and more sophisticated game.

An argument has been advanced that mathematics is a “closed” system, hence cannot yield any knowledge about anything other than itself. There are no avenues for introducing non-mathematical parameters, hence mathematics can never provide “new” knowledge. This argument is actually key to the entire Illuminist project because Illuminism asserts that mathematics is indeed a closed system but it further asserts that there is nothing at all external to mathematics i.e. mathematics is EVERYTHING. To say that mathematics is closed is not to place any limitations on its explanatory power since there’s nothing outside it, nothing else to which it would have to open itself.

Illuminism declares that everything that exists and all authentic knowledge of everything that exists are entirely defined mathematically. Mathematics is IT. There’s nothing else. By the end of this series of books, we hope we will have persuaded you of this astounding fact.

Just look at the best theories of science: almost entirely expressed mathematically. If mathematics is simply a formalism, a self-consistent game, then the same must also be true of the most successful scientific theories, which means that we know nothing of the world and it might as well be Kant’s noumenal universe (about which we must remain silent).

Just look at computers and computer simulations – wholly mathematical. Where would we be without our computers? Has anything proved as successful as applied mathematics?

The abstract work of Bernhard Riemann on non-Euclidean curved spaces would once have seemed to be mathematics in the purest formalist sense, with no connection with external reality (assumed to be entirely Euclidean), yet this work became the bedrock of Einstein’s general theory of relativity and is used in the cosmological theories describing the evolution of the universe.

“Platonist” mathematics is what we define as ontological mathematics.

The Home of the Soul

Descartes famously identified the pineal gland as where the mind or soul exists and interacts with the physical body. He imagined the soul as a “homunculus” – a little man – who receives all of the information flowing in from the senses and processes it all, adding his own reason and logic to make sense of it. It is as if our soul is in a private cinema watching the images being sent, via the eyes, from the external world. The soul itself does not interact with the external world while the body that does is in some sense just a human automaton. Behaviourist philosopher Gilbert Ryle referred to this model of a private soul inside a kind of mechanical man as the “ghost in the machine”.

For Descartes, Nature, in its material aspect, is an automaton, and he held that animals have neither souls nor feelings. They are just machines. In fact, even humans are just machines materially, meaning that doctors are not healers but mechanics and repairmen. In Descartes’ mechanistic universe, matter affects matter only through physical contact. Matter, motion and collisions are the only elements in this system. There is no “action at a distance” – no forces operating across space. It was a corollary of this position that if the motions of all particles were known, we would be able to know the future by calculating how the system would evolve with time. Everything, in principle, could be explained. This is still, more or less, the position adopted by scientific materialism.

Kant

“No confession of faith, no appeal to holy names nor any observance of religious ceremonies can help to gain salvation.” -- Kant

If Descartes was the founder of modern philosophy, professional philosophers tend to regard Kant as its most towering figure. Kant's project was to define what could be known for sure and to reveal where thinkers strayed into error by over-extending concepts beyond their proper domain. The effect of his philosophy was to promote skepticism and to undermine faith in conventional religion and metaphysics. Although he thought he was succeeding in accounting for the power of science and making sense of it, scientists never adopted his view that reality is a construction of mind. Science continued to assume as an unshakeable fact an external world regulated by laws external to our minds. For scientists, these laws shaped the world of minds rather than mind shaping these laws. Space and time, cause and effect, were real rather than mind creations allowing us to comprehend reality.

Illuminism is a means of reconciling Kant's views with science and showing how both can be correct, despite their apparently unbridgeable contradictions.

Kant, while no atheist, was contemptuous of much of religion. He referred to petitionary prayer as the “wheedling of God.” If you think about it, petitioning God on behalf of your own naked self-interest is one of the least Godly things you can do. All the masses who pray to God to cure their sickness or allow them to win the lottery or to make someone love or to make their team win are not treating God as a Moral Arbiter and steersman of the cosmos but as a Super Genie who grants wishes. They've made him into a witch doctor or wizard working with spells and charms. Their “God” is one of magic. He's from the world of fairies, elves, goblins and things that go bump in the night. This isn't religion at all. It's Harry Potter on a cosmic scale, with God as the top wizard with the most powerful wand, and Lord Voldemort as Satan. Most “religious” people subscribe to a vision of a world of unseen spirits operating according to the principles of magic. In other words, their vision is one of superstition, fantasy and wishful thinking. It has zero connection with theology, philosophy, reason, logic, science and mathematics. It's pure Mythos (story and fable) and rejects Logos (reason) completely.

Only the ill-educated and stupid subscribe to conventional religion. What is “faith” if not the spectacular ability to wholly suspend disbelief and believe in unadulterated magic?

Kant went out of his way to be “indisposed” whenever his official participation in religious ceremonies was required. What a wise man.

Despite that, Nietzsche, a radical atheist, categorised Kant as merely “a cunning Christian”. He saw Kant's philosophy as a desperate rearguard action by Christianity to carve out a space for itself (the noumenal universe) where it could remain permanently unmolested by science – a realm of pure faith rather than knowledge since it was literally unknowable. Additionally, he viewed Kant's famous categorical imperative as a back door to conventional Christian morality. As usual, obligations were placed on human beings to toe the line of the authorities. Nietzsche's project was to destroy all Christian and metaphysical values, and to bring about a reevaluation of all values that would transform humanity and lead to higher humans: supermen.

There's a lot to be said for Nietzsche's analysis of Kant's philosophy. In many ways, Kant staged the last and best defence of the Christian worldview, but with God shunted off to the noumenal universe where he could neither interfere nor be interfered with in the ever-growing dominance of science in the phenomenal world.

When he was at school, Kant had a low opinion of his teachers, saying of them, “They were incapable of inflaming the sparks within us for the study of philosophy or mathematics but could certainly blow them out!”

It’s vital that all teachers should not only know their subject inside out but also should love it and enthuse every student with their passion.

Ancient Greece

In this book, we are going to do some time travel. We are going back to the dawn of rational human thinking: to ancient Greece and the brilliant pre-Socratic philosophers.

In our time expedition, we will deliberately avoid the claims of the mainstream religions, especially those of Judaism and its absurd Creationist God. There can be no doubt that the fanatical, bearded prophets of the Jews were the authors of the greatest error in history, both intellectually and morally. There is not a single worthwhile aspect to the Jewish religion. Everything about it is fallacious and indeed evil. Their Creator is a Torture God, a monster, a tyrant, a Devil. Judaism is the ultimate sado-masochistic exploration of life, with the most submissive, masochist race conceivable searching for the most dominant sadist the cosmos can offer. That ultimate sadist, a maniacal torturer and killer, is Jehovah.

The founding tale of Judaism tells you everything you need to know about this evil religion. The first Jew, Abraham, was ordered to murder his own son for no reason at all, and immediately agreed to do so to show his absolute, mindless and slavish obedience to his God. Any sane person would imagine that Abraham would defy to his dying breath this monstrous order and the creature that issued it. How could it be anything other than the Devil himself that gave such a homicidal and evil command? Instead, Abraham complied and worshipped this Devil. He cared not one jot for the life of his son. He did nothing to defend his son.

Imagine a Hollywood movie about a man who was commanded by a supernatural being to kill his son. The story would be about how the father fought to the death to fight the monstrous being and save his son's life. But not in the Jewish movie. Abraham immediately picks up a dagger and says, "Where shall I stab? Heart or throat?" And this is the greatest story ever told?! This is the story that has captivated billions of human beings. It's INSANE. Even Hollywood, full of Jews, has been unable to make a movie glorifying Abraham. No one could make that psychopath a sympathetic hero.

Abraham's moral compass was so flawed that he imagined that obeying the Devil was somehow "good". But, of course, Judaism has nothing to do with morality. It's about absolute obedience to ultimate power, to a power devoid of all morality – Satan.

The Jews obey 620 commandments. Obeying is what Jews do, what they love. It defines everything about them. Judaism is the supreme slave religion. There is no moral dimension to Judaism except in the sense that obeying 620 commandments is deemed "good" and disobeying them is "evil". Whether or not each commandment is good or evil – and surely Jehovah's order to Abraham to kill his innocent son for no reason was as evil as it could possibly get – is not something to which Jews give any thought.

Islam, the religion of the Muslims, means "submission" i.e. Muslims are those who mindlessly and slavishly submit to Allah, just as the Jews do to Jehovah. Once again, there is no morality whatever involved in this religion. It's all about obeying.

As for the Christians, they worship someone calling himself the "son" of the monster Jehovah. Obviously, if Jehovah is evil, so is someone styling himself as his son. Jesus is the Antichrist! Have you noticed that Christians always refer to Yehoshua ben Yosef ("Jesus Christ") as "Lord" and never as "friend", "brother", "guide", "helper", "companion", "confederate" or "comrade"? It would be more honest if they called their overlord "master" (indeed they often do) or, even better, FUEHRER.

No, there is no rational reason for any thinking person to stray anywhere near these mad and evil religions of human enslavement to a cosmic tyrant who threatens everyone with eternal

hellfire if they don't obey him to the letter. Abrahamism is the expression of Hegel's master-slave dialectic with "God" as the supreme master and Abrahamists voluntarily casting themselves as the perfect slaves.

For weak, submissive, superstitious, irrational and slave-like human beings who have no initiative, no strength, no self-respect, no dignity and no ability to think for themselves, Abrahamism is the perfect religion.

But our task is to pursue the thinking person's route through life. Logos – reason – was born in ancient Greece and its colonies. We shall review the astoundingly insightful questions the ancient Greek philosophers asked about the nature of existence and the ingenious answers they offered. And, later in this series, we will provide the true and definitive explanations of all the cosmic issues with which the Greeks wrestled. The Greeks were lacking only a few vital mathematical concepts. Without those, they had no chance of answering the ultimate questions of existence. But now humanity possesses all of the mathematical knowledge it needs to provide the "big picture". This series provides, for the first time ever in the public domain, the Illuminati's mathematical big picture of reality, the answer to everything, the Grand Unified Theory of existence.

Something and Nothing

It was universally agreed by the great thinkers of ancient Greece that something could not come from nothing. Thales, the world's first recognisable philosopher, denied the existence of nothing, maintaining that things cannot emerge from nothing nor disappear into it, and, indeed, we never witness anything vanishing into "thin air" (nothing) or appearing out of thin air. If that is true of everything we observe, it must also be true of the universe. It cannot have come from nothing. So what did it come from? It seemed to Thales that there must be a basic, eternal "stuff" of the universe from which everything is derived. He identified this stuff as water since water was essential for life and came in solid, liquid and gaseous forms.

However, he also believed that "all things were full of gods", meaning that the universal water must have some spiritual, soul-like, mind-like, living quality – it wasn't plain old water as we would understand it. Alternatively, it might be argued that Thales was anticipating Descartes and had water as the universal material aspect of existence and the minds of gods as the universal mental substance. This would therefore be a kind of sophisticated animism: everything is alive and has a soul. However, rather than regarding mind as existing in every different object of the world as a local spirit or god with an individual soul, thinkers such as Thales tended to use the language of soul or mind in the context of a universal principle of animation; a collective mental substance or spirit rather than lots of individual minds (although they could revert to the second meaning if the thinkers were talking about the multiple gods of polytheistic Greece for the benefit of the superstitious masses). This approach subtly allowed a more scientific approach and, as in the Cartesian view, mind and matter could be treated separately.

According to Cicero, "Thales assures that *water* is the principle of all things; and that God is that Mind which shaped and created all things from water." Commenting on Thales' theory, Aetios said, "A divine power is present in the element of water by which it is endowed with movement." So, perhaps it would be more accurate to describe it as "holy water"!

In this view, Thales was anticipating Plato's notion of the Demiurge fashioning the material world into what we see around us, with water taking the role of matter, and the Demiurge being *in* the water rather than external to it i.e. he is shaping the universe out of himself.

For Thales, no matter other than water existed. This is the first grand unified theory of everything with all matter being water in different guises, being acted upon by a single force (mind).

This stands as the first proper scientific theory of existence, based on matter (water) and energy (mind), and how they interact.

Empedocles, continuing the assault on nothing, said, "Nothing can arise from what in no way is." He was wholly opposed to any notion of a void or Creation. (Creationism assumes that there is a void to be filled; it is opposed by Eternalism, which says that everything that exists has always existed and will always exist.)

Anaxagoras was another to maintain that something could not come from nothing. Instead, he envisaged order coming from chaos, mediated by some cosmic mind. This was a vision of an evolving universe rather than one of Creation.

The Eleatic thinker Xenophanes believed that the universe was an unmovable and unchangeable solid mass. Parts within the whole might change in relation to one another, but

nothing could be added to the whole or subtracted from it. His pupil Parmenides was even more extreme and taught that authentic change is inconceivable. He said, “The One [the universe] is fixed within itself, having no space in which to change or move.” He argued that the future does not yet exist and since non-existent things cannot come from existent things then the future can never happen. The same argument applies to the past: the present cannot have come from it. As Parmenides explained it, “How, then, can what IS be going to be in the future? Or how could it come into being? If it came into being, it is not; nor is it if it is going to be in the future. Thus is becoming extinguished and passing away not to be heard of.” This is very much an exploration of the word “is”. Anything that “is” cannot have had a past or future because if it did then it would be a coming into being (in the future case) or going out of being (in the past case). It would be a becoming rather than a being, and, as far as Parmenides was concerned, a becoming was impossible since it stood in absolute contradiction of being. Something that “is”, always “is”. The process of becoming is an impossibility since it is forever turning the existent into a future thing that does not yet exist (i.e. a non-existent) and also making it a non-existent in terms of the past (which no longer exists).

Parmenides was the first great champion of being. He considered all change an illusion and his pupil Zeno produced a number of ingenious paradoxes to show that the concept of change was incoherent and contradictory, hence unreal. Even today, Zeno’s paradoxes would successfully befuddle most people. His most famous example is a race between Achilles and a tortoise, with the tortoise enjoying a short start. By the time Achilles reaches the starting position of the tortoise, it has moved on to a new position. By the time Achilles reaches that new position, the tortoise has moved on yet again, and so on ad infinitum. Achilles, in this scenario, never seems to catch the tortoise. He gets closer and closer to the tortoise but can never overtake it, so, it seems, the faster can never beat the slower if the slower has a start.

Zeno is raising the question of how an infinite series of divisions, by definition inexhaustible, can be exhausted, which it would have to be for Achilles to win. We will examine this astonishingly profound thought experiment in much more detail in another book of this series. It is arguably the most important thought experiment of all time.

Another of Zeno’s ingenious paradoxes is that of the arrow. At any particular instant of the arrow’s flight, it is at rest (i.e. you could take endless snapshots of it and at what stage would you see it as anything other than an arrow at rest?). So how does it manage to move?

Another philosopher, Melissus, stated: “If something exists, it is eternal, since nothing can come from nothing.”

Epicurus held the same position, declaring: “Nothing can be created out of nothing.”

Creation versus Eternalism and Evolution

Creation = getting something from nothing. An infinitely powerful and perfect Creator, the most advanced and complex being conceivable, creates simpler, imperfect forms out of ... thin air, and in fact out of no air at all – out of absolute nothingness and non-existence. In this view, complexity precedes simplicity. Perfection precedes imperfection. It is absolutely anti-evolutionary.

Eternalism = something endures eternally.

Eternalism comes in two forms: 1) pure being and 2) pure becoming.

Pure being Eternalism is the type advocated by Parmenides where change is illusory. Pure becoming Eternalism is the type advocated by Heraclitus: “There is nothing permanent except change.” Something is always changing and adapting.

Evolution comes in two forms: 1) purposeless and 2) purposeful.

Purposeless evolution is the one favoured by scientific materialism, where natural

selection produces better and better-adapted organisms, but no grand purpose is being pursued. Simpler forms precede more complex, better-adapted forms.

Purposeful evolution (teleology) asserts that evolution has a meaning and is heading for perfection. Imperfection precedes perfection. Perfection is the omega point – the final endpoint.

Eternalism (of becoming) and either type of Evolution work very well together.

Eternalism (of being) is not consistent with Evolution.

Creationism is not consistent with Evolution.

The Big Bang model is definitely wrong as traditionally presented because it asserts a Creationist event (something from nothing), followed by purposeless Evolution that will eventually run out of puff and degenerate into a permanent state of maximum disorder and heat death (the final consequence of the Second Law of Thermodynamics). There is definitely no happy ending in scientific materialism. The universe serves no purpose at all and mind and life are mere by-products, devoid of meaning. The universe has no objective. It just exists for no good reason.

The Arche: the Fundamental Stuff of the Universe

As we have seen, Thales identified water as the arche, with a kind of universal mind operating in it or through it. Thales' pupil Anaximander also put mind and matter together to create a monistic living mass – invisible and indeterminate – called the *apeiron* (the “infinite”). The *apeiron* filled all of space as a plenum and contained limitless motion. This motion caused the *apeiron* to fragment in various ways to create the various particles of the world. In due course, the ongoing motion would bring about the reverse process and everything would come back together again.

This view was highly influential within the Illuminati given that Pythagoras, the first official Grand Master of the Illuminati, studied under Anaximander. Pythagoras gave the infinite form and definition by declaring that it was in fact numbers. The whole of existence was controlled by numbers and reflected numerical relations, which created the order and harmony of the cosmos. The Music of the Spheres was the cosmic soundtrack of numbers.

Next to play the arche game was Anaximenes who believed that the basic substance was air, from which everything else was derived by rarefaction and condensation. Then came Heraclitus, another Grand Master of the Illuminati, who characterised the universe as a perpetual becoming, and he considered that the best way to define it was as an eternal fire. We might think of this ceaseless fire in terms of the modern concept of endlessly transforming energy; energy being a highly mathematical concept. Heraclitus saw this eternal fire as an expression of a great cosmic conflict (an idea that would later find new life in Nietzsche's Will to Power in which he envisaged all of existence as an endless competition for power). Yet, for Heraclitus, underlying the strife was a rational order known as the Logos (like the scientific laws of nature).

Next came Empedocles, another Illuminati Grand Master, who took the water of Thales, the air of Anaximenes and the fire of Heraclitus and added to them earth to create four basic elements which were governed by “love” and “strife” or (attraction and repulsion as modern scientists would say). Everything was a combination of different amounts of these basic elements. These four core elements guided “scientific” thinking until the rise of modern science in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Nowadays, science acknowledges over 100 elements, as shown in the Periodic Table of Chemistry (the successor of alchemy that was largely built around the four elements of Empedocles together with a mysterious fifth element – the famous quintessence or aether, introduced by other Pythagorean thinkers. Aether was lighter than air and filled every possible space, ensuring the existence of a plenum and the impossibility of a vacuum. It could also transmit influence from one body to another, in the manner of scientific field theory).

Another thinker, Anaxagoras, asserted that there were infinite fundamental substances called *homoeomeries*, all differing in quality. These *homoeomeries* were infinitesimally small particles that filled all of space without gaps (i.e. this was another plenum system) and were arranged in a logical order by the Mind (Nous) of the cosmos. Initially, they were all jumbled together, but the Mind sorted and organised them. Every object, no matter how small, was composed of all possible *homoeomeries* (the entire infinite set). As Anaxagoras said, “Everything has a portion of everything hidden within it, but only that which is most numerous will be apparent.” So, iron appears as iron because *homoeomeries* of iron outnumber the *homoeomeries* of all the other substances. This view implies that nothing is ever pure and all things are in some sense alike since everything contains everything, but in different concentrations. Everything can be transformed into everything else just by changing the relative proportions of the different

homoeomerics (an idea that was of course highly influential in later alchemy – could iron be changed to gold by decreasing the iron homoeomerics and increasing the relative proportion of gold homoeomerics?). A corollary is that everything also contains its opposite, hence can dialectically change into its antithesis.

Mind is the orchestrator of the homoeomerics and might be regarded as the most refined, purest and highest quality of the homoeomerics. It is present in significant quantities only in living things, and, when it leaves, they die. But it does not in any way create the homoeomerics. Like them, it is material and eternal. It is called mind because it intelligently organises things, produces order and is the cause of all meaningful phenomena. It doesn't operate by blind chance. Yet we don't need to think of it as a Godlike consciousness. A sleepwalking, unconscious human being can perform intelligent tasks – why not a sleepwalking, unconscious universe?

The final significant contributors were the Atomists Leucippus and Democritus who declared that all that existed were, on the one hand, atoms (an infinite number of them, all quite similar but differing in shape and size) and void on the other. Atoms were tiny (too small to be seen) and indivisible (that's what "atom" means). While the homoeomerics of Anaxagoras were infinitesimal (implying that all objects are infinitely divisible), atoms were not. They were hard, solid particles, the smallest parts into which matter could be divided, and were equipped with various shapes and hooks. All of them flew around randomly in the void, colliding with each other and holding together with their hooks until something split them apart again. They were ceaselessly rearranging themselves, thus creating all of the diverse phenomena of the world. The worldview of the Atomists succeeded to some extent in resolving the enigma of being and becoming. The atoms were eternal, immutable entities – pure being – while they were constantly moving and colliding, thus producing a world of eternal becoming.

Although the Atomists also firmly denied that something could ever come from nothing, they felt that the void ("nothing") must be allowed to exist on the same basis as "something". One could not be privileged over the other. The atoms and the void were both eternal. The void was the everlasting theatre in which the actors of existence – the atoms – everlastingly moved. Life and mind were explained as being the product of special spiritual or "soul" atoms that mingled with the other atoms. They were rounder and smoother than other atoms and more mobile, but they were material objects like everything else.

People stay alive by breathing spiritual and air atoms in and out in a careful equilibrium and when they can no longer do so, they die. To explain the workings of the mind, the Atomists also spoke of "sense" atoms and "thought" atoms, with the former impinging on the latter i.e. creating sensory impressions on which the thinking atoms then reflected. All phenomena occurred via the physical contact of atoms. No information could be transmitted except via the collisions of atoms.

This was a supremely materialistic view and inspired the ultra materialism of modern science. There is no first cause for the Atomists, and no purpose. The universe isn't trying to accomplish anything. It just endlessly rearranges itself. Meaning is entirely absent.

These various models of reality of the ancient Greeks cannot be bettered. They covered every base. The view of the modern Illuminati is that Pythagoras was right all along. Number (or mathematics to be more general) is the arche. The effects of mathematics resemble the fire of Heraclitus in conjunction with the infinite of Anaximander, the attractive and repulsive forces of Empedocles and the particles of the Atomists (except as Leibnizian monads).

All of humanity's philosophical and scientific thinking has in essence been nothing but a continual process of refining the brilliant insights of the ancient Greeks, the true founders of modern civilisation. Greece truly is the cradle of the world. Where would we be without the brilliance of the ancient Greeks? They were so dazzling, they were like gods being dropped

amongst apes. Even today, the average person wouldn't be able to understand the thoughts of the Greek geniuses. They are still far ahead of their time even though they died thousands of years ago.

The rationalists Descartes and Leibniz advocated a plenum, while Newton supported the Atomist position of space as empty, as a great Void in which atoms move. Yet what does it mean to say that space is "empty"? Empty of what? Empty of *everything*? If it's empty of everything then it must be non-existence, and so it can't, by definition, exist. So it's not "space": it's *nothingness*. It's not there at all! Therefore, space *cannot* be empty. It must be full of *something*, and therefore it must be a plenum after all. What people really mean when they talk of empty space is that it's empty of anything that could in any way hinder the progress of atoms, so it's *as if* there's nothing there. Yet, as Descartes understood so well, space is extended i.e. it has length, breadth and height so, whatever it is, it isn't nothingness because nothingness cannot occupy length, breadth and height. Quite simply, defining space is one of the greatest challenges of all, and how it is defined defines everything else. If it is defined wrongly, all assumptions that flow from that definition will be WRONG. The prevailing scientific paradigm is WRONG because it has never been able to define space. It's as much a mystery to scientists as it has always been.

There are two views of space in the present day. One is that space is a *perfect* continuum: there are no gaps, no dislocations. Nature makes no leaps. This views space as a plenum, but a plenum of what? The opposite of a plenum is a vacuum, but what's a "vacuum"? Even scientists no longer believe that a vacuum is nothing.

The second view is that space is not a continuum at all. Rather, it's quantised, "grainy". As physicist Lee Smolin puts it, "[There] is indeed a smallest unit of space. It is much smaller than an atom of matter, but nevertheless, there are good reasons to believe that the continuous appearance of space is as much an illusion as the smooth appearance of matter. When we look on a small enough scale, we see that space is made of things we can count. ... Of course, so far no one has ever observed an atom of space."

"Atoms of space"? Here, we see the materialistic mode of thinking in full flow. Something remarkable has happened. Physicists such as Smolin are replacing the ancient view of the Atomists that there were atoms travelling through void, and nothing else, with the new view that there are only atoms, but of two types – material atoms and space atoms. Matter atoms somehow travel in or through space atoms. Do they "collide" with them? Do they transfer energy? What exactly is a space atom? What's it made of if not something material? Far from clarifying things, this approach merely seems to deepen the mystery.

The expanding universe doctrine of science asserts that space itself is expanding, hence if space is nothing (non-existence), how can it have the property of being expandable? Non-existence has no properties by definition. Moreover, we are entitled to ask what space is expanding into. More space? A different type of space? A greater nothingness?

If, hypothetically, all the matter were removed from the universe, would space continue to expand? What does it mean to speak of space in the absence of matter? Does space have independent existence? Is it absolute? Is it an existent at all?

What of "space atoms"? Are more of these being generated in order to cause expansion? Well, what's creating them? How are they created? What are they created from?

The Emptiness of Matter

“The space occupied by a cubic metre of solid platinum is as empty as the space of stars beyond the Earth.” -- Phillippe Lenard

“Look at the dot at the end of this sentence. Its ink contains some 100 billion atoms of carbon. To see one of these with the naked eye, you would need to magnify the dot to be 100 metres across. While huge, this is still imaginable. But to see the atomic nucleus you would need that dot to be enlarged to 10,000 kilometres: as big as the Earth from pole to pole.” -- Frank Close

It has been said that if you could squeeze all the space out of atoms, the entire human race would fit into a space the size of a sugar cube.

Although we seem to live in a resolutely solid world, nothing could be further from the truth. Our world is made of atoms and atoms are 99.99999999999999 empty space. The atomic world is a grand illusion – emptiness presented as solidity. However, the apparent emptiness isn't the whole story. The atom is full of force fields, the most obvious to us being the electric and magnetic fields. If we inflated an atom to human size and then tried to enter its apparent emptiness, we'd be stopped instantly by force fields.

The concept of force fields was unknown to the ancient Greeks. The closest they got was the aether through which influences might be transmitted like a message in a bottle crossing an ocean, but the aether was considered so rarefied that it was barely there at all and was verging on being mental rather than physical. It certainly did not act as a force field preventing motion through it.

Force fields add an entirely new dimension to the ancient debate about matter, void and plenum. Fields decisively change the debate in favour of the plenum because fields can occupy every conceivable part of space. Even if no matter is present in a region of space, a field, such as a gravitational or electric field, will be present, hence that region is not empty. It's not void. It's not nothing. It's not non-existence. When scientists talk about a vacuum, what they mean is a region emptied of matter, but not emptied of fields. A vacuum is still a thing, an existent, comprised of fields (and also of “virtual” particles which, according to quantum physics, are particles so short-lived that they never enter into meaningful spacetime existence and are instead like ghosts of real particles). According to the Einsteinian equivalence of mass and energy, we don't even need a material object to generate a gravitational field: energy in all of its manifestations must generate gravitational fields.

The molten core of the Earth is in motion as our planet rotates and the immense temperatures produce a free flow of electrons, leading to electric currents that transform our planet into a huge magnet, generating magnetic fields that are much stronger than Earth's gravity, and which repel all manner of deadly cosmic rays that would otherwise reach the surface and destroy all life on the planet.

But now a whole new question arises. How does a vacuum conduct a field? What is sustaining it? If there's no material substance there, what's supporting the field? How does it exist? We shall return to this vital question later since it goes to the heart of the fabric of existence.

Relative versus Absolute Space

Aristotle, one of the most influential thinkers of all time, who dominated scientific thinking until Copernicus and the birth of the modern scientific age, was resolutely opposed to the existence of the void, famously declaring, “Nature abhors a vacuum.”

The primary reason Aristotle was so important in the history of thought was that Christian thinkers were able to deploy his philosophy in service of the Christian Creator God. Aristotle and Christianity dovetailed perfectly, allowing philosophy, science and religion to be a second Holy Trinity. All three subjects worked in perfect harmony with each other and the whole system made perfect sense in terms of the knowledge of the day. There was no division between religion and science, no conflict, no gulf as there is today.

According to Aristotle’s cosmology, Earth has always existed and it is a perfect stationary sphere at the centre of the universe. The universe is vast but not infinite and consists of a nest of heavenly spheres, all fitting within each other like Russian dolls. All of the spheres above the moon consist of aether (the heavenly element), which is transparent and completely fills each sphere, making each sphere seem like a glassy, crystalline solid. Since aether is defined to be an invisible, weightless substance more rarefied than the light elements of fire and air, one would have to conceive of it being so densely concentrated as to take on a solid-like character. The planets and stars are also made of aether, though they must be differently constituted in relation to the aethereal crystal spheres: their density must be different and they must contain qualities that give them their characteristic appearance.

Each of the celestial objects – the Moon, Mercury, Venus, the Sun, Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn – was encased in its own glassy shell of perfect aether. The cosmic sphere familiar to the observer terminated with the *firmament* – the sphere of fixed stars – and beyond that was a majestic transparent crystal sphere – the *Primum Mobile* (the Prime Mover) – that imparted motion to the cosmos by virtue of the fact that it was its nature to revolve forever, its revolutions prompting all of the inner shells to move too with clockwork precision. The *Primum Mobile* was the source of all motion in the universe, the sine qua non of movement.

The sphere of the moon provided the boundary between the heavens and the Earth. Everything above the Moon (supralunar) was aethereal and perfect; everything below was non-aethereal and imperfect. While the celestial region was made of the aether (quintessence), the sublunar region comprised the four terrestrial elements of Earth, Water, Air and Fire.

Outside the full cosmic sphere was nothingness (unfortunately, Aristotle seems not to have noticed that this violated his insistence that Nature will countenance no vacuum – why doesn’t the universe explode in order to fill the void with aether?).

It was a simple matter for Christians to commandeer this scheme and declare that it fitted perfectly with the Creation described in the Bible. All they had to do was add the Empyrean (heaven) – the home of God and the angels – as a final sphere extending infinitely outwards and filled with God’s presence (thus establishing a divine supralunar plenum). Earth was thus the centre of God’s Creation, and God was on the outside of his sphere of Creation, supervising every part of it. The aethereal souls of human beings – being of the same miraculous substance as the celestial regions – were capable of ascending through the spheres to reach the Empyrean where they could enjoy the Beatific Vision of Divine Perfection.

This all made perfect sense prior to the birth of modern science. In fact, even now, it retains a certain beauty and plausibility for the ill educated. It’s a true Grand Unified theory of science, philosophy, and religion and it’s easy to see why it seduced so many people. It explained

everything in a rational and clear way (as long as awkward, detailed questions were avoided). It contained meaning and purpose, and everyone knew that they must strain to rise upwards spiritually (and even physically) to reach heaven. People could literally imagine a transcendent soul journey through the planets and stars to heaven, and Dante describes just such a journey in *Paradiso*. No one would fear death if they thought they would soon be enjoying such a journey, the literal trip of a lifetime.

As for hell, it was located at the centre of the Earth. Evil people would be consigned there for eternity. Hell was physically down and heaven was physically up. God was looking down on everyone; the Devil was assaulting and corrupting us from below, seeking to drag us down into the depths. All of the pieces neatly fitted together. There was just one problem: the whole thing was utter nonsense. Science disproved this vision of the universe long ago, and if human beings were rational, it would also have destroyed the entire Abrahamic worldview. When the crystal spheres perished, the whole model based on them ought to have vanished with them. It's testimony to the spectacular irrationality of Abrahamists that when the "science" of their religion failed, they simply shrugged their shoulders and redoubled their *faith*.

There is now NO Abrahamic scientific view. The Abrahamists make no rational attempt to explain in what way their beliefs are compatible with science. The two domains are now 100% separate. Religion is now purely about faith, and has zero connection with reason and knowledge, facts and evidence. Faith, of course, has zero truth content. Being charitable, it's wishful thinking, delusion, fantasy and irrationalism. Being less charitable, it's actual clinical insanity and the faithful are literally mad and ought to be locked up as mental patients. Faith revolves around pure Mythos: emotional stories in ancient books. Since the death of the crystal spheres, it has no Logos components. What faith *proves* is that most people have no interest in reason and can do without it as far as living their lives is concerned.

In a contest of reason versus faith, most people will ditch reason. That, of course, is the definition of irrationality. Luther was saying nothing surprising when he declared that reason was the "Devil's whore", likely to seduce people away from faith. Any person who proclaims himself a person of faith is implicitly agreeing with Luther. You CANNOT be both rational and a believer. The two are mutually exclusive. To be a believer means to reject Logos and accept Mythos.

All Jews, Christians and Muslims should have accepted the facts and abandoned their false and formally disproven religions. Instead, what happened was that philosophy, through Descartes and Hobbes, began to develop separately from religion (and from science too), and religion and science become outright enemies. Abrahamists had no choice but to reject science if they wished to go on believing in their God because science proved that the Torah, Bible and Koran were false. It is a FACT that these books are false. There is no debate about it. But faith, sadly, is immune to facts and reason. Faith can actually become stronger the more it is rationally disproved.

Abrahamists had to dismiss scientific proof and say that somehow science had got it all wrong and all the nonsense of the "infallible" Abrahamic holy texts somehow remained true despite contradicting the scientific facts. They had to assert the primacy of faith over reason, of "divine" revelation over hard science. "God" knows better than "man", they declared. Humanity's fallible reason reveals illusory truths, while God's infallible reason is the only reason worth listening to, and divinely inspired holy books and prophets reveal it to us.

Abrahamism is hatred of reality, a refusal to face the facts, a disregard of reason and logic in favour of delusion and fantasy. Abrahamism is the most disturbing phenomenon in our world. It's severe mental illness on a vast scale, turning Earth into a mental asylum. It removes reason as humanity's touchstone of certainty. It makes Mythos the centrepiece of existence i.e. it makes the

earth *Storyworld*. We live in a kind of fairytale, but no one lives happily ever after.

Illuminism is the only way to fix the world. It once again reconciles science, religion and philosophy except on an enormously more complex and sophisticated level than that of Aristotle's grand synthesis. Illuminism rejects faith entirely and celebrates knowledge, reason and logic. Above all, it brings science, religion and philosophy together by expressing them in a single underlying language – MATHEMATICS. There is NO other way of reconciling science, religion and philosophy. It's Illuminism or nothing.

If you want to approach religion rationally, you cannot do anything other than embrace Illuminism. Otherwise, you will have to inhabit the fantasy world of Abrahamism where the truth never intrudes. As we keep saying, Abrahamism literally has zero truth content; not one word is true or worth listening to. It's false in every possible way. It has been disproven beyond any doubt, yet billions still cling to it. There is no sadder fact about our world. It means that we can have no expectation that human beings will act rationally, or be persuaded by rational arguments. Will, not intellect, rules human beings. That is humanity's supreme tragedy. No wonder that the German philosopher Schopenhauer identified Will as the source of evil and concluded that existence itself was fundamentally evil.

Aristotle was a relationist when it came to empty space i.e. he did not accept space as real, as absolute. Bodies were real, not space, and if you removed all bodies from the universe there would be nothing at all. There would be no space because space isn't a thing. That's why Aristotle denied the existence of a vacuum. From his point of view, there would be nothing there – non-existence. It was an impossible state. Space, to the extent that it could be invoked at all, simply established the frame in which objects had positions in relation to one another. Remove those objects and the framework vanished too since it only existed in relation to the objects. Given that nature "abhors a vacuum", *something* would fill space and establish a plenum, and aether was Aristotle's chosen solution.

Newton, one of the greatest champions of modern science (despite his obsessive interest in alchemy, mysticism and Bible Studies) established the concept of absolute space. In his view, space was an eternal container and it existed regardless of the presence of any objects. Science writer Frank Close said, "For Newton, space exists as if it were some invisible matrix of graph paper which cannot be acted upon. Bodies moved through this matrix grid without altering it; its existence thus had some absolute meaning even in the absence of bodies, whereby 'empty' space is what remains when all material bodies are removed. The absence of matter implied for Newton the absence of gravitational force too, leaving nothing but the pristine inertial framework of absolute space."

In Newton's view, God had created a three-dimensional container and then placed the material universe within it. Space preceded matter and existed independently of matter. It was the necessary cosmic stage on which the events of creation unfolded. They could not happen without it because it provided the means of establishing absolute relations between things.

Leibniz, for most of his life, supported the Aristotelian relationist position and took issue with the Newtonian view. Leibniz argued that space came into existence when the material world appeared, and not before. Space is not a container, nor indeed is it anything at all other than the means for allowing us to describe the spatial relations between objects.

In the Newtonian framework, absolute motion can be distinguished from relative motion (in principle if not practice), but not in the Leibnizian framework.

Leibniz advocated a principle called the *identity of indiscernibles*. According to this principle, if no differences between two objects are discernible in principle then they are identical

i.e. they are one and the same object. Leibniz proposed a thought experiment in which two different universes containing exactly the same objects are compared. In the first universe, every object occupies a particular location in absolute space. In the second universe, every object is uniformly shifted two kilometres west. How could we tell the two universes apart? If we can't distinguish them then they are identical, hence the concept of absolute space is refuted and relationism is vindicated. Even Newton agreed that it was impossible to determine the absolute position of any object. It seems that we can only ever observe the relative positions of objects.

However, Newton believed there was an experiment – known as Newton's bucket – that *did* reveal the existence of absolute space. Imagine a universe containing nothing but a person with a bucket of water. A rope dangles down into the water and is firmly attached to the base. Initially, the bucket and water are at rest. The person then takes the rope and uses it to rotate the bucket. After a few seconds, the water and bucket are both in uniform motion. There should be no difference between water in a stationary bucket and water in a bucket moving in rotation since, relative to each other, the rotating bucket and water are at rest. However, the water is observed to curve upwards at the sides of the bucket. Since the bucket or the person is not causing this effect, it must be caused by the universe: by rotation with reference to absolute space. Although this argument is not without difficulties, it was generally held to give final victory to Newton.

And these things remained until Einstein's special theory of relativity. Prior to that theory, everyone had assumed the existence of a "luminiferous ether" that filled space, acted as the medium for the transmission of light and provided an absolute frame of reference. However, Einstein's theory dispensed with the ether since it could not be detected by any possible experiment (as revealed by the fact that the speed of light is found to be the same in all frames of reference, hence is unaffected by any hypothetical ether). Without ether, there is no absolute space hence only relative motion has physical meaning. This seemed to establish that a version of Leibniz's relational view of space was correct after all

That said, relativity and relationism do have distinct conceptual differences. They are often bracketed together because they both deny the existence of absolute space and time and are based on relative rather than absolute relations.

In Newtonian physics, there is an absolute time difference between two events, theoretically calculated with respect to the beginning of time (although we can never in practice establish the first tick of the clock: that's God's business). In Leibnizian relationism, we can establish that event B took place two seconds after event A, and event A occurred two seconds before event B, but we can never establish any absolute time for the events. In Einsteinian relativity, two observers can each think they are two seconds ahead of the other thanks to the "relativity of simultaneity" – something inconceivable to a relationist. Relativity is therefore the most extreme kind of relationism where even "absolute" relations (such as B taking place two seconds after A) are replaced by "relative" relations where the question of whether B took place two seconds after A or before A is observer-dependent. Leibnizian relationism respects an objective ordering of two temporal events: Einsteinian relativity does not; it provides for a consistent but subjective view within a particular reference frame.

Relativity, in common with Newtonian physics, gives a decisive role to inertial coordinate systems and inertial motion, except it does so in a radically different way, removing an absolute reference frame. Inertia is not defined in terms of relations with other bodies, which it would be in a purely relational system. Instead, it is defined with respect to each and every individual body.

Einstein said, "The laws by which the states of physical systems undergo change are not affected, whether these changes of state be referred to the one or the other of two systems of coordinates in uniform translatory motion [i.e., inertial coordinate systems]."

The debate comes down to inertial frames of reference. In both Newtonian and Einsteinian physics, any coordinate system centred on an individual body and moving uniformly in a straight line can be considered stationary, but Newtonian physics declares that there is an underlying absolute reference frame against which all motion is ultimately measured while Einsteinian physics denies this, declaring instead that it's all relative. Relationism on the other hand would never talk of any individual body viewed in complete isolation (in its own inertial reference frame) since that defies the whole definition of a relation with other things. An individual inertial frame is technically meaningless relationally. Everything must be defined with regard to at least one other thing, and should offer an objective measurement (not one referred to an unseen and unmeasurable absolute frame).

So, relativity and relationism both attack Newtonian absolutism, but in different ways. They are not the same thing.

Einstein and Newton had radically different views of what mass is. Einstein said mass increases as velocity increases; Newton denied this. Also, in Newton's model of the world, the Sun and Earth interact instantaneously gravitationally, but for Einstein gravitational effects cannot travel faster than the speed of light, and we know that it takes eight minutes for sunlight to reach the Earth.

The Platonic View

Plato expressed a dualistic view of reality. There was a perfect, eternal, transcendental world of immutable Forms, and an imperfect, mortal, ever-changing material world of relative falsity and delusion. While the transcendent realm was one of absolute truth, the physical world was one of deception, illusion, and appearance where no sure knowledge was to be had. A mind could find genuine knowledge only by making contact with the higher realm.

This is a highly rationalist view. Experience of the material world (empiricism) does not provide anyone with reliable knowledge. Only reason that can operate in the world of Perfect Forms can yield certainty.

For Kant, the world of appearance was the only world we could truly know while the transcendent world was the noumenal domain of which we could never gain any direct knowledge in our human lifetime.

The Existence Enigma

There are only two possible states: existence and non-existence. In fact, since they are mutually exclusive states, there is only one possible state: existence OR non-existence. If one is true, the other must be false. This is true not just now but forever. It was true infinitely long ago and will be true infinitely far into the future.

Existence and non-existence are states that cannot mix. You cannot have some existence and some non-existence. You cannot have existence emerging from non-existence or non-existence springing forth from existence. You cannot have existence disappearing into non-existence or non-existence being swallowed by existence. It's all or nothing; one or the other. If existence is true (which patently it is since we exist), there can therefore *never* have been a time when there was non-existence.

Moreover, existence/non-existence are subject to an "Infinity Multiplier." What this means is that if it is possible for one "particle" of existence/existence to have reality then there is no sufficient reason why there should not be an infinite number of such particles. It would be absurd for there to be ten particles of existence, or one thousand and one, or one million and sixty-five thousand and three. There is no sufficient reason why there should be any finite limit, so the Infinity Multiplier immediately and automatically applies. What this means is that the state of existence or non-existence is necessarily infinite in extent. There is not one spatial location that it not filled by either existence or non-existence (of course, strictly speaking, there would be no locations if the latter were true – there wouldn't be anything at all).

Moreover, the Infinity Multiplier applies to time too. If a fundamental particle of existence/non-existence has reality at one instant then that is true for *eternity*.

At this stage, we are talking about time and space in a loose sense. Later in this series, we will show that there is an existent state that is a necessary precursor of physical time and space. This state is outside space and time as they are defined scientifically. Physical time and space are, as we will demonstrate, preceded by mental time and space.

The *First Law of Existence* states that if existence is possible at all then it is necessarily infinite in extent because of the Infinity Multiplier, and it thereby excludes the possibility of non-existence. The *Second Law of Existence*, which is a logical consequence of the first, states that existence can be neither created nor destroyed (it is permanently infinite in extent), only transformed into different manifestations of existence. You can't take a single existing thing out of existence, nor add any new existent to what already exists.

The *hypothetical First Law of Non-Existence* states that if non-existence is possible then it will be infinite in scale spatially and temporally, and so nothing at all will exist – *ever*. The hypothetical *Second Law of Non-Existence* states that non-existence can be neither created nor destroyed: not a single thing can come into existence – *ever*. We say "hypothetical" because if these two laws applied, there would be nothing at all (including the laws themselves – non-existence eats itself, so to speak).

If existence and non-existence were not mutually exclusive states and could be present together, the universe would be an insane place, and organisation and life would be impossible. Huge chunks of existence could suddenly vanish as they were swallowed by patches of non-existence springing out of nowhere. People, planets and galaxies could disappear from existence at any instant. Equally, things could suddenly erupt for no reason from oceans of non-existence. The universe would be chaotic, random and devoid of organisation since nothing organised could emerge in a scenario where all or any part of it could disappear, or indeed

appear, without warning. Existence and non-existence are immiscible. End of story. They cannot mix under any circumstances.

Our own individual existence – the fact that we can say, as Descartes did, “I think therefore I am” – means that we can be certain of several things:

1) By virtue of our own existence, it is proved that non-existence is an impossible state and therefore that there is an *infinity* of existence. The universe of existence has no limits whatever. It stretches to ... infinity. That’s an indisputable rational fact.

2) There is no further point contemplating non-existence. Had this state been true (and hence existence false), we wouldn’t be here to think about it. But it is false now, false in the past and false *forever*. We will later provide a logical mathematical argument to explain why existence is preferred over non-existence, but there was never any time when any “decision” had to be made. Existence has always been true and non-existence always false. Existence is an eternal and indissoluble fact. Existence is the way it is and it can’t be otherwise. Non-existence, as the mutually exclusive “partner” of existence, can be ruled out forever as a subject worthy of our consideration. (A Creator God making existence spring out of non-existence – creating something from nothing – is also logically and permanently refuted. There can be no Abrahamic Creator God, and all Abrahamists are wrong and deluded. That’s a fact.)

3) The fundamental stuff of which we are made – the fundamental stuff of existence – is *eternal*. It is infinitely old and it will endure eternally. It cannot perish. It cannot be annihilated. There is no means to stop it from existing. That, of course, goes for us too – our immortal souls. The existence of immortal souls is just about the surest and most logical concept you can possibly have.

4) The fundamental stuff of existence is capable of producing mind, life and consciousness. We know this for the simple reason that we ourselves are living creatures with conscious minds.

5) There is an infinite amount of this fundamental stuff of existence that can give rise to mind, life and consciousness.

6) The universe of existence is infinite in extent. It does not co-exist with regions of non-existence that limit its scale. It is UNLIMITED in any definition of time and space that we choose to apply. It is everywhere and it is eternal.

7) Whatever this fundamental stuff of existence is, it is ultimately what defines us, our thoughts, our lives and the universe itself. We are the way we are because it is the way it is. Its properties make us. All of our properties are inherent in it.

So, what is the fundamental stuff of existence, the *arche* (to use the ancient Greek term)? Are there infinite, discrete fundamental particles, or is there an infinite, continuous “existence field”? In fact, both are true, and this is a result that chimes perfectly with contemporary physics, which speaks of quantum field theory, mediated by the exchange of quantum particles i.e. fields and particles go together. They are inextricably linked. But while scientists, in accordance with the prevailing ideology of scientific materialism, insist that the fundamental fields and particles are material things, the truth is otherwise. We will show conclusively that they are mental, not physical.

What are the fundamental axioms of existence? Here is an initial set, all of which are intimately connected, and flow one from the other and into each other:

Axiom 1: Non-existence is impossible.

Axiom 2: Existence cannot be created from non-existence and existence cannot disappear into non-existence.

Axiom 3: Existence is everywhere and forever.

Axiom 4: Anything that exists is eternal in terms of its constituents.

Axiom 5: There are no limits on existence, hence it is infinite.

Axiom 6: The universe is infinite.

Axiom 7: Nothing can be added to existence or subtracted from it, but existence can continually transform itself.

Axiom 8: Any transformation of existence must reflect the inherent properties of the fundamental units of existence since otherwise things previously non-existent things would be coming into existence in contradiction of Axiom 1, the fundamental basis of existence. In particular, there is no such thing as EMERGENCE where novel, previously non-existent phenomena are said to be appear as a result of mixing ingredients in certain special ways.

Axiom 9: A key corollary of Axiom 8 is that mind, life and consciousness must already be present in some form in the fundamental units of existence; otherwise, these would have to be treated as non-existents that suddenly came into existence through some miraculous *emergence*, in contradiction of Axiom 1.

Axiom10: The fundamental units of existence are therefore in some sense alive.

Axiom11: The fundamental units of existence are therefore in some sense imbued with mind, and consciousness is a potentiality of mind even if it may be difficult to express it (mind in its basic condition is unconscious; alternatively, we might say that consciousness is the highest expression of unconsciousness, or unconsciousness is the lowest expression – ground state – of consciousness).

Axiom 12: The fundamental units of existence are unconscious or pre-conscious, and consciousness is nothing but a more complex version of the mental processes involved in unconscious or pre-conscious minds i.e. unconsciousness and consciousness exist on a spectrum and are not wholly different states. Consciousness is more advanced, more complex, unconsciousness. Since this is such a key point, we will give an example. A sleepwalking human being is not conscious and yet can walk, talk, and perform complex tasks. The difference between an unconscious and conscious human being is that the latter can reflect on what he is doing and remember it. The actual mental tasks performed may be identical in both cases and indeed there is a great deal of evidence that unconscious acts can be performed more expertly than conscious acts, as in the sporting arena where sportsmen and women often fail when they become overly conscious of what they are doing and leave the “zone” where they had previously been doing things effortlessly (and essentially unconsciously). Consciousness is different in *quality* from unconsciousness, but is not different in *kind*. It’s a more complex and sophisticated version of the same phenomenon. If you think about it, all human beings are continually acting according to unconscious factors as well as conscious ones, and these are seamlessly integrated to provide the appearance of 100% conscious control, when the truth is rather different. But what this means is that consciousness and unconsciousness are not two different “substances”, but the same substance expressed with higher or lower quality, with greater or lesser expression of its inherent potential.

Axiom 13: It follows from Axiom 12 that the universe is capable of performing minded, purposeful, intelligent acts, just like a sleepwalking human being. The universe can be conceived as an unconscious, sleepwalking, living intelligence. It is not stupid, lifeless, mindless robotic, mechanistic and purposeless, as scientific materialism asserts.

Axiom 14: It follows from Axioms 12 and 13 that the universe is inherently teleological: it has purposes that it seeks to fulfil, and above all, it seeks to become conscious as the best means of enacting its purposes.

Axiom 15: It follows from the previous Axioms that the universe is an evolving,

purposeful organism or mind – not a lifeless, clockwork mechanism obeying implacable machine laws, as is so often characterised by scientific materialists.

It may seem that many of these Axioms are at odds with Big Bang theory, which asserts that space and time had a definite beginning some 13.7 billion years in some kind of Creation event. We will show as we proceed how to correctly interpret and understand the Big Bang as part of an infinite series.

“Nothing” versus Non-existence

Perhaps the most misunderstood and problematic concept in human history is the meaning of *nothing* – void, emptiness, vacuum, space.

The ancient Greeks wrestled endlessly with this concept, but they never managed to produce a definition that resolved the issue once and for all. In fact, no clear-cut definition exists to this day in the scientific world. “Nothing” is particularly difficult for scientific materialists because their ideological position of faith (and “faith” is exactly the right word because scientific materialism is effectively a religion) is that only things that have a size (extension, dimensionality) exist. Existence, for a materialist, is revealed by the human senses. It’s all about empiricism – experience, experiment and observation.

A materialist asserts, in effect, that if our senses were sufficiently acute – in particular our vision – we could “see” and detect everything that exists, no matter how small it is. Everything that exists is physical i.e. it is an entity within space and time. It has dimensions. It has one or more of the following attributes: mass, volume, speed, energy, a wavelength, a frequency. All of these attributes are considered to have meaning only in relation to space and time.

If our senses or our physical, scientific equipment can’t in principle detect something then it is, according to scientists, non-sensical to talk of the thing having any kind of existence. A religious entity such as an immaterial and immortal soul that can’t be detected is regarded as superstitious and fanciful nonsense that can’t be taken seriously rationally or logically. Hence, all consistent scientific materialists are atheists. Those scientists who proclaim religious beliefs are fundamentally dishonest and deluded because atheist materialists are absolutely correct that materialism and religion are as mutually exclusive as existence and non-existence. If scientific materialism is true then religion is false. It’s as simple as that. There’s no scope for souls and, without souls, religion is absurd.

In philosophy, materialists and empiricists have waged an intellectual war against the idealists and rationalists.

It’s critical to have a basic understanding of the positions espoused by these four schools of philosophical thinking:

- 1) Materialism
- 2) Empiricism
- 3) Idealism
- 4) Rationalism

Materialism and empiricism are natural partners and drive modern science. Idealism and rationalism are also natural partners and put mind above matter. Idealists and rationalists have effectively been defeated by science since they have been unable to compete with its remarkable successes and its predictive and transformative abilities.

That’s where Illuminism comes into the picture. Illuminism is absolutely located within the tradition of idealism and rationalism but what Illuminists realised was that they must also lay claim to materialism and empiricism by showing that these are just subsets of idealism and rationalism.

Illuminism asserts that scientific materialism is perfect for studying the PHYSICAL universe – that’s what it’s designed for – but hopeless at addressing any of the big questions relating to life, mind, consciousness, God, souls and afterlife. All the primary questions of existence can be answered only within the idealist and rationalist context. We will have proved this to you by the end of this series of books and we will do so using the only possible tool –

mathematics, the queen of the sciences.

Mathematics, unlike science, is not materialistic or empiricist. It is an expression of rationalism *par excellence* and it also absolutely in the tradition of idealism. The mathematical domain is nothing other than the perfect manifestation of Plato's realm of perfect Forms: eternal, immutable, flawless Ideas. Is it not a remarkable thing that mathematics (a tool of ultra Platonic rationalism) is the mainstay of science (a materialist and empiricist ideology)? That ought to have set alarm bells ringing in the loudest possible way for scientific materialists and revealed that there was a catastrophic logical defect in their anti-rationalist approach. But it never has. They have simply ignored this question. In fact, it may never have occurred to them. Scientists in general are staggeringly unphilosophically minded – to their extreme detriment.

Pleroma, Hysterema and Horos

Illuminism is the most advanced expression of the ancient religion of Gnosticism. The Gnostics spoke of a domain of fullness known as the pleroma (from ancient Greek pleroma: “a filling up, fullness”), outside space and time, where the True God existed in the realm of light). There was another domain called hysterema (ancient Greek: “incompletion, insufficiency or inferiority”), the realm of matter, that was deficient and imperfect and ruled over by a counterfeit God called the Demiurge. Separating them was a kind of cosmic veil known as the horos (ancient Greek: “boundary, the limit”) through which only those who have achieved gnosis – full knowledge of things – can pass. If you don’t reach gnosis, you are condemned to the hysterema, the prison universe of the Demiurge. The hysterema is also known as the kenoma (ancient Greek: “the emptiness, the deficiency”), the domain of matter and realm of the Demiurge. The world of matter is evil and empty while the world of light and spirit is intrinsically good and full.

In terms of Kantian philosophy, we might say that the pleroma is the noumenal domain of things as they are in themselves and the hysterema the phenomenal universe of flux, imperfection and illusion. In relation to Platonic philosophy, the pleroma is the perfect and immortal domain of immutable Forms while the hysterema is the transient, perishable, mortal world.

Illuminism equates the pleroma with the mental domain of zero and infinity and the hysterema with the material world. The horos is the extraordinary region in which the mind-matter interface occurs. We might compare it with the event horizon of black holes. Once you pass this horizon, you are irreversibly drawn into the black hole singularity in which space and time vanish and the domain of zero and infinity is entered – matter is converted into mind.

In Gnostic terms, the being that claims to have created the material world is not God but the Devil (the Demiurge). Therefore, Gnostics regard Jehovah/Allah as Satan, and they are split over Jesus Christ, some regarding him as a messenger of the True God come to help humanity escape from the Devil’s material world, and some seeing him as an archon (prince) of the Devil come to exploit, manipulate and deceive humanity, to draw them further into Satan’s power and rule over them. The latter is the position of Illuminism. The Illuminati have contempt for Jews, Muslims and Christians, seeing them as followers of the Devil, and servants of the forces of darkness. They are the ones who will never cross the horos.

Superior world of fullness = pleroma.

World of emptiness = hysterema/kenoma.

Ancient Gnostics believed the world of matter is empty and evil and the world of spiritual things is intrinsically good and full.

The Plenum

Pleroma (ancient Greek) = fullness, completion, whole.

Plenum (Latin) = fullness, full, as opposed to void or empty space.

In ancient Gnostic metaphysics, the Pleroma was understood as the Godhood or the primal ground of being. It was conceived as being both unitary and plural. It consisted of a central power, the Unknown God, and a set of dynamic powers called Aeons. In other words, there is both one God and a company of Gods in the Pleroma: the company of heaven.

In Kabbalistic terms, *Ain Soph Aur* – the Limitless Light – is the equivalent of the Pleroma. The three Veils of “Negative” Existence are called:

Ain: “Nothing”, the Absence of Things.

Ain Soph: “Without Limit”, Infinite Space.

Ain Soph Aur: “Limitless Light”.

Ain and Ain Soph = nothing and infinity (everything).

The clash of these produces a finite positive Idea: Light [*Aur*].

Light is the compromise between nothing and infinity.

The light [*Aur*] is the Universe after Chaos. It is what emerges dialectically from the clash of nothing and everything.

“Horror vacui” – horror of the vacuum, the fear of emptiness. Nature abhors a vacuum.

Plenism: this is the theory first proposed by Aristotle. It states that empty space would always suck in gas or liquids to avoid being empty.

Descartes rejected the possibility of a vacuum on the grounds that if it existed within the extended world, it would be matter and not mind. If it were “nothing”, it would be mind, hence would have no extension and wouldn’t be observable in any way.

It is now generally accepted that a vacuum is NOT non-existence or perfect void. It is a special type of existence devoid of tangible matter.

Existons

What name shall we give to the indestructible fundamental particles of existence? Perhaps we could call them *existons*. However, since they are mental, perhaps we should name them *psychons*. Leibniz called them *monads* – units – but he was well aware that they could be given a far more dramatic and resonant name: *SOULS*.

What could be more astounding? – the universe is made of immortal souls! Souls constitute the actual fabric of existence. Everything is made of souls. Physicists like to say that human beings are made of stardust but the truth is even more remarkable: we are made of “soul dust”. We inhabit Soul World. Souls, far from being the strangest and most inexplicable of things, are the basic “stuff” of existence. They are the least strange them of all, and most fundamental thing of all. Souls, in fact, are the most rationally certain things that exist. Their existence is incontestable because they ARE existence. All that exists are souls and their contents – and they exist in a very precise way: MATHEMATICALLY.

When Descartes first drew a Cartesian graph, little did he know he was drawing Soul World. Each apparently bland, innocuous, abstract mathematical point was actually representing a fundamental unit of existence – a soul. When you TRULY grasp that mathematical points are, ontologically, souls you have understood all. Of course, mathematics is always taught as an abstraction. It is never taught ontologically i.e. numbers are not explained to be frequencies of energy (ontologically numbers ARE energy – who knew?), and, above all, the number zero is not

explained to be a zero-energy “container” for infinite energy i.e. zero always contains infinity; zero energy is, via mathematics, at one and the same time infinite energy; zero contains all numbers; if you “invert” zero (divide by zero), all the numbers of existence pour out. This is the ontological truth of zero; this is zero no longer treated as an abstraction. Zero is the soul – which is why it cannot be detected in the material world, why it cannot be seen, touched, heard, smelled or tasted. Atheists have concluded that the soul is therefore not there at all; they have thereby irrationally turned their backs on the arche – the fundamental stuff of existence.

Souls, it cannot be emphasized enough, are not inherently conscious. When we talk about the universe being full of souls, we do not mean “people”, “personalities” or “consciousnesses”, or anything like that. In fact, it takes an *enormous* effort to render a soul conscious, and it is the process of EVOLUTION that transforms unconscious minds into conscious souls. The whole universe is evolving, but each psychon/ monad evolves at a different rate. A “soul” should really be regarded as a mathematical potentiality that can become mathematically actualised to different degrees.

In chess, a pawn that reaches the other end of the board can be “promoted” to the most powerful chess piece – the Queen (the goddess of chess). The soul is something similar. It is a basic pawn that, if it gets to the other side of a huge and vicious battlefield – the process of “life” itself – it is promoted to the highest piece of all: GOD. We are all pawns, yet, like any pawn, we have it in us to be heroes that cross the widest abysses, achieve the most astounding things, and become divine. But that is the fate of very few pawns. Most muddle along in eternal mediocrity, never understanding their own potential, believing in other gods rather than in their own inner godliness.

In chess, every pawn is a potential queen, yet there is a queen already on the board. Most pawns go through life worshipping the queen that’s already there – the prevailing power – rather than seeking to become queens themselves.

Humanity can be divided into two species: 1) the servile, slavelike pawn species that worships the most powerful thing they can find (the queen, the monarch, the super rich person, the celebrity, the fuehrer, the god) and plods through life in complete mediocrity, or is on its knees worshipping power, and 2) the meritocratic pawn species that is aware of its own remarkable inner potential and sees no reason why, if it’s talented enough, it should not itself become God. The first species is always alienated from God and sees God as inherently external, something they could never be. The second species sees God within themselves and is not in any way alienated from God. God, for them, is internal, not external. They can truly become God, although they recognise that it will be a cosmic journey of adventure and heroism, fraught with terrible danger, upon which they must embark. Just as the humble pawn in chess must traverse a deadly battlefield featuring immensely powerful religious figures (bishops), savage knights, great Lords in their castles (rooks) and monarchy (the king and queen), so must we negotiate our way past all the great powers that oppress us and try to intimidate and destroy us. The pawn’s journey in chess is always the most remarkable. The pawn that crosses the board is the true meritocrat, overcoming the forces of privilege, and showing that he will bow to no one.

Here is something for you to ponder. All of us, the whole of humanity, are remarkable. Unlike almost all souls – which remain locked in unconsciousness – our souls have achieved consciousness. In a contest amongst infinite souls, we are the ones who have MADE IT. We are well on our way to becoming Gods. We have beaten astounding odds to be where we are today.

You may not realise this, but you are already the most stupendous of miracles. You are so miraculous that it is astounding that you are here at all. You may be one in 600 million! Male ejaculate can contain as many as 600 million sperm. Only one of those was you (or, actually, half of you; your father provided the sperm half of you and your mother the egg half of you). All 600

million might have failed to impregnate your mother's egg. Or any of the others – hypothetical brothers or sisters – might have made it instead of you. But, no, you were the one who ventured through the ultimate assault course – because a woman's body regards male sperm as an alien entity that must be destroyed, just like some virulent infection – and you succeeded where all the others failed.

YOU ARE ONE IN SIX HUNDRED MILLION! You have beaten lottery odds. So why are you so humble, so beaten down by life, so cowardly, so willing to accept the shit treatment you get? You are already a remarkable warrior, you are already a god who has achieved greater than the feats of any of the most legendary heroes. Achilles was nothing compared with you. Artemis could never have done what you did.

Live up to what you have already achieved. Make your life the reflection of the supreme struggle you endured and over which you have triumphed. **REMEMBER, ONE IN SIX HUNDRED MILLION!!!** Now you must do the same thing in this world of seven billions souls. Can you be one of the top ten human beings who shape human destiny? **WHY NOT?** Who's holding you back except yourself?

We all belong to the lucky sperm club. We have all beaten staggering odds.

The Alternative Big Bang Theory

What is the arche? In mathematical terms, it is an infinite set of dimensionless points. In philosophical terms, it is an infinite number of transcendental egos/selves/monads/unconscious minds. In religious terms, it is an infinite number of unrealised souls waiting to become conscious; potential souls striving to become actual.

(Scientific materialism denies the existence of points that exist outside space and time, hence science searches for tiny, indivisible 1-dimensional strings that *do* exist in space and time.)

Mathematically, before the Big Bang, all of these dimensionless points existed together as a single point. We can define this state mathematically by using the “Dirac Delta Function”.

Wikipedia describes it thus: The Dirac delta function, or δ function, is (informally) a generalized function on the real number line that is zero everywhere except at zero, with an integral of one over the entire real line. The delta function is sometimes thought of as an infinitely high, infinitely thin spike at the origin, with total area one under the spike, and physically represents an idealized point mass or point charge. Theoretical physicist Paul Dirac introduced it. In the context of signal processing, it is often referred to as the unit impulse symbol (or function). . . . The Dirac delta function is the limit (in the sense of distributions) of a particular sequence of Gaussians.”

The Dirac delta function assigns a value of zero to the function at all points other than one, at which it has an infinite value. It is defined as having an integral of one. We can interpret this on a cosmic scale as meaning that it contains ALL of existence. This is the monadic SINGULARITY.

Philosophically, this function is a Monad comprised of infinite monads, or an Absolute Ego comprised of infinite egos. It is Hegel’s Geist (mind/spirit) in its most basic state. It is Kant’s noumenal universe. It is the noumenal Will of Schopenhauer.

Religiously, we might call the single point – the origin described by the Delta function – the God Point or the Genesis Singularity. It is the Neoplatonic “One”, the ground of all existence, the source of All. In Gnosticism, it is the pleroma, the fullness, the kingdom of pure light, uncontaminated by any matter. In Kabbalah, this God Point contains the three roots of the Tree of Life which are hidden behind the Veils of the “great unmanifested”. They are 1) Ain = The Absolute Nothing, 2) Ain Soph = The Unlimited, Limitless, or Infinite Abundance and 3) The Ain Soph Aur = The Unlimited Light. These are said to be an eternal mystery, beyond our level of consciousness and understanding. This God Point can also be described as the Kabbalistic Aleph, the point that contains all other points, the “primordial one that contains all numbers”.

It is pure Mind. Some people call it Inner Space or Hyperspace. It is not a consciousness. Yet it feels, it experiences, it has thoughts, it has a will. Above all, it has a drive to actualise itself, to transform infinite potential into infinite actualisation – to become perfectly conscious, to become God.

In physics, all fundamental particles are classed according to two categories: bosons and fermions. An infinite number of bosons can exist in the same state. As for fermions, no two fermions can occupy the same state i.e. they are subject to an Exclusion Principle. All fermions are necessarily unique. It’s hard to emphasize how important this point is. Fermions are the basis of the philosophical principle of individuation – how one thing is distinguished from another. Fermions underpin space and time – the domain of individual things. If there were no fermions, the universe would consist of nothing but bosons occupying the same state – an immaterial state outside space and time, hence a mental state! (Mainstream scientists are obliged to deny this

since they deny dimensionless existence.)

Quick summary:

Two types of particles:

BOSONS = UNINDIVIDUATED

FERMIONS = INDIVIDUATED

Fermions differ from bosons in that the fermions obey an **EXCLUSION PRINCIPLE** and bosons do not. Fermions avoid each other. Bosons crowd together as much as possible.

Everything is a boson until it experiences the exclusion principle and is converted into a fermion. We can imagine evolution as a process of conversion of unindividuated bosons into individuated fermions.

What are space and time? They constitute the domain in which indistinguishable monadic bosons are converted into individuated monadic fermions. Individuated monadic fermions provide the essential platform for the physical universe.

The Big Bang heralded the beginning of the process for making monadic bosons into fermions. Moreover, the Big Bang is not an event that has finished. It is ongoing! The conversion of a bosonic monad to a fermionic monad is the key process of existence. If this could not happen, existence would never have become meaningful. This process is **ENTIRELY** a mathematical phenomenon, hence existence is wholly mathematical.

What Constitutes Existence?

Many philosophers and religious thinkers have proposed endless ways to describe the basic nature of existence. So, let's play the God Game. If you were God, which of the following options would you have chosen? We shall take an incredible tour of the multitude of options available to God.

Materialism: "The world ... is corporeal, that is to say, body ... and every part of the universe is body, and that which is not body is no part of the universe." – Thomas Hobbes

Idealism: Everything is mental; the material world is ultimately mental.

Panpsychism: all matter has a mental aspect; mind is everywhere; all entities have a unified centre of experience; all entities have their own unique point of view (perspective); all parts of matter involve mind, or more holistically, the whole universe is an organism that possesses a mind; the idea that all matter is imbued with some (greater or lesser) form of consciousness.

The distinction between idealism and panpsychism is that the latter treats everything as mind or as containing mind whereas the former treats things as *content* of the mind. In panpsychism, a rock, for example, has a mind (albeit rudimentary and unconscious) whereas in idealism, a rock has no independent material existence but is merely a mental phenomenon – an idea in a mind. In panpsychism, a rock doesn't vanish if the mind perceiving it dies. In idealism, the rock is dependent in the mind's perception of it, so "dies" when the mind dies. In other words, panpsychism allows for the objective existence of things whereas idealism is purely subjective (all apparently objective things are contained within subjective minds, and do not exist without the subjective minds that sustain them).

Illuminism agrees with idealism that mind and not matter is the basis of reality, but Illuminism is fundamentally an expression of panpsychism.

"Panpsychism is the view that the basic physical constituents of the universe have mental properties" -- Thomas Nagel

Dualism: the view that mind and matter have independent existence and neither is reliant on the other or originates from the other.

Panpsychism is sometimes seen as dualist since it attributes mind to matter, thus acknowledging the objective existence of matter, and regards everything as having both mental and physical properties. In Illuminism, mind and matter are both mathematical and matter is in some sense "solid" mind i.e. matter is an expression of mind. It has different mathematical characteristics: above all the number zero is excluded from material existence yet defines mental existence.

"In the matter of consciousness, the position of Empedocles may be defined as a rigorous panpsychism. In his view, which seems to be shared to some degree by most early Greek thinkers, the faculty of feeling, perception, and thought does not constitute a prerogative of men and animals, but is assumed to be distributed generally throughout the natural world. From this point of view, there is really no such thing as inanimate nature. The character of any object is conceived of as a vital urge that may be described in terms of thought and volition. This conception is analogous to the 'animism' which is said to characterise the attitude of many primitive peoples in their dealings with nature. But the animism of Empedocles is scarcely primitive: it is explicitly formulated as a philosophic principle. He ends the poem *On Nature* with a warning to his friend Pausanias that *the truths communicated must be carefully borne in mind, or else they will leave you all at once, when their times come round, yearning after their fellows,*

to return to their own dear kind; for know that all things have intelligence and a share in thought. This statement implies a systematic parallelism between physical objects and mental conceptions. Not only does everything have a share in thought, but every thought is treated like a thing. Apparently Empedocles recognizes no radical distinction between the two, for the constituents of the physical world and our perception of this world are described in the same terms:

*By earth we behold earth, by water water,
by air bright air, by fire, ravaging fire,
love by love and strife by gloomy strife.*

*For out of these are all things compounded and fitted together
and with these do they think and feel pleasure and pain."*

-- *Essays in Ancient Greek Philosophy*, Edited by John P. Anton with George L. Kustas
Reductive panpsychism reduces all material properties to mind.

Reductive physicalism does the opposite and reduces everything to matter. Reductive physicalism is essentially materialism: everything in the world can be reduced analytically to its fundamental physical, or material, basis. All mental states and processes can be reduced to physical states and processes. All organic and inorganic processes can be explained by reference to the laws of physical nature.

Illuminism, on the other hand, reduces everything, mental and material, to mathematics and asserts that all organic and inorganic processes can be explained with regard to mathematical laws of existence.

Neutral monism: this is the view that the mental and the material are two different perspectives of the same underlying thing, which is itself "neutral" i.e. neither physical nor mental. So, this stance rejects the view that the mental and the physical are two fundamentally different things and asserts that there is only one fundamental "stuff" in the universe (hence why it's a monism). Neutral monism was first propounded by Spinoza who proposed that mind and matter were two attributes of God (the underlying monism), although Spinoza's view might better be called dual-aspect monism:

"In strict parlance, neutral monism should be distinguished from dual-aspect monism, which holds that all existence consists of one kind (hence monism) of primal substance, which in itself is neither mental nor physical, but is capable of distinct mental and physical aspects or attributes that are two faces of the same underlying reality in the one substance. ... The theory's relationship to neutral monism is ill-defined, but one proffered distinction says that whereas neutral monism allows the context of a given group of neutral elements to determine whether the group is mental, physical, both, or neither, double-aspect theory requires the mental and the physical to be inseparable and irreducible (though distinct)." -- Wikipedia

Schopenhauer, like Spinoza, is a dual-aspect monist. In Schopenhauer's philosophy, there is only one substance (Will), but it manifests itself physically (phenomenally) and mentally (noumenally), with each being the flip side of the other.

Illuminism might be considered a dual-aspect monism. Mathematics is the ground of existence (the monism) and takes the form of infinite mathematical points, inbuilt with the laws of mathematics. Since a monad is a rudimentary mind, mind and mathematics are intimately connected. Mind can be considered as subjective mathematics – how it feels to be a mathematical entity; the inside perspective; the inner experience – while matter is objective mathematics, subject to the laws of what humanity calls science. Subjective mathematics is the *within* of mathematics while objective mathematics is the *without*.

It is a primary axiom of Illuminism that all of the fundamental units of existence are subjective when experienced internally and objective when viewed externally. Everything is a subject to itself, but an object to everything else. If a subject acquires a body (as in a human

being) then that constitutes its objective presence in the world, while the mind is its subjective presence.

William James also developed a neutral monist view, and is perhaps the classic expression of that view. Bertrand Russell said, "James's view is that the raw material out of which the world is built up is not of two sorts, one matter and the other mind, but that it is arranged in different patterns by its inter-relations, and that some arrangements may be called mental, while others may be called physical."

Panpsychism can be readily combined with neutral monism. Illuminism is the stance that mathematics is the basis of mind and matter, hence mathematics is the neutral monism in that sense. Each mathematical point is regarded both as a unique mind and as fundamental building block of the material world. (Many of these definitions flow in and out of each other or form a continuum rather than clear-cut distinctions.)

Holism: the view that the whole Universe is an organism that possesses a mind. Equivalent to a certain view of panpsychism.

Animism (from Latin *anima* "soul, life, mind, breath"; similar in concept to Greek words such as *psyche* and *pneuma*): the view that all things have a soul; all animate and inanimate objects possess individual, innate souls; the hypothesis first advanced by Pythagoras and later promoted by Plato that an immaterial force animates the universe (the World Soul).

Animism is the belief that non-human entities are spiritual beings, or embody a life-principle. In this view, there is no separation between the spiritual and physical worlds. Souls/spirits exist not just in humans, but also in all other animals, plants, rocks, and all natural phenomena. Thunder and lightning have souls. Mountains, rivers, woods, stars, planets, galaxies, black holes – they all have souls. The universe is a vast network of ensouled creatures. Personalized supernatural beings (or souls) occupy all objects and govern their existence. Just as a human body is said to have a soul, all bodies of any type at all (including inorganic bodies) also have souls, although of very different mental character. Animism is the view that spirits inhabit the universe in all of its parts.

Extreme animism attributes souls even to abstractions such as words, true names (which have tremendous power in the occult world), and mythological symbols. Shinto, Hinduism, Buddhism, Taoism, Pantheism and Neopaganism all have significant animistic tendencies.

Illuminism is a type of animism since it teaches that living (but unconscious) monads are the source of everything in the world. However, while animism assigns consciousness to all things, Illuminism does not. Illuminism is about the unconscious mind evolving towards consciousness as its highest manifestation.

In Illuminism, unconscious monads are the building blocks of existence. Existence is predicated on fundamental units of mathematical life. Ontological mathematics is alive. All mathematical functions and signals produce an inner experience in the living monads affected by them.

Animism was the first religious system conceived by the human mind and, when equated with ontological mathematics, becomes supremely powerful. However, when associated with primitive beliefs and superstitions, it degenerates into the monotheistic Abrahamic system that there is one single and all-unifying animating force in the universe – God, the Creator.

Abrahamism is animism taken to its extreme position in terms of conscious design of the universe. Illuminism is animism taken to its extreme position in terms of unconscious, teleological evolution of the universe.

Science disregards animism completely, and is thereby incapable of explaining how life comes from non-life. It should be noted that life/non-life dualism is just another way of talking about the mind-body problem. Life and mind are effectively synonymous. You are alive if you

have a mind, even if that mind is rudimentary and unconscious. Illuminism solves mind-body dualism by demonstrating that the body originates in mind (i.e. there is no separate material world). It solves the life/non-life problem by demonstrating that everything is alive (i.e. there's no kingdom of dead things that are somehow assembled like Frankenstein's monster into living beings). Existence MUST be monistic. There can be no existential dualism.

Science claims to be a monistic materialism, but philosophically it is radically dualistic since it cannot offer any viable mechanism to account for how mind comes from non-mind or life from non-life. Although science claims that life and mind are materialistic phenomena that originate in more elemental materialistic phenomena, in reality the gulf between mind and non-mind and life and non-life is infinite.

Descartes' philosophy failed because of its dualism. Either matter must be fully explained by mind, or mind by matter. Illuminism is the proof that matter is ultimately mental and not physical. Science, on the other hand, has wholly failed to prove that mind is ultimately material.

Animatism: all animate and inanimate objects are infused with a *single* common life force; ascribing consciousness to animate and inanimate objects; the belief that inanimate objects and nature have a consciousness and personality, but not an individual spirit. (Animism on the other hand is the belief that inanimate objects and nature have a consciousness and personality AND an individual rather than collective spirit/soul.)

Totemism (from the Ojibwa word *ototeman*, meaning "one's brother-sister kin"): the belief that humans have kinship or a mystical bond with a spirit-being, such as an animal, a plant, a geographical feature e.g. a mountain, stream, plain, forest or cave. The entity – the totem – interacts with a given kin group or an individual, serving as their emblem or symbol and offering them protection, health, happiness, assistance and abundance if they do right by it. Totemism is a personalised form of animism.

Hylozoism (from the ancient Greek *hyle* (matter, literally wood) and *zoe* (life, alive, living)): the philosophical doctrine that all material things possess life; the view that all things have a soul or are alive; the doctrine that life is a property or derivative of matter, or that life and matter are inseparable; the view that all matter (including the universe as a whole) is in some sense alive. "Inanimate" matter has latent powers of *abiogenesis* (how living things arise from non-living material).

Hylozoism was a doctrine of early Greek philosophy that all matter has life, that life is inseparable from matter, that all matter is intrinsically linked with life, that the material universe is essentially alive.

Hylozoism ("matter possessing life") and panpsychism ("mind in everything, including matter") have much in common. The first stresses the importance of matter – there can be no life without matter; living matter can exist without mind. The second stresses the importance of mind – there can be no life without mind; living mind can exist without matter. Animism – the idea that all matter is possessed of "spirits" – is another variation.

Hylozoism tends to describe a single life-force pervading matter, while animism points to many independent life forces within matter, and panpsychism can go either way. Stoicism was rather hylozoistic. Aristotle's philosophy was midway between hylozoism and animism, with "form" taking the role of the spirit that inhabited matter.

In contrast with modern scientific materialism, hylozoism asserted that life was a basic feature of matter. In scientific materialism, mechanistic scientific laws replace the "life" in matter. With Descartes, science became mechanistic (hylozoism was killed off) and life was transferred to a separate mental domain. Previously, matter and mind had always been directly connected. After Descartes, they were completely separate and it wasn't clear at all how they could interact. Thus it was Descartes who fully gave birth to scientific materialism, though that

was never his intention. He was a great champion of the soul, but that part of his thinking was simply dismissed by the scientific materialists.

Thales, the first recognisable philosopher, taught that water was the arche, the basic substance of existence, and that all things were “full of gods”. Putting the two together, we arrive at the position of hylozoism that matter (water) is alive (“full of gods”). Thales’s position can also be viewed in terms of panpsychism – mind is in all things – and animism – everything is alive and possessed of individual spirits (“full of gods”). Thales was clearly no scientific materialist i.e. those who believe that life and mind are “emergent” properties of matter, but are not actually inherent in matter.

Philosophically, strong emergentism amounts to stating that in the case of two radically different substances – such as Cartesian mind and matter – one can miraculously “emerge” from the other even though their definitions preclude this. The supporters of “emergence” tend to treat mind on a similar footing to something like the taste of salt (this taste being something that emerges unexpectedly from the combination of sodium and chlorine). However, taste is itself a subjective property dependent on a subject (a mind!) capable of experiencing it i.e. sensory experience is in fact strong evidence that mind and not matter is primary.

Anaximenes of Miletus regarded air as the universal animating principle (i.e. full of life/mind/spirit). Heraclitus taught that it was fire (or energy as we might say today). The Stoics believed that a rational “world soul” (Logos) informed all things in the world.

With Anaxagoras, a subtle change takes place. Wikipedia describes his position in this way: “All things have existed from the beginning. But originally they existed in infinitesimally small fragments of themselves, endless in number and inextricably combined. All things existed in this mass, but in a confused and indistinguishable form. There were the seeds (spermata) or miniatures of wheat and flesh and gold in the primitive mixture; but these parts, of like nature with their wholes, had to be eliminated from the complex mass before they could receive a definite name and character. Mind arranged the segregation of like from unlike. This peculiar thing, called Mind (Nous), was no less illimitable than the chaotic mass, but, unlike the logos of Heraclitus, it stood pure and independent, a thing of finer texture, alike in all its manifestations and everywhere the same. This subtle agent, possessed of all knowledge and power, is especially seen ruling in all the forms of life.”

Here we see the idea that mind is the purest form of matter and controls less pure matter (i.e. there are now essentially two types of matter: active and passive, with the active dictating to the passive); mind has started to subtly separate from matter. With Plato, they are completely separate and matter has become the lowest form of existence and represents a kind of evil since it is capable of trapping mind and making it do irrational things.

So, mind (life) and matter were once regarded as one, but gradually they started to be treated as somewhat separate until, with Descartes, their difference was radical and rendered mathematically precise: non-extension (mind) versus extension (matter). Idealists then treated mind as the true reality while materialists made matter the true reality. Marxist dialectical materialism represents a kind of halfway house because matter is given a teleological spin. With Marx we have almost headed back to ancient Greek hylozoism – living, purposeful matter.

Ernst Heinrich Haeckel developed a form of hylozoism that erased the distinction between living and non-living things. He argued that they are essentially the same and behave according to a single set of laws.

In Illuminism, mind and matter obey a single set of laws – the mathematical set. Any system that relies on separate laws for mind and matter immediately runs into problems of dualism. How do these separate and distinct laws allow mind-body interaction? No such difficulty arises in Illuminism since mathematics handles everything.

Like Anaxagoras, the Stoics, who were heavily influenced by Aristotle, taught that material bodies are made up of two principles: a passive principle (matter) and an active principle (form – or mind as we might say). Form was itself corporeal, composed of the finest matter (pneuma). In Stoicism, pneuma was once known as the “*pyr technikon*” – the creative or fashioning fire that could be equated with God (Zeus) himself. That is, God is an inherently creative energy present throughout the universe, animating everything and ruling it according to divine reason (Logos).

Wikipedia notes that Spinoza’s form of idealism also tends towards hylozoism: “Seeking a balance between matter and mind, Spinoza combined materialistic with pantheistic hylozoism, reducing both matter and mind to mere attributes of one infinite substance. Although he specifically rejected identity in inorganic matter, he, like the Cambridge Platonists, perceived a life force within, as well as beyond, all matter.”

Scientific hylozoism: In contrast to the purely mechanistic scientific materialist view of the world, Spencer, Lotze, and Haeckel developed the concept of a unifying life force which animates all of nature. Haeckel proposed a unity of organic and inorganic nature and attributed all actions of both types of matter to natural causes and laws. His definition of hylozoism removed the clear distinction between living and non-living things.

Hylopathism: the attribution of sentience to all matter. It is said that “whatever it is about the brain that gives rise to consciousness, must necessarily be present to some degree in any other material thing.” Hylopathism relates to “whatever underlies consciousness in a material sense”. It is thus a materialistic version of panpsychism. It is closely linked to hylozoism.

Hylotheism: the doctrine that matter is God, or that there is no God beyond matter and the universe (which is similar to pantheism).

Stoicism: the Stoics held a view of God reminiscent of that of Heraclitus. God was both Fire (active energy) and Logos (reason), diffused throughout the universe. The Stoics believed that what God is for the universe, the soul is for man i.e. a human being is the universe on a small scale: a microcosm. Man is an image of God. Of course, if the rational laws of the universe are present in the individual, he can then work out the laws of the whole universe. In Leibniz’s *Monadology*, the whole universe can be understood on the basis of a single monad.

In Stoicism, God is the Soul of the World and the World is a living organism. God fills and penetrates it and rationally rules every part of it. The human soul is a “fragment of the universal divine force, yet not completely sundered from the parent-stock” i.e. we are all part of God.

The City of Zeus: the perfect city, ruled according to perfect reason. All citizens work in perfect rational harmony, striving towards the common good.

For the Stoics, the human soul (*pneuma psychikon*) is a mixture of air and fire (*pneuma*). This mixture is highly refined (similar to aether); it’s “vital heat”. The pneuma permeating the human body is a portion of the divine pneuma that permeates and rules the cosmos. The human soul is therefore a portion of God within us. We are all part of God, and we are all endowed with God’s reason and intelligence – if we did but put our minds to it.

Pandeism (from Ancient Greek: pan “all” and Latin: deus “God”, in the sense of deism): the view that the Creator of the Universe *became* the Universe, thereby ceasing to exist as a separate and conscious entity. The universe is God as an *unconsciousness*. God created the universe by *becoming* the universe. Pandeism says that God created the universe then disappeared into it (hence why he does not seem to interact with the universe even though he created it – he has actually become it). Whereas pantheism eternally equates God and Nature (so there is no concept of the universe being created and nor does the pantheistic universe seem to have any particular purpose since it is merely the continual unfolding of the laws of Nature),

pandeism maintains that God was once separate from Nature and, indeed, was its Creator. He became one with nature because he is a rational God of laws rather than a God of feelings and personal intervention in events. Nature was, in this view, the rational means for God to maximise his rational self-expression. We should not imagine God before Creation as a conscious, feeling Creator in the manner of the Abrahamic God. Rather he was a kind of rational force seeking to convert his own rational potential into rational actuality, and Nature, based on rational laws, fulfils that function. The view of the ancient Stoics was somewhat pandeistic.

Pantheism (from the Greek (pan) meaning “all” and the Greek (theos) meaning “God”): the view that the Universe (Nature) and God (divinity) are identical. Pantheists do not believe in a personal, anthropomorphic or Creator God. The cosmos is conceived as an all-encompassing unity and Nature is held sacred.

Just as theism involves a more personal God than deism, pantheism invites us to believe we are immersed in God through Nature (and can “feel” him) while pandeism suggests that God is more remote and abstract and can be “reached” only rationally through understanding the laws of Nature.

The spiral, an extremely common and profound shape in nature, is the designated symbol of pantheists. The spiral arms of a galaxy and the spiral structure of the nautilus shell (which embodies the Fibonacci series and the golden ratio) reveal the link and unity between the physical cosmos and the biological cosmos. The spiral (or helix) symbolises evolution, eternity, spirituality, growth, DNA and the dialectic.

Spiral: describes a circular pathway evolving in time through space. Whereas a spiral has an increasing or decreasing diameter along the medial axis of the spiral, the diameter of a helix (such as a DNA molecule) is uniformly constant. A spiral is associated with a winding pattern around a cone, while a helix involves a winding pattern around a cylinder. A helix can be considered a special case of a spiral.

Panentheism. While in pantheism, God is identical with the universe, in panentheism God lies within and also beyond (or outside) the universe. He is both immanent, interpenetrating every part of Nature, and transcendent. In panentheism, the whole is greater than the sum of the parts. For pantheism, God is not a distinct being and is synonymous with the universe. Panentheism, on the other hand, is an extension of pandeism. In panentheism, God creates the universe and is fully immersed in it, but remains distinct from it, while being changed by it as it evolves. If it evolves, so does he because he is the Whole, and always greater than the sum of the parts. As the parts improve, so does the whole.

In pantheism, God is the whole; in panentheism, the whole is *in* God. In pantheism, God and the universe are ontologically equivalent; in panentheism, they are ontologically distinct.

In panentheism, God (or, more accurately, Gods) is the eternal animating force behind the universe, but is initially unconscious and must come to consciousness through evolution (and consciousness in fact requires a multiplicity of Gods). The physical universe is the manifest part of God (God revealed), but he is also an unseen mind (God hidden).

Hinduism can be considered from both pantheistic and panentheistic perspectives (often, such ideas flow into each other and can't be clearly separated.) Abrahamism is opposed to both. It is anti-evolutionary and posits the absurd idea of an eternally conscious perfect and all-powerful being, and thereby generates innumerable logical problems that deter all rational people.

Hegel has often been called a panentheist and, indeed, Illuminism is highly receptive to the idea of panentheism providing it involves a non-conscious God coming to consciousness via the evolution of the universe, or a non-conscious universe giving rise, through evolution, to something greater than the sum of its parts – God (just as all the “parts” of the Earth gave rise to

something vastly better than a barren rock hurtling through space: they create humanity, Earth's consciousness).

Pansophy (from the ancient Greek *pan*, "all", and *sophia*, "wisdom") means "all wisdom" – universal knowledge or wisdom; a system or work embracing all knowledge. The Illuminati have always aimed to create a pansophy and Leibniz and Hegel were consumed by this task. Their philosophies are two of the great wonders of the world. Yet the undeniable pansophy is mathematics itself.

Divine Suicide?

God's Debris: A Thought Experiment is a 2001 novella by *Dilbert* creator Scott Adams.

"*God's Debris* espouses a philosophy based on the idea that the simplest explanation tends to be the best (a corruption of Occam's Razor). It surmises that an omnipotent God annihilated himself in the Big Bang, because an omniscient God would already know everything possible except his own lack of existence, and exists now as the smallest units of matter and the law of probability, or 'God's debris', hence the title. ... God is currently reassembling himself through the ongoing formation of a collective intelligence in the form of the human race, modern examples of which include the development of the Internet; this is related to the idea of the Omega Point." – Wikipedia

Henotheism: "(ancient Greek *heis theos* "one god") is the belief and worship of a single god while accepting the existence or possible existence of other deities. The term was originally coined by Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling (1775–1854) to depict early stages of monotheism, however Max Müller (1823–1900), a German philologist and orientalist, brought the term into common usage. Müller made the term central to his criticism of Western theological and religious exceptionalism (relative to Eastern religions), focusing on a cultural dogma which held "monotheism" to be both fundamentally well-defined and inherently superior to differing conceptions of God." -- Wikipedia

Hinduism is henotheistic. Each Hindu typically worships one God of the Hindu pantheon, while respecting all of the others. No Hindu objects to what Hindu God another Hindu worships. All Gods are equal in dignity. Similarly, each ancient Greek typically revered one of the Olympians, while taking care not to offend the others. There were temples, shrines and oracles for all the Gods. Zeus as the supreme ruler of the gods was worshipped by all, but usually less intensely than one of the other Gods, who had their own devoted sects.

It has also been claimed that the earliest Israelites were henotheists: they acknowledged other gods as valid, but chose to regard the Hebrew God as the supreme deity.

Monolatry (from ancient Greek "monos" = single and "latreia" = worship): the recognition of the existence of many gods, but with the consistent worship of only one deity. Judaism evolved from polytheism to monolatry to monotheism.

Monolatry is a more extreme version of henotheism. While acknowledging the existence of other gods, it is opposed to worshipping any God other than the particular God of the tribe. The Jews, for example, may have accepted the Canaanite Gods as real, but warned Jews to worship only the Jewish God. This mutated in time to the monotheistic stance that there was only one God and he was Jewish.

Monolatrists might acknowledge the Devil as equal in power to God, but prohibit all worship of the Devil. Zoroastrianism and Manichaeism are of this ilk.

The Amarna period of Egyptian history concerning Pharaoh Akhenaten and his queen Nefertiti, is often described as monotheistic, but Monolatry fits better since Akhenaten didn't explicitly deny the existence of all the other gods.

Where henotheism is tolerant towards different gods, monolatry is intolerant (Jehovah, as portrayed in the Old Testament, is himself essentially monolatristic since he is obsessed with

Jews worshipping other gods – if he were monotheistic he wouldn't talk about other gods since, of course, no other gods exist in monotheism), and monotheism denies the existence of other gods.

Both henotheism and monolatry could be described as polytheisms with a monotheistic tendency. Monolatry is particularly likely to mutate into outright monotheism (as in Abrahamism), while henotheism can remain a stable polytheism, as in Hinduism.

Henotheism has been called *inclusive* monotheism or monarchical polytheism (i.e. one God is supreme, or is chosen above the others). Monolatry and henotheism are a cross between monotheism and polytheism, with the former being stricter than the latter. The monolatrists will worship only one God whereas the henotheist might worship one God as supreme and then worship other gods according to his own tastes. Henotheism is thus closer to polytheism than monolatry.

Monotheism is completely intolerant of other Gods and dismisses their existence.

Monolatry is intolerant of other Gods, but acknowledges their existence.

Henotheism acknowledges the existence of other Gods and tolerates their worship; in fact, it regards such worship as equally valid.

Transtheism: a system of thought or religious philosophy which is neither theistic nor atheistic but is beyond both of them. Jainism is theistic to the extent that it accepts the existence of gods, but these are not the highest spiritual reality. They are transcended via moksha (enlightenment). This means that theism is downplayed, but not in an atheistic sense. What we are left with is something that transcends gods but does not reject gods or the highest spiritual possibilities, so it is transtheistic.

It has been suggested that ancient Romano-Greek Stoicism is a basic religious attitude that can be interpreted in theistic, atheistic, or transtheistic forms. Illuminism could be regarded in much the same way.

Apatheism: “(a portmanteau of apathy and theism/atheism), also known as pragmatic atheism or (critically) as practical atheism, is acting with apathy, disregard, or lack of interest towards belief or lack of belief in a deity. Apatheism describes the manner of acting towards a belief or lack of a belief in a deity, so applies to both theism and atheism. An apatheist is also someone who is not interested in accepting or denying any claims that gods exist or do not exist. In other words, an apatheist is someone who considers the question of the existence of gods as neither meaningful nor relevant to his or her life.” -- Wikipedia

Tirthankara (“ford-maker”), also known as *jina*, “one who overcomes”. In Jainism, a Tirthankara is a human being who has overcome all soul-constraining karmas and achieved liberation and enlightenment. However, rather than accept his reward in paradise, he has chosen to become a role model and leader for those seeking spiritual guidance. At the end of his human life span, a Tirthankara achieves “siddha” status, thus ending his cycle of infinite births and deaths. Tirthankaras are described as transtheistic because they have passed “beyond the godly governors of the natural order”. In another sense, they themselves have become the gods.

Jains do not believe that there are currently any living Tirthankaras on the Earth. The last was Mahavira (“Great Hero”), who attained omniscience around 2,500 years ago. That said, the universe is never devoid of living Tirthankaras at any point of time, so they are therefore present in other parts of the universe. As in Illuminism, Jainism asserts that time has no beginning or end; it moves like the “wheel of a cart”.

Buddhism has also been called transtheistic. It is definitely not a form of atheism, as many people believe. It has been suggested that “transpolytheistic” would be a better description. Polytheistic gods are not denied or rejected in systems such as Jainism and Buddhism, even if, as in Buddhism, they are transcended by an impersonal Absolute. The Absolute is in some sense the

“God above God(s)” or the impersonal ultimate over the personal ultimate. The Absolute transcends the personal.

In the West, Absolute monotheism did not “transcend” polytheism but simply abolished it.

In Hinduism, the various gods were never elevated to the status of Brahman (the Absolute), but had roles not dissimilar to Western archangels.

Siddhas

In Jainism, Siddhas are liberated souls that have reached the ultimate state of salvation and freedom – moksha. They do not have any karmas and nor do they collect any new karmas. They are bodiless, formless and have no passions. Therefore, they are free from all karmic temptations.

Siddhas have eight specific characteristics or qualities:

- 1) infinite knowledge.
- 2) infinite vision or wisdom.
- 3) infinite power.
- 4) infinite bliss.
- 5) Are without name.
- 6) Are without association to any caste.
- 7) Have infinite life span.
- 8) And undergo no change.

A Siddha has therefore become God.

This is extremely similar to Illuminist teachings. Simon Magus constitutes one who has become God.

A Siddha means “one who is accomplished” and refers to perfected masters who have transcended the *ahamkara* (ego or I-maker) and have transformed their bodies from dense matter into aetherial substance: they have become soul in its purest form. They reside in *Siddha-shila* which is situated at the top of the Universe. In terms of the Earth, it sounds rather like the fictional Himalayan valley of *Shangri-La* (said to be based on the Tibetan mystical kingdom of *Shambhala*). It also resembles *Siddhashrama* (from Hindu theology), a secret land deep in the Himalayas where great mystics and gurus live. The Siddhas, the liberated souls who will never take birth again stay at Siddha-shila for eternity.

Hindus also speak of a transcendent place called *siddhaloka* where perfected beings (Siddhas) are born and are naturally endowed with the eight primary siddhis. Siddhi is a Sanskrit noun meaning “perfection”, “accomplishment”, “attainment”, or “success”. Therefore a siddhi is a perfect skill, faculty or capability, which one acquires after paying off all karmic debts (as a legal term, it refers to the settlement of a debt). In its purest form, siddhi means “the attainment of flawless identity with Reality (Brahman); perfection of Spirit.”

Siddhis are usually associated with supernatural powers and magic, involving such things as clairvoyance, levitation, bilocation, becoming as small as an atom or as large as the universe, materialization and dematerialization (teleporting), accessing memories of past lives, knowing everything and remembering everything etc.

The eight primary siddhis are (from Wikipedia):

- 1) Reducing one’s body even to the size of an atom.
- 2) Expanding one’s body to an infinitely large size.
- 3) Becoming infinitely heavy.
- 4) Becoming weightless.
- 5) Having unrestricted access to all places.

- 6) Accomplishing whatever one desires at will.
- 7) Possessing absolute lordship.
- 8) Possessing the power to subjugate all enemies.

There are ten secondary siddhis and these are:

- 1) Being undisturbed by hunger, thirst, and other bodily disturbances.
- 2) Hearing things infinitely far away.
- 3) Seeing things infinitely far away.
- 4) Moving the body wherever thought goes (teleportation).
- 5) Assuming any form desired (shape shifting).
- 6) Entering the bodies of others (possession).
- 7) Dying when one desires.
- 8) Witnessing and participating in the pastimes of the gods.
- 9) Perfect accomplishment of any task embarked upon.
- 10) All orders or commands are carried out effortlessly, with no resistance at all.

In some systems, there are five other siddhis:

- 1) Knowing the past, present and future.
- 2) Perfect tolerance of heat, cold and other dualities.
- 3) Knowing the minds of others.
- 4) Being completely aware of the influence of fire, sun, water, poison, and so on.
- 5) Never being conquered by others.

A Siddha can be defined as one who has attained all the siddhis, or just one. Paranormal abilities – siddhis – are said to emerge naturally as an individual advances along the path to siddhahood. He acquires more and more, of ever-increasing power, as he gets closer to his final destination – *divinity*. The gods are those who have already acquired all of these powers.

The concepts of the Siddha and siddhis have a great deal in common with the Illuminist ideal of “becoming God”. Illuminism, however, takes care to emphasize that all powers acquired are defined mathematically. There are no powers that can contradict the fundamental mathematical nature of existence. All powers must be definable mathematically, or they are fantasy. If there is a legitimate mathematical mechanism associated with a proposed power then it must already exist or will definitely come into existence: “anything not forbidden is compulsory”.

Jains

The religion of the Jains has many gods and various heavens but, crucially, none of these gods is a supreme Creator God. For Jains, the universe is eternal. It is neither created nor capable of being destroyed. Jain thinkers summed up their position in the following way:

Some foolish men declare that a Creator made the World. This is not a good idea. Have nothing to do with it. If God made the world, where was he before he made it? If he needed nothing to stand on, where is he now? If no one was needed to make the stuff of the world was made from, then the world could have come about by itself, without the need for anyone to make it. If God created the world out of love for living things and need for them, why did he not make the world completely happy and free of misfortune? The idea that the world was created by God makes no sense at all.

If only Abrahamists would listen to that good sense!

Jains believe that each individual is composed of two things: *jiva* = self = mind/spirit and *a-jiva* = non-self = matter.

Like Western Gnostics, Jains believe that spirit is imprisoned by matter and must find the means to escape, which happens when an individual *jiva* attains enlightenment. Jains believe that the whole world is alive and everything has a soul. Every soul is evolving spiritually and the best

souls evolve into gods i.e. the universe creates gods rather than God creating the universe.

Jainism asserts that the universe is cyclical. It is without beginning, without end and without a Creator. The objective of Jainism is to attain moksha: liberation from the cycles of birth, death and rebirth. A liberated soul is called a Siddha and achieves a state of infinite bliss and power. Every Jiva (living being) has the potential of becoming a Siddha and therefore God. This is identical to the Illuminist position that everyone can become God.

God is not the author of the universe. Rather, he is the culmination of universal processes. He has attained enlightenment and become a liberated soul. He can then become a role model, teacher and mentor for everyone else. The LAST thing he would ever do is make anyone bow to him and worship him, and threaten them with eternal suffering in hell if they disobeyed him. Such a being would be the least enlightened imaginable and would in fact be functionally equivalent to the Devil. The Abrahamist God is unquestionably Satan. He has no redeeming features at all. He is a cosmic tyrant and torturer, bringing misery wherever he goes. It is the Abrahamic God that must be overcome if humanity is to be liberated.

The Jews are more or less the opposite of the Jains. While the latter have a supremely enlightened religion, the former have a supremely endarkened religion.

Jainism, like Illuminism, declares that the future of a man is in his own hands. Is that not the true gospel of freedom? All that Abrahamism offers is bondage to a monster who demands obedience even to the extent of making a father (Abraham) agree to kill his son for no reason at all other than to make concrete his absolute obedience. Abrahamic religions are slave religions while Enlightenment religions offer ultimate freedom and the possibility of achieving personal divinity. How can there be any question about which path is healthier and more rational for humanity?

Jainism has many similarities with Illuminism, but, to its extreme detriment, has very little scientific or mathematical content. It is a kind of Mythos version of Illuminism, lacking the Logos elements to make it intellectually credible.

What we must emphasize is that there is nothing new or revolutionary about the religious tenets of Illuminism. Many of its elements are present in all of the religions based on reincarnation, Enlightenment and the absence of any Creator God. What makes Illuminism unique is that it provides the mathematical, scientific and philosophical justification for its religious principles.

Wikipedia

Has there been a nobler undertaking than this in recent times? An army of clever people have created a superb, free body of knowledge. It is by no means perfect, but it is the perfect “access route” to higher knowledge. If only the world could apply the Wikipedia philosophy and methodology to everything, we could be living in paradise. To all Wikipedia contributors – you all deserve a medal. You have all done your duty to the human race.

Ayn Rand

In Ayn Rand’s *Atlas Shrugged*, the “heroes” – we use that word advisedly: “devils” is more accurate – retreat to “Galt’s Gulch”, a secluded valley community in Colorado. This vast tract of land in the Rocky Mountains was never listed on any map. The floor of the valley was elevated 8,000 feet above sea level and the valley itself was completely cut off from the world apart from one camouflaged road. Here, the super rich hid from the world. Well, good riddance. Can’t we build Galt’s Gulch for real and send all the super rich there? We all know what will happen: the wider world will become paradise and the rich in the Gulch will fight like rats in a sack. It will be hell on earth for them, and they will beg to be allowed back to the real world. One

of the biggest lies ever told is Rand's that the rich could endure existence together, without ordinary people to serve them. The laziness and ineptitude of these people would become all too apparent. Without their money, they would be nothing. Note that another name for the Gulch was "Atlantis" – ho, ho, ho.

Cosmic consciousness: the universe exists as an interconnected network of consciousness, forming a collective consciousness spanning the cosmos. Alternatively, the Absolute or Godhead from which all conscious beings emanate.

Canadian psychiatrist Richard M. Bucke developed a theory in which ordinary consciousness (humanity's natural state of consciousness) lies above animal "consciousness" but below "cosmic consciousness", a mystical higher state of consciousness. We can imagine humans being as the subjects of a perpetual conflict. On the one hand, they are continually assailed by bestial forces trying to drag them down to the domain of animal primitivism, but on the other hand, higher powers seek to raise them up to divinity. Most human beings succumb to the low road. Very few can take that high road that leads to the celestial plane. Sometimes "gateway" drugs (psychedelics such as LSD and magic mushrooms) can give people a glimpse of cosmic consciousness.

It might also be said that ordinary consciousness lies above the Jungian collective unconscious but below a collective consciousness (akin to the Noosphere of which Pierre Teilhard de Chardin spoke).

Simple animal consciousness is basic sentience while human self-consciousness involves reason, imagination, creativity and so on. Cosmic consciousness is a higher faculty, the next stage of human mental evolution, and it involves a huge expansion of ordinary consciousness and merging with the consciousness of others in a Teilhardian Noosphere.

Cosmic Consciousness appears on Earth slowly, with only a few higher individuals (psychonauts) able to act as its pathfinders, but in time it will spread throughout humanity and the whole human race will be raised up. We can view this as a dialectical progression that is currently being obstructed by such dark forces as Abrahamism and free-market capitalism. These blockages have to be cleared before humanity can properly evolve in the mental sphere.

There is no doubt that human consciousness can be radically transformed and enhanced, but first we must reject the brakes on conscious development. Abrahamism, with its irrational, superstitious faith keeps dragging us back to more primitive times. Only reason and the concept of "becoming God" can pull us forward to the bright uplands.

Emergentism: the hypothesis that completely new types of organisms, behaviours and phenomena such as consciousness emerge suddenly and unexpectedly during the process of evolution, as a result of unpredictable rearrangements of pre-existing elements. In general, the unpredicted appearance of novel phenomena in the course of evolution.

Panpsychism does not attribute full, human-style consciousness to the fundamental constituents of the universe so it follows that more sophisticated mental states must arise from simpler mental states. Panpsychism is generally associated with "weak emergence", meaning that there is no great gulf between what emerges and what preceded it. In terms of "strong emergence", on the other hand, high-level properties have no obvious basis in low-level precursors, and thus seem to emerge "from nothing". Scientific materialism is associated with strong emergence since life and mind do not appear to have any basis whatever in the dead stuff (atoms) of matter, as understood by scientists. Many arguments in favour of panpsychism claim materialism is incapable of accounting for subjective experience (*qualia*); also, the problems found with the logic and plausibility of strong emergence seem to offer a powerful repudiation of materialism.

Panpsychism differs from strong emergence in that, according to panpsychism, even the

smallest physical particles have mental characteristics. Strong emergence, on the other hand, claims that though the particles are mindless, some systems formed by them, and by nothing but them, *do* possess mental attributes, and even consciousness. The human brain is the classic example. The question that scientific materialists (advocates of strong emergence) manifestly fail to address is how consciousness can appear in a group of atoms given that each atom in the group is considered to have zero consciousness and indeed zero mental attributes.

Imagine we filled a desert island with one hundred ten-year-old Chinese speakers, none of whom knew anything about the English language, and came back fifty years later – would we expect them to be speaking English? Would we make any prediction that they would speak English? Wouldn't it be insane to hypothesise that they would be speaking English? There could be no rational basis for such a hypothesis, and no one would be taken seriously if they suggested it. Yet the advocates of strong emergence are saying something of exactly that nature, and in fact much more extreme. At least English is another language. Consciousness has nothing in common whatever with mindless, lifeless atoms.

If you put an enormous number of mindless, lifeless atoms together and come back a billion years later then apparently things composed of them will be alive and will talk to you and shake your hand. By what process? Magic?! Emergence isn't really a philosophy at all. It works backwards. It takes the properties that we observe – living, thinking human beings – compares them with the lifeless, mindless atoms of which they are composed, then concludes rather self-evidently that life and consciousness must somehow have “emerged” (without giving any conceivable explanation). Above all, it refuses to countenance the much more probable scenario that life and mind are already present in atoms, and more complex arrangements of atoms can express their inherent life and mental capacity much more effectively. Atoms and humans (composed of atoms) are on a continuum of life and mind. There is no miraculous point at which dead, mindless atoms somehow combine to create completely unexpected, and one might say impossible, properties such as life and consciousnesses.

Jung

“Psyche and matter are contained in one and the same world, and moreover are in continuous contact with one another. It is probable that psyche and matter are two different aspects of one and the same thing.” -- Carl Jung

Jung's view is interpreted as panpsychism of the neutral monism variety. Neutral monism is the view that the mental and the physical are two ways of organizing or describing the same elements, which are themselves “neutral” i.e. neither physical nor mental. This view denies that the mental and the physical are two fundamentally different things. Rather, the universe consists of only one kind of stuff, in the form of neutral elements that are in themselves neither mental nor physical.

Panpsychism is the view that all physical reality has a mental aspect. It can be understood as a form of idealism if the fundamental constituents of reality not only have a mental component but are actually exclusively mental (yet capable of giving rise to the apparently material world) Leibniz's Monadology is the perfect expression of panpsychism, idealism and rationalism since the fundamental units of existence are monadic minds, governed by the laws of mathematics.

Panpsychism can also be interpreted as a form of dualism — either as substance dualism (mind and matter as separate properties, but with matter always containing mind, or mind always being accompanied by matter) or property dualism (everything having both mental and physical properties).

“*Naive*” panpsychism: the idea that inanimate objects are sentient and/or intentional. This is similar to animism.

Gaia theory: the view that the biosphere is a self-regulating system that maintains homeostasis in relation to many vital chemical and physical variables. It is sometimes interpreted in terms of panpsychism because any goal-directed behaviour might qualify as mental. Others say that Gaia theory is an emergent function of organised, “living” matter, and not a quality of any old matter. Thus, in this view, it should be seen in terms of emergentism rather than panpsychism.

The World Soul: just as a human body has a soul, so a planetary body has a soul, providing an intrinsic connection between all living things on the planet (earth has the “Gaia Soul”). By extension, the whole universe has a soul. This concept originated with Plato and was developed by the Neoplatonists. This has a great deal in common with James Lovelock’s Gaia theory and Pierre Teilhard’s Noosphere. The idea is that our planet is alive in some sense, with a mind, and it seeks to create, support and help life to flourish on the planet. The planet is therefore a key agent in the process of evolution. And what is true of Earth is true on a larger scale of the whole universe.

As we have seen, the Stoics believed in a vital, rational energy directing the universe: a cosmic soul. Human beings were in some sense fragments or seeds of this soul, and life made sense when we saw existence from its point of view rather than our own i.e. when we exercised proper reason. If we resisted reason, life was likely to be miserable and baffling for us. The Hindu concepts of Brahman (the cosmic soul) and atman (the individual soul deceived by Maya) are rather similar.

Hegelianism: Hegel insisted that in order for a thinking subject (human reason or consciousness) to know its object (the world) in any true sense at all, there must be some identity of thought and being. Otherwise, the subject would never have genuine access to the object and no certainty about any of its knowledge of the world. However, thought and being seem very different. We cannot say “ $A = A$ ” in terms of thought and being i.e. we cannot say that thought and being are identical, at least not at first sight. But might they *become* identical via some process?

And thus Hegel introduced his wondrous new form of logic – dialectical logic – for precisely this purpose. Dialectical logic involves the overcoming of contradictions via an evolving process of thesis, antithesis and synthesis, which then becomes a new thesis and the process starts over again at a higher level and keeps going until all contradictions are resolved in the ultimate synthesis where finally $A = A$ is true in the classic sense. In other words, we start with A and B where A does not equal B but where they may have much more in common than we suspect. After a long dialectical process, all of the apparent differences (contradictions) between A and B are ironed out and they merge with one another i.e. A now equals B and they are revealed to be identical after all. The differences were a kind of illusion, or a consequence of insufficient evolution. Evolution, in this view is CONVERGENCE. All apparently separate things evolve towards TOGETHERNESS. The Many evolve towards the One. In the end, we are all IDENTICAL. And, in fact, at the final end of history, we are all GOD. We have collectively attained the state of Absolute Perfection and Absolute Knowledge. We know everything because we ARE everything.

The Holographic Principle

“The holographic principle is a property of quantum gravity and string theories which states that the description of a volume of space can be thought of as encoded on a boundary to the region—preferably a light-like boundary like a gravitational horizon. String theory admits a lower dimensional description in which gravity emerges from it in what would now be called a holographic way. In a larger and more speculative sense, the theory suggests that the entire

universe can be seen as a two-dimensional information structure ‘painted’ on the cosmological horizon, such that the three dimensions we observe are only an effective description at macroscopic scales and at low energies. Cosmological holography has not been made mathematically precise, partly because the cosmological horizon has a finite area and grows with time. The holographic principle was inspired by black hole thermodynamics, which implies that the maximal entropy in any region scales with the radius squared, and not cubed as might be expected. In the case of a black hole, the insight was that the informational content of all the objects which have fallen into the hole could be entirely contained in surface fluctuations of the event horizon. The holographic principle resolves the black hole information paradox within the framework of string theory.” -- Wikipedia

Mythopoeic thought: a hypothetical stage of human thought prior to modern thought. Humanity did not think in terms of generalizations and impersonal laws. Instead, humans regarded each event as an act of will by some personal being. This is “Mythos” rather than “Logos” thinking, and events are explained by way of narratives accounting for the actions of spirits and gods. Abrahamism is mythopoeic, the narrative being entirely concerned with the Will of God, and of humans cooperating with, or defying, God’s will. God causes the “Flood” because he is angry, not because of an earthquake and subsequent tsunami (i.e. a wholly natural event).

The “bicameral” mental model proposed by Julian Jaynes asserts that before the rise of modern consciousness, human beings experienced auditory hallucinations in which the gods and spirits spoke to them (a condition not unlike schizophrenia). Naturally, these provided a mythopoeic, narratised version of reality, which remains very popular to this day since most people understand the world through stories rather than hard, logical analysis.

It has been claimed that the ancient Egyptians and Mesopotamians lived in a wholly mythopoeic world – and the same may be said of the Hebrews, Christians and Muslims. The latter three religions replaced polytheistic Mythos with a monotheistic Mythos, but all the Mythos rules and mentality remained in place.

The ancient Greeks were the first to offer a Logos rather than Mythos way forward. The pre-Socratic philosophers treated “God” as a kind of impersonal, abstract cosmic mind (a deist rather than theist approach i.e. God remote from us rather than personally interested in us). In time, this evolved into the scientific materialist view where God was replaced by a set of natural, inflexible laws of cause and effect.

For these intellectual Greeks, each event was seen not as an act of God’s will (contrast Muslims who, even today, think that Allah personally directs their RPG grenades i.e. it’s his will whether they hit their target or not, and has nothing to do with the laws of physics).

Logos thinking kills Mythopoeic thinking. Logos thinking is the basis of authentic consciousness, but, sadly, most people prefer the Mythos worldview. They are not truly conscious and in charge of their own destiny but instead remain strongly bicameral, believing that some sort of divine will is really in charge, to which they think they can pray to change the course of their lives. The whole concept of prayer is bicameral. It implies that a person can enter into direct communication with the gods, and even with the Creator of the Universe, by uttering a few ritual incantations (like magic!) and then pleading with the Creator for a few personal favours not to be conferred on others. Prayer is conceived as a kind of direct conversation between a human being and his Creator. It is thus exactly the same as bicameralism whereby a person imagines he hears the voice of God in his own head, giving him commands.

In the Logos view, this is insane. It’s not an exaggeration to say that most of humanity remains bicameral, prone to “magic” Mythopoeic thinking, and that they cannot be considered fully conscious and rational.

Mythos human beings vastly outnumber Logos human beings, which is why our world is

the way it is. It's a place of stories, illusions, delusions, hallucinations, emotions and sensations rather than reason, logic, science, mathematics and philosophy.

Stupid, emotional people always block rational progress. How on earth can anyone rationally deal with billions of Muslims, Christians and Jews who continue to believe in scientifically disproven fantasies? How can the planet possibly become enlightened when such people exist?

Vitalism: the belief that the functions of a living organism are due to a vital principle distinct from biochemical reactions; that the processes of life are not explicable by the laws of physics and chemistry alone; that life is self-determining. Vitalism invokes a vital principle: the "vital spark" or "élan vital" (sometimes equated with the soul or spirit).

In medicine, vitalism proposes that disease results from imbalances in the vital energies that distinguish living from non-living matter. In the West, in ancient times, these vital forces were associated with the four temperaments and humours ("sanguine", "choleric", "melancholic" and "phlegmatic"); in the East forces such as qi and prana are held of central importance and must be perfectly balanced. Any blockages must be removed. Vitalism in medicine is concerned with living energies while modern Western medicine is materialistic, reductionist and mechanistic. Western medicine sees a patient as a broken-down car in need of repair by a mechanic; vitalist medicine is much more concerned with mental energy, with the patient as a living organism not reducible to "spare parts".

Nondualism: the Eastern belief that things which appear distinct are in fact not separate but belong to an underlying unity; thus it has much in common with Western monism. While monism holds that all phenomena actually belong to the same substance, nondualism asserts that different phenomena are inseparable or flowing into each other, and there is no hard demarcation line between them. Nevertheless, they are not the same as monism would contend they ultimately are. Zen Buddhism is nondualist while Advaita Hinduism is monist (because it contends that all phenomena are really Brahman).

The Illuminati's Most Illustrious Grand Masters

Solomon – greatest magician.

Pythagoras – greatest inspiration; greatest intuitive genius.

Heraclitus – greatest mystic and riddler; father of the dialectic.

Empedocles – greatest showman.

Simon Magus – most revered; most transcendent; most spiritual; most divine; man become God.

Hypatia – noblest and bravest; the eternal feminine; the embodiment of Sophia, goddess of wisdom.

Leibniz – greatest intellectual; greatest genius in human history.

Adam Weishaupt – greatest political activist and revolutionary.

Goethe – greatest artist and aesthete; the most "complete" genius. (Some estimates of IQ make Goethe the person with the highest IQ in history.)

Hegel – greatest visionary and system builder; the greatest advocate of dialectics.

Noumena and Phenomena

“Platonic Ideas and Forms are noumena, and phenomena are things displaying themselves to the senses [...] that noumena and the noumenal world are objects of the highest knowledge, truths, and values is Plato’s principal legacy to philosophy.” —The Oxford Companion to Philosophy

Noumenon: from ancient Greek *noein* (“I think”), from *nous* (“mind”) -- “something that is thought”; “the object of an act of thought”.

Plato defined phenomena as those things perceived by the senses and noumena as those things reflected upon by thought (reason). We can know something rationally (as a noumenon) while having no sensory experience of it. So, does that constitute knowledge or not? Is knowledge which is derived from reason more or less important than knowledge derived from perception? Does what is thought have more or less significance than what is perceived? According to rationalists, noumena, explored by reason, are the only true source of absolute knowledge, while empiricists claim that all true knowledge must begin with the senses.

Kant, trying to reconcile rationalism and empiricism, muddied the waters by defining phenomena as objects of experience (accessible to the senses) and noumena as things as they are “in themselves”: a state of being NOT accessible to human reason (i.e. Kant has turned noumena on their head in comparison with Plato). Kant argued that reason often went astray because it tried to grasp the unknowable noumenal universe instead of restricting itself to reflecting on objects of experience. Kant is therefore much more of an empiricist than rationalist, although he tried to help the rationalist position by arguing that objects of experience must conform to reason because they are in fact created by mind i.e. every object we experience is consistent with rational categories because those constitute the mental framework via which we process the world of experience.

The school of “positivism” asserted that knowledge must be limited to what can be observed and scientifically comprehended. It focused on observable facts alone and proclaimed that any proposition that cannot be reduced to a simple statement of fact is unintelligible. Positivism is the default scientific position. We can’t stress enough that the philosophical paradigm of science is entirely based on materialism, empiricism and positivism and therefore all scientists are incapable of considering the noumenal domain.

Illuminism is rationalist and might also be described as positivist in a certain sense: any proposition that cannot ultimately be reduced to a valid statement of mathematics is unintelligible. Mathematical facts are the only facts and mathematics is the only source of true and absolute knowledge. Illuminism does not place “observable” facts on a pedestal but rather mathematical facts.

Logical positivism was a further progression of positivism and asserted that philosophy, like science, should be based on observation and testing.

(“Positivism” is a more general term than “logical positivism”. The latter is the philosophy (or epistemology) to which positivists subscribe. Positivism itself can be carried into other fields such as law, politics, economics and so on.)

According to logical positivism, the only meaningful propositions are those that can be verified empirically. This is a fundamental issue. If someone says, “Prove it”, what do they mean and what are they expecting? For a scientist, a repeatable experiment involving the human senses (no matter how fallible and deceptive these senses demonstrably are) is required. For an Illuminist, a mathematical proof is a much more certain basis of knowledge than any scientific

experiment. Science is a moving target. It continually contradicts itself and replaces old discredited theories (that were once experimentally verified!) with new ones. Science itself only lays claim to provisional “truths” and acknowledges that current theories might be replaced by “new” truths at any time. Science doesn’t aim for absolute knowledge but only for progressively more reliable knowledge. Illuminism on the other hand focuses on eternal, immutable truths such as $1 + 1 = 2$. All such truths are mathematical truths.

We don’t deny for a moment that science is extremely useful but we absolutely deny that it is a source of immutable truth. If you let science be your guide, you have abandoned any pretence to absolute knowledge. Anyone who asks us to prove something scientifically is asking us to “prove” something in a manner that is inherently unprovable in its own self-defined terms. Once upon a time, science conclusively “proved” that light is a wave phenomenon and definitely not a particle phenomenon, but now claims that light is both particle and wave. So, how can anyone take scientific “proof” seriously, except in a strictly provisional sense?

Science never in fact proves anything. All it does is assemble provisional theories and evidence that, at a certain time, lends support to those theories. It’s not about certainty; it’s about the degree of confidence we can have in an assertion. “Confidence” is neither truth nor knowledge. When it comes to mathematics, on the other hand, you can be 100% certain that $1 + 1 = 2$. So, isn’t it time people stopped asking for scientific “proof” of the soul, for example, and started considering mathematical proofs of the soul?

The soul is a noumenon not a phenomenon and hence must be addressed in noumenal terms. Sure, it can have phenomenal consequences in certain circumstances, but these will not be amenable to the scientific method. So, what will you do – reject the soul because it is inherently outside the scope of conventional science? In which case, you have elevated science to the status of religion and proclaimed that anything not in the Holy Book of Science is false. You have become a person of faith. Remember: absence of scientific evidence is not evidence of existential absence.

It’s about time people got serious about what they regard as truth and knowledge. Mathematics alone offers certainty. Those who believe that science does are confused and philosophically illiterate. Science should be used as a tool for helping us to throw light on mathematical reality. It should not be considered as any kind of truth in itself. It isn’t, not even in its own self-declared terms. It’s far too dependent on provisional theories and provisional experiments.

As Thomas Kuhn so brilliantly showed, science operates via paradigms. These are not truths. They are just intellectual frameworks in which science is conducted during certain periods. The fact that they often become dogmatic is thanks to the scientific priesthood who profit from them and owe their status to them.

The question is simple: are thinking and reasoning more important than perception? Rationalists say yes and empiricists say no. Can we arrive at the truth purely by thinking – by the use of reason and logic – or must we associate truth only with the “evidence” of our senses? (Seeing is believing, literally.)

Nietzsche famously said, “There are no facts, only interpretations.” We agree with this entirely, except in relation to mathematics. Only mathematical facts are true facts and that’s because they are analytic truths: they are true by definition. In some sense, the whole of mathematics might be said to flow from the single truth that $1 + 1 = 2$. In mathematics, all truths flow necessarily and automatically from just one, or a few, central axioms and definitions. There is no room for interpretation. Facts are facts. Truths are truths. Errors are errors. No one on earth can physically perceive these immutable and eternal truths of mathematics, so why are scientists so fixated on perception as the most reliable source of truth?

We have to move beyond perception and embrace reason. Just as the Enlightenment rejected the absurdities of religious faith and revelation in favour of reason, so should reason be enshrined above sensory perception. Our senses are not the judges of truth: our reason is. There is no sensory organ of truth: the mental organ of reason is the closest we'll ever get to a truth detector.

Mathematics – the essential subject of truth – is transcendental: it's outside the world of sense experience.

Join the rationalists. Join *Team Leibniz*. Wouldn't you prefer to be on the same side as the likes of Pythagoras, Plato, Descartes, Spinoza and, above all, Leibniz, the supreme rationalist and logician? Reason is our touchstone, not sense perception.

Illuminism

Key words associated with Illuminism: monism (a single ontological substance: the Monadic substance), panpsychism (mind is everywhere and everything has a mind, via monads), the dialectic (the world evolves via the resolution of opposites), idealism (mind is more important than matter; mind is primary), rationalism (reason is more important than sense-perception), Logos (reason and logic are embedded in the fabric of reality via mathematics), transcendentalism (truth is found beyond the sensory domain).

Psychological Philosophy

The attitude most people have to rationalism or empiricism is heavily influenced by their Myers-Briggs personality type. Introverted intuitives and thinkers are drawn to rationalism. Philosophy and mathematics are archetypal introverted, rationalist subjects since they require no engagement with the sensory, external world at all. A philosopher could literally lie on his bed with his eyes shut and solve all of the problems of existence. He doesn't need to look out of any window. A mathematician just needs a pencil and paper.

Most people are extraverted sensing and feeling types and in thrall to their senses. Science is an extraverted subject since it looks to outer rather than inner worlds, to externality rather than internality. It asks, "What's out there?" rather than "What's in here?" It's about outer space rather than inner space. So, inevitably, it emphasizes the senses. For extraverts, they use the eyes to look at the world whereas, for introverts, eyes are the window on the soul.

Science is actually an extremely peculiar subject because if we associate thinking, intuition and introversion with Intellect, and feeling, sensing and extraversion with Will then science is on the wrong side of the fence. It belongs to Will rather than Intellect, even though it's supposed to be an intellectual enterprise. It's defined by extraverted rather than introverted thinking, and extraverted rather than introverted intuition. It's obsessed with sensory data. Scientists, in their eagerness to interact with the world and with experimental data, never stop to subject their ideas to deep philosophical analysis. Most of them hate philosophy – to their immense detriment. Science needs to become enormously more philosophically engaged if it's to make any further progress.

Illuminism places mathematics and philosophy above science. Science is actually viewed as quite vulgar and "stupid", overly concerned with the material world rather than the domain of mind. Leibniz is perhaps the archetypal Illuminist: a brilliant mathematician and philosopher with a secondary yet dazzling skill in science. Newton was a scientist first and foremost (if we leave aside his strange religious obsessions), with a secondary interest in mathematics and philosophy. So, guess whom scientists revere?

Scientists are dismissive of the soul because they are extraverted materialists guided by their senses. Their psychological type makes them reject the soul and the inner world. The "soul" is something infinitely bizarre and mysterious to them, and they find it easy to dismiss it as "nonsense".

Most Abrahamists are extraverted sensing and feeling types, with almost zero intellect. Scientists tend to be extraverted sensing and thinking types (scientists are usually regarded as introverts, but this is only because they tend to have poor social skills, not because they direct their energy inwards rather than outwards, which is the true definition of introversion). While Abrahamists "feel" the soul, scientists do not. That's why so many of them are atheists. The more philosophical of them – such as Einstein – tend to retain a religious sensibility, although they rarely subscribe to any mainstream religion.

As we have already observed, Abrahamists are stupid extraverted sensing and feeling types. They are attracted to faith in preference to knowledge because faith is anti-intellectual while knowledge is intellectual. They agree with Luther that reason is the Devil's whore. Thinking and reason give them a headache.

Scientists are clever extraverted sensing and thinking types and are attracted to materialism rather than idealism. They are generally unintuitive.

Illuminists are hyperrational introverted thinking and intuitive types. They are idealists

rather than materialists, rationalists rather than empiricists.

In terms of deciding who is best placed to know the truth of existence, one of the things you must ponder is the psychological type of those “preaching” to you. Clearly, Abraham, Moses, Jesus and Mohammed were not intellectuals. They were stupid creatures of Will who never made any clever statements at all. You’d need to be pretty dim-witted yourself to take them seriously. Equally, extraverted scientific materialists are not exactly best placed to explain the inner world of the soul to you. Their kneejerk hostility to religion is entirely predictable. They are not intuitive. They use thinking to support their sensory perceptions. Illuminists, on the other hand, use thinking to support their intuition. Who will best understand the soul? A sensing type or an intuitive type? Well, given that the soul is not an object of sensory experience, the answer is self-evident.

It’s pointless to expect scientists to have much of a religious sensibility, and they are the last people you would go to if you were seeking the spiritual answers to existence. Your best bet is introverted intuitives who are also extremely rational thinkers. That, of course, is exactly what the Illuminati are all about!

It may seem an odd thing to say, but a person’s relationship to ultimate truth is psychologically determined. Scientists will always struggle with ultimate truth because their brains aren’t properly wired for the task. Scientists will be people whose greatest triumphs relate to understanding the phenomenal world “out there”. That’s why they’re materialists, empiricists and positivists. They’re hopeless when it comes to the noumenal domain: the natural territory of idealists, rationalists and intuitives.

So, if you want to come closer to ultimate truth, make sure you choose your gurus wisely. The psychological type of the messenger is as important as the message, and indeed shapes the message. The Illuminati are introverted, intuitive, rationalist thinkers. We are the best suited to probing the mysteries of existence. Don’t look to us for materialist “proofs”. When you enter our world, you are stepping into the mind world. If you’re hung up on finding sensory data regarding ultimate reality, you will never get anywhere.

We’re not for one moment suggesting that you should turn to faith. REASON is the supreme tool for bringing humanity face to face with the innermost secrets of reality. And it was reason that led the Illuminati to the greatest truth of them all: the universe is a mathematical system. There is nothing in it that isn’t mathematical. Mathematics explains everything. Mathematics IS everything. What could be more rational, logical and intuitive than mathematics? What could possibly rival mathematics as a candidate for ultimate truth? Nothing else comes close. There are simply no other viable candidates. Revelation and faith are absurd. The Creator God is absurd. Karma is absurd (although it must be said that Eastern religion is otherwise full of intuitive insights of the highest order, and can easily be rebranded mathematically). As for science, all of its greatest successes are owed entirely to mathematics. So, that’s it. There are no other contestants in the game, no other shows in town. Your choice is between 1) Abrahamism (faith), 2) science (atheism) and 3) Illuminism (the monadic mathematics of the soul and existence: the number of the soul is ZERO).

Well, what’s it to be?

God

“God” is shorthand for “guarantor of the highest values”. If God is dead, as Nietzsche declared, then the universe contains no guarantor of that which is best and highest. We ourselves must become Gods in order to fill that divine vacuum. Richard Dawkins replaces God with the “selfish gene”. Not much of an exchange, is it?

God versus Satan

Every aspect of the universe evolves to its optimal degree, its omega point. If the two primary components of the mind are Intellect and Will then God represents the omega point of the former and Satan of the latter.

God achieves complete knowledge of the universe (via mathematics) and complete intellectual mastery of material existence. He can use his mind to alter the equations that determine material existence in his local environment and achieve the kind of power exhibited by Neo in *The Matrix*.

God is dialectically opposed by Satan, the Lord of Will. We can't think of any better way of defining Satan than to refer to the monster worshipped by Jews, Christians and Muslims. Just read their unholy texts. You will observe that their "God" *never* says anything intellectual. All "holy" texts are devoid of mathematics, science, philosophy, reason and logic and make no attempt to account for this extraordinary absence. They emphasize irrational concepts such as faith and revelation and insanely claim that these are superior to reason. These books have no moral or ethical content. They feel no need to account for why God would order his first prophet Abraham to murder his innocent son for no reason. They do not consider that such an order inherently violates ANY code of morality.

These holy books are overwhelmingly about control and dominance, about making human beings bow and grovel. They are intent on creating the widest possible gap between God and humanity. Human beings are to be mere insects, begging for mercy from their Lord and Master. Humanity is reduced to penal servitude where they must blindly and absolutely obey, and live in terror of the most horrific and indeed eternal punishment if they disobey. Abrahamism is obsessed with obedience. In fact, obedience is really the sole subject of Judaism, Christianity and Islam. Heresy, apostasy, free thinking are all to be met with death. Infidels are to be persecuted and killed.

The degree of intolerance and hatred towards those who reject the Abrahamic God is effectively infinite. Hatred, intolerance, extremism, fanaticism, irrationality, violence, persecution, and extermination are the hallmarks of Abrahamism. These are all manifestations of Will. The God of the Jews, Christians and Muslims is pure Will. He exhibits zero intellectual capacity and never at any time explains himself rationally. There is no dialogue between this "God" and humanity. We must obey him, no matter if it means killing our own children. That's the whole point of the story of Abraham.

Only self-hating slaves could ever embrace Judaism, Christianity or Islam. These are not the people of God, but of Satan. We barely acknowledge them as human. They are an insult to the human race and represent everything that is worst about human beings. They are bestial, irrational creatures of Will, indistinguishable from animals. The "God" they worship is nothing but themselves writ large. If they were to acquire immense power, they would wish to rule over a planet of slaves, permanently on their knees in worship.

Abraxas is the God of Reason and Jehovah/Christ/Allah/Satan is the God of Will.

Which God you choose to acknowledge says everything about you. Better an atheist than a Devil worshipping Jew, Christian or Muslim.

Just as some people will embark on the quest to become God, others will follow the other path and seek to become Satan. Look at the men and women of Wall Street and Washington D. C. Look at monarchs and celebrities and the super rich. All of these people are evil scum who have actively chosen to emulate Satan. They want to be worshipped by the stupid, credulous

common herd. Would-be Satans are everywhere. We're surrounded by them.

Phosters and Archons

All conscious creatures have the ability to achieve gnosis and become God. However, gnosis is usually accomplished by higher beings than humans.

Where Abrahamists refer to angels and demons, we refer to *phosters* (higher beings of lights and reason – enlightened emissaries of Abraxas) and *archons* (higher beings of power and dominance – endarkened overlords and rulers, princes of the Devil). Every intelligent planet has phosters and archons, but they do not go around as comic-book superheroes or dastardly villains. They are shadowy beings operating behind the scenes. To use the language of *Star Wars*, they are keeping the “force” in balance, so to speak. Their task is not to save or enslave humanity but merely to maintain the conditions in which those of Intellect pursue their rightful path of light, and those of Will gravitate towards the Prince of Darkness.

Compared with ordinary human beings, they enjoy much greater longevity (and thus have to continually fake their own deaths and create new identities) and have what humans would call special powers. They are like “superheroes”. However, there are very few of them, and they draw no attention to themselves. They are not here for our benefit, but for their own. They are progressing towards their own personal objectives. They may help certain groups – the phosters on earth are known to the leadership of the Illuminati and the archons are known to the most senior level of the Old World Order – and they may offer esoteric knowledge and powers, but this is always done in a subtle, responsible way on both sides.

Phosters and archons often appear in spiritual stories. In *Faust*, for example, Mephistopheles is an archon. In the Arthurian tales, Galahad is a phoster, and Merlin may also be regarded as a phoster.

Neither the phosters nor archons are permitted to “take over” or unduly influence the world. Typically, they target a few individuals (usually “prophets”, celebrities, leaders and geniuses) and spread their message via them. They themselves would never play a lead role in the limelight. Abrahamism is an archon-inspired religion and Illuminism is a phoster-inspired religion.

Rational people seek to achieve rational “gnosis” (ultimate self-knowledge). Wilful people seek to achieve wilful “gnosis” (knowledge of power over others – the true message of Abrahamism).

However, you should not dwell on the subject of phosters and archons. Concentrate on yourself. Don’t look to others to “save” you. Save yourself. Archons and phosters are extremely unlikely to have any direct impact on your life unless you move in certain rarefied circles. They are not allowed to obstruct any natural alterations in the balance of power on earth. Earth, at the present time, is an archon planet, under the sway of primitive Will, greed, hate, selfishness and self-interest. However, there is no law against it becoming a phoster planet of light and reason. It’s up to all of us to make that happen.

There are 144 archons on archon planets and only 36 phosters. On phoster planets, these numbers are reversed. Every intelligent planet is playing the archon-phoster game. You yourself may one day become a higher being and reincarnate as a phoster (or archon if you are a creature of will) on a planet like Earth. If you want to become God, you will have to use your life as a phoster as the final springboard to gnosis. You must already be acting like god if you wish to become God (or like Satan if that is of more appeal to you! – the Wall Street gang are doing a good job as trainee Devils).

How seriously you take the concept of archons and phosters is up to you (it may strike

you as pure Mythos), but bear in mind that if there is a ladder of higher existence then there must be beings above us and below God. Think of all the tales about “gods” visiting the earth and interacting with primitive humans. Think of the tales of Erich von Daniken. Think of the Watchers and the Nephilim. Think of ancient stories of angels and demons. Are they all pure fantasy or is there a kernel of truth in them? Have higher beings steered our civilisation and accelerated our evolution? Was Satan – the “God” of Abraham – actually an archon who physically lived on Earth, appeared to certain individuals, and manipulated them to do his Will?

Every healthy religion must be a mixture of Mythos and Logos. Abrahamism is pure Mythos and zero Logos. Illuminism is overwhelmingly a Logos religion, but it retains some Mythos elements dating back to ancient Gnosticism. Sometimes it’s said that the Mythos elements conceal the greatest truths, the highest secrets, the supreme wisdom. It’s for you to decide for yourself if Mythos has any deep meaning or is just some entertaining tall tale.

The highest degrees of Illuminism are concerned with the secret meanings of Mythos tales going back to King Solomon and even further back to the dawn of civilisation when phosters and archons were said to have played a much more prominent role in human affairs than they do now. Did they bury secret knowledge to help chosen seekers? Did they leave guides regarding how to achieve gnosis and become God? Did they deliver the secret of the Holy Grail to Simon Magus? Did they present him with the mathematical secret of how to control matter with the mind, to transmute base metal into gold?

Infinite versus Finite beings

We are all immortal, yet our actual experience of life is as an endless sequence of finite, mortal lives (via reincarnation). The sequence can terminate only when gnosis – enlightenment – is attained.

The Big Picture

Abrahamism's big picture – the Creator God who has all the answers. The cosmos as Creation.

Eastern Religion's big picture – karma, illusion and balance (the cosmos as an uncreated, cyclical, living organism).

Science's big picture – materialism (the cosmos as a clockwork, purposeless mechanism, inexorably winding down).

Illuminism's big picture – mathematics (the cosmos is “living mathematics”).

Abrahamism and Eastern Religion are not based on mathematics; the former is entirely devoid of mathematical content while the latter has many concepts that *could* be converted into mathematics.

Science and Illuminism are both mathematical, but the former regards various key numbers as non-ontological i.e. as unreal and abstract (namely, zero, infinity, negative and imaginary numbers).

Illuminism assigns ontological reality to these same numbers, and elevates zero and infinity to the key determinants of existence. Note that these numbers are wholly beyond materialism and empiricism.

Here are all your choices:

- 1) Abrahamism – no mathematics.
- 2) Eastern religion – some disguised mathematics.
- 3) Science – incomplete mathematics.
- 4) Illuminism – complete mathematics.

It's very simple, isn't it? Everything is about the extent to which mathematics can be equated with existence.

The stupid, mathematically and scientifically illiterate Abrahamists disregard mathematics; the Eastern religious believers convert it into Mythos and mysticism; the skeptical scientists acknowledge mathematics only to the extent that it accords with their senses and experience (empiricism, materialism and positivism) and Illuminism defines mathematics as existence itself (rationalism).

There are no other players in this game. Nothing else will be coming along. You must make your choice – rational or irrational – on the basis of the four options we have presented.

Mythos versus Logos

Mythos: “subjective” mathematics – will, desire, emotion, the inner experience of the world.

Logos: “objective” mathematics – reason and logic, the outer (scientific) experience of the world, inner wisdom and intuition.

Where you stand is dependent on your Myers-Briggs personality type. In general, the following is true (though there are of course exceptions to the rule):

 Illuminists are introverted thinkers and intuitives.

 Scientists are extravert thinkers (non-intuitive) and sensors.

 Eastern religions are introverted, intuitive and feeling (non-thinking).

 Abrahamists are extravert sensing and feeling types (non-thinking and non-intuitive).

Abrahamism is therefore the most irrational and idiotic religious system. It promotes “faith” rather than knowledge because knowledge requires hard work, thinking and intuition – all denied to Abrahamists. If a really stupid, primitive person were asked to create a religion from scratch, he would create Abrahamism. If the same task were given to a really smart person, he would create Illuminism.

Remember – underlying everything is a non-physical soul with infinite capacity, capable of being alchemically transmuted (via dialectical mathematical evolution) into gold. This is the gospel of Illuminism.

From the point of view of the Illuminati, there is nowhere left to go. Complete mathematics covers EVERYTHING. Nothing is omitted (unlike with science).

Illuminism is the true Grand Unified Theory of Everything. Everything is united in one thing – living mathematics, and nothing besides.

This is the absolute, undeniable truth of existence. This is our gospel. This is the true “Good News”.

The four moral choices:

1) Abrahamism: Morality as *transcendent* (vested in a “perfect” Creator); this proves wholly immoral unless “God” demonstrates that he can do no evil. The Abrahamic God, by ordering Abraham to murder his son, showed himself supremely immoral, hence not God, hence his entire moral code is bogus.

2) Eastern Religion: Morality as *immanent* (the universe is imbued with morality via the mysterious force of karma).

3) Science: No morality; amorality.

4) Illuminism: Rational morality.

So, what’s it to be?

Nietzsche, an atheist who described himself as an “immoralist” – he was defiantly opposed to the morality of Christianity (as any sane person should be!) – offered a morality of self-overcoming and striving towards superhuman perfection. This kind of thinking is built into the dialectical moral code of Illuminism i.e. Nietzsche’s morality is thoroughly rational and desirable.

On the other hand, Nietzsche was in many ways an elitist snob and entirely dismissive of the “common herd”. Illuminism, on the contrary, seeks to perfect everyone, not just the favoured few.

What is the difference between Aristotelian and Hegelian (dialectical) logic?

Aristotelian logic is abstract and objective. It is pure and absolute. It is of the nature of law, of immutable, eternal Platonic Forms. Aristotelian logic doesn't have to apply to anything real. Logical statements about unicorns are every bit as valid as logical statements about horses – yet unicorns don't exist.

Hegelian dialectical logic is concrete and ontological. It's a dynamic process. It's "real life" logic – how things actually unfold.

In the arena of actual existence, things don't ask themselves whether they are "A" or "not-A" (in Aristotelian terms). Nothing in actual existence is ever clear-cut. It is never pure being. It is always becoming.

To become means to be changing into something else. If you are "A" and you are becoming then you are already moving away from "A" and becoming "not-A". But nor were you ever really "A" in the first place. So, nothing ever belongs to an unambiguous logical division. In a universe of becoming, everything is flowing in and out of different states of transient being. All "A's" become "not-A's" i.e. they are dialectical. Things turn into their opposites and back again, over and over again, just as in the Taoist concept of yin and yang.

An evolutionary universe of becoming automatically reflects dialectical logic. There is no other type of logic that can be applied to a continual flow. The wondrous thing about dialectical logic is that it leads to a superior flow: more efficient, more productive, of higher quality. Dialectical logic is none other than how the cosmic equation solves itself.

The solution to existence is when the dialectic has reached its omega point: the Absolute – *perfection*. The universe *knows* it has solved itself when it has arrived at the omega point and can go no further.

In order to understand the future, we need only study the past. That reveals the secret of the dialectic to us, and we can then consciously create dialectical processes that will accelerate our progress towards the omega point ... towards becoming God!

Old-style Aristotelian logic does have a range of applicability in on/off situations for individuals. Someone is a virgin or not, pregnant or not, married or not, in a job or not, and so on. But viewed from the perspective of the whole human race, there is a constant dialectical "flow" of virginity, pregnancy, marriage and so on.

Moreover, in a reincarnational view of a human being whereby he has had countless lives, his dialectical progress has to be viewed across all of these lives, not just one. In this light, gender, virginity, pregnancy, married status and so on are not in fact on and off since a new life can reverse all of the decisions and properties of a previous life. In a new life, someone might choose to be a celibate priest, whereas in a former life he was a Don Juan. Reincarnation offers the perfect dialectical system where all opposites can be explored and tested.

The key difference between Hegel's dialectical logic and traditional abstract logic is that Hegel's dialectic is ONTOLOGICAL i.e. it has real existence. Traditional logic is about form and has no necessary contact with content: traditional logic could specify a set of logical forms describing all of the properties of a race of Hamlets. Yet Hamlet is just a fictional character in a play by Shakespeare i.e. he has no real content whatever. In dialectical logic, form and content cannot be separated. There are no abstractions. Dialectic logic is therefore "messy" compared with traditional logic. In fact, it might even be called illogical in many of its manifestations (if the underlying process isn't understood). Dialectical logic deals with metaphysics, science, nature,

ethics, mechanical, chemical, inorganic and organic processes, with desire, feeling and will, with music, with art, religion and philosophy. The dialectic is ingrained in everything.

This view is sometimes called panlogism meaning that logic (dialectical logic to be more precise) is literally everywhere. Reason (dialectical reason) is omnipresent. Everything is fundamentally imbued with ontological reason.

This type of reason does not proceed by way of smooth operations that we might associate with a computer, but by way of contradiction, opposition, conflict i.e. reason works itself out via a vast, cosmic struggle where, slowly but surely, after many setbacks and defeats, the type of flawless, computer reason that we normally think of starts to emerge. This type of reason is the highest product of the dialectic, its culmination, its omega point, the Absolute. We might say that reason evolves from something chaotic to something of pure order and organization. It does so through the dialectic which works by way of throwing all possible rational routes together in the great war of thesis and antithesis and then moving to better (more rational) outcomes via the synthesis phase, which generates a higher thesis, which invokes a higher antithesis, thus requiring a higher synthesis, and so on until we arrive at rational perfection – GOD.

For the universe to operate in any other way would require reason and logic to have their traditional computer-like form. The world would be a clockwork mechanism, an infallible natural computer. But the universe isn't like that – it's a living organism, and must proceed with dialectical, organic messiness, confusion and contradiction rather than perfectly smooth, inorganic machine logic.

Abstract logic = the universe as a machine.

Dialectical logic = the universe as an organism.

Naturally, scientific materialists detest dialectical logic and even deny its existence. The scientific view has a lot in common with the ancient view of the materialistic Stoics. For them, the core of existence was Reason (Logos). God was the God of Reason and, since God was in charge of everything, reason and logic were everywhere, hence “fate”, “necessity”, inevitability” and “Providence” ruled all things. Everything happened according to precise rational cause and effect, just as modern scientists think. Nature was a place of inescapable rational laws. Nothing happened by chance. If people were sufficiently rational, they would discern the reason for everything, hence never be troubled because they would understand that everything was rationally inevitable.

Abrahamism is radically different, more or less the opposite of Stoicism. “God” now becomes a creature of pure Will rather than pure Reason. He is violent, jealous, angry, cruel, capricious, and frequently makes mistakes (he even had to drown the world he himself created!). He's partisan (taking the side of his “Chosen People” against everyone else), and egotistical, demanding that everyone gets on their knees to worship him. He thinks nothing of ordering fathers to kill their children. This, somehow, is supposed to be a moral God. There is not one particle of reason on show in relation to Abrahamism.

The dialectic is reflected perfectly by Abrahamism. This backward system of superstition, hatred of reason, love of faith, rejection of knowledge and promotion of fanaticism is the dialectical antithesis that humanity must overcome if it is to proceed to a higher level of dialectical evolution – to bring us closer to becoming a Community of Gods.

Abstract reason and logic accompany dead things while the dialectic is the essence of living things. Only at the culmination of the dialectic does life attain the perfection of abstract reason and logic. This is when the cosmos has reached what might be called a state of bliss, of perfect being. Everything has its place and there's a place for everything. Everything functions perfectly harmoniously. Everything happens according to perfect reason and logic. There are no contradictions. No one has any cause for complaint. Nothing unreasonable and irrational happens.

There's just one problem – this is a dead universe. It is a computer, not a living entity.

In order to achieve life once more, to reanimate itself, to embrace the life of becoming rather than the death of being, to restart the dialectic, the cosmos has to commit divine suicide and start again. This is the end of a cosmic age. Each cosmic age always ends in exactly the same way – with the completion of the dialectic – and cosmic death.

Life IS a messy business, full of contradictions, horrors, evils, illogicalities and irrationalities. When all of the problems of life are resolved then life is actually over because those problems *were* life. The overcoming of obstacles – the business of the dialectic – is the essence of life. When the dialectic is over, what's left? People everywhere are bedazzled and beguiled by the concept of nirvana, heaven, paradise, moksha, release from the wheel of suffering – by the vision of eternal bliss – yet the supreme irony is that this longed for state is indistinguishable from death. To be alive, the cosmos must be striving to attain bliss, but it's a disaster to actually attain it because life is then at an end. It must begin again. It must die and be reborn.

So, although the Illuminati promote the religion of “becoming God” – as the culmination of the dialectic and the perfect actualization of the initial cosmic potential – we don't do so in any naïve way.

When the Community of Gods has become sufficiently big, when a critical mass of divinity is attained, a chain reaction of gnosis takes place and the entire universe becomes enlightened. Every monad becomes God. The whole universe is now God fully actualized, fully manifested. *Deus Absconditus* becomes *Deus Manifestus*. But this chain reaction of light does not stop. It goes all the way – to the Big Bang that ushers in the next Age of the cosmos, the rebirth of the dialectic, the renewal of life.

Let there be Light. Let there be Life!

All principles that apply to the cosmos apply everywhere, big and small. *As above, so below*. The cosmos itself is subject to the same laws as any of us. The universe itself reincarnates, exactly as we do. It goes through the same cycle of birth, growth, death, rebirth.

Life is eternal and the cosmos is eternal. Their journey through eternity is conducted via cycles. The details of the cycle are unique, but the pattern is exactly the same each time. We can see precisely the same thing when we look at humanity. Each life is unique but follows a pattern. All of us are born, are children then adolescents then adults then middle-aged then elderly and then dead. Some unlucky people might die young and some might live much longer than average. These are the outliers, but their lives nevertheless conform to the pattern of all life: birth followed at some point by death.

The dialectic embraces everything, even the irrational. It is the universal science, which includes all the particular sciences, and also everything non-scientific. Logic, Reason, Nature, Will, Desire, Feeling and Mind/Spirit are all aspects of the unfolding dialectic. The dialectic is embedded in the evolution of the cosmos. It is embedded in history. All of the institutions of society are reflective of our current state of dialectical evolution. The workings of the dialectic are revealed all around us. We ourselves, in everything we do, reflect the dialectic. We are the children of the Cosmic Dialectic.

Spinoza and Hegel

There is a great deal of similarity between these two great thinkers. Spinoza, a rationalist philosopher, was often accused of pantheism or even atheism. Certainly, his God was nothing like that of Abrahamism. He maintained that there was only one substance that he referred to as “Deus sive Nature” (God or Nature) i.e. God and the cosmos were one and the same. As for mind and matter, they were just different attributes of this single substance. Spinoza’s system is reminiscent of ancient Stoicism where all matter is infused with mind and subject to the laws of reason. For the Stoics and Spinoza, freedom lay in rationally understanding the laws of the universe. Emotions were a disaster because they clouded our judgement, obscured the truth, and made us want things that could never be. They made us rail against divine reason rather than embracing it and seeing its underlying perfection.

As for Hegel, he was an idealist, rationalist philosopher, very much in the mould of his Illuminatus predecessor Heraclitus, who based the universe on reason (Logos), dynamism, and the dialectic. For Hegel, matter was a mode of mind.

Where Spinoza’s system was largely static, with reason fully formed (so to speak), Hegel’s system was dynamic and evolutionary, with reason dialectically perfecting itself. Their vision is much the same, but with Hegel’s system acting as a dynamic and evolving version of Spinoza’s system. By the same token, Aristotle’s philosophy was a more dynamic and evolutionary version of Plato’s.

In philosophy, static systems are often recast in dynamic terms, usually for the better.

The tension between static and dynamic thinking goes back to Parmenides and Heraclitus. The former maintained that change was illusory and the latter that change was the only reality. We also see the same type of dichotomy in Creationism versus Evolutionism. Creationists picture an unchanging Creator making a static, perfect spherical universe, like the old Aristotelian cosmos with its crystal spheres, one within another in perfect order like Russian dolls. Evolutionary thinking dispenses with an unchanging Creator and has the whole of existence in motion, dynamically changing.

In general, Mythos thinkers are Creationists and Logos thinkers are Evolutionists. Creationism lends itself to silly, irrational stories and Evolutionism to scientific, rational processes.

All thinking can be reduced to Mythos and Logos, to Creationism and Evolutionism, to static versus dynamic thinking. Intuitive people are always attracted to evolutionary thinking because it promises a better future, higher possibilities, things ascending. Intuitives are usually Logos thinkers. Feeling people are much more likely to be Creationist, Mythos thinkers. They are scared of the future and of change. They seek security and certainty. An unchanging Creator is the ultimate symbol of security and certainty. All that the feeling person has to do is place their faith in the Creator and they can emotionally relax.

A feeling person is not interested in actual truth. What he wants is the *feeling* that he has access to the truth. A bewildering world of relativity theory, quantum theory, M-theory, dialectical processes and so on offers no reassurance to a feeling type. Everything seems vague, uncertain, provisional. This, for a feeling person, is an abyss of dread and doubt. He demands a Creator because only a Creator stands for certainty.

We see that people’s ways of thinking, their beliefs, their attitudes to knowledge and reason are all actually dictated by their psychological personality types and their brain wiring. Mythos Creationists do not choose to be of that type. Their emotions drive them into that camp.

Mythos Creationism is the natural mode of thinking of a sentimental, nostalgic, fearful, superstitious, emotional person. Logos Evolutionism is the natural mode of thinking of a logical, analytical, rational person.

Probably by the age of three, a child is in one camp or the other, and extremely unlikely to change camps, even though certain aspects of his personality may change over time.

Darwin versus Hegel

Darwinian Evolutionism differs from Hegelian Evolutionism in respect of the purpose of the universe. Darwinism points to world of things becoming better and better adapted to their environment via natural selection, but there is no intrinsic desire of anything to get better, to become more perfect. It happens as an inevitable consequence of natural selection (though whether Darwinism is relevant to human minds is a very different matter – there seems to be no general improvement in the quality of human minds; the reverse is true, if anything). The dialectic, on the other hand, is all about teleology – about the universe *wanting* to improve, to become more perfect. The dialectic presupposes that the universe has a mental aspect while Darwinism is based on pure materialism.

Illuminism asserts that Darwinism and Hegelianism are difficult to distinguish practically. There's no simple observation that can prove one correct and disprove the other. However, materialism is, by its very nature, in serious philosophical difficulties when it attempts to account for how life and mind arise from dead, mindless atoms. Hegelianism attributes inherent life and mind, albeit rudimentary, to everything in the universe.

If you look at the human cities of the present day compared with the caves of Stone Age people, is this remarkable transformation caused by materialistic natural selection or by idealistic dialectical improvement? And if humanity can come this far in a few thousand years, what will it achieve in millions of years? Idealistic dialecticalism points to humanity, or at least its finest exemplars, becoming more and more like Gods. Darwinism makes no such predictions since it assigns no purpose to life, and isn't interested in the fate of human beings. Scientists are much happier to describe the fate of the universe which is one, most of them say, of terminal heat death – where the whole universe runs down because of the Second Law of Thermodynamics. In the scientific view, human beings are merely a bizarre epiphenomenon that appears in a small window of opportunity during the evolution of the non-mental universe. In the Hegelian view, matter is a necessary dialectical phenomenon that appears during the evolution of the mind.

For scientists, matter is driving everything. For Hegelians, mind is driving everything. For scientists, life and mind are inconsequential; the laws of physics are all that count. For Hegelians, life and mind are everything. They are the whole point of the universe, not incidental to it. The laws of reason are all that count – and these laws are dialectical in an ontological sense.

So, which version of evolutionary theory do you prefer? Scientific materialism has no spiritual or religious dimension. Hegelianism, on the other hand, is fundamentally spiritual and religious, and matter is only a vehicle for the evolution of mind.

Both forms of Evolutionism reflect Logos thinking, but they differ radically in how they treat the mind-body problem. Darwinism rejects mind as an independent reality. Hegelianism rejects matter as an independent reality. In Darwinism, a purposeless material universe unfolds according to the inexorable laws of physics. In Hegelianism, the unconscious mind of the cosmos comes to consciousness and perfection according to the inexorable dialectical laws of reason. Those are your two choices: materialism versus idealism – an evolving, purposeless material universe or an evolving, purposeful mental universe.

As for Mythos Creationism, it rejects Evolutionism entirely. Eastern religion is a kind of halfway house between Mythos Creationism and Logos Evolutionism. The concept of karma – a fixed moral dimension of the cosmos – is highly Creationist. But samsara and reincarnation are evolutionary.

Over and over again in human thinking, we see a few basic building blocks being

rearranged in different ways. In Illuminism, the basic building blocks are monads and the numbers of mathematics – and they are fundamentally mental rather than physical. In science, the building blocks are thought to be “strings”, and they are physical rather than mental. In Abrahamism, God is the basis of everything else. In Eastern religion, the living cosmos is the basis of everything.

The thinking of Spinoza and Hegel can easily be reconciled with Eastern religion if the latter chooses to ditch mysticism and ritual and become much more logical, rational and analytical. Scientific materialism could easily be reconciled with Spinoza and Hegel if it became scientific idealism. There is only one type of thinking that is irrevocably separate from everything else – Abrahamic Creationism.

The Jews, as the inventors of Abrahamic Monotheistic Creationism, committed the greatest intellectual error in history, setting humanity back by thousands of years. Everyone who embraces Abrahamism is an enemy of intellect. Abrahamism is pure Mythos and that’s all it can ever be. Its appeal, such as it is, is solely to emotion. To every Logos thinker, Abrahamism is incomprehensible. It’s so irrational as to be actively offensive to any rational person.

Anyone who embraces Abrahamism is expressing contempt for reason. As Kierkegaard recognised, to “believe” in Abrahamism requires the wholesale rejection of reason. There is no conceivable rational defence of Abrahamism. It is loved by all stupid people who revere their own feelings and place these above thinking. The people who love Abrahamism most of all are those infinitely submissive and masochistic people who long to be on their knees, debasing themselves before an infinite Master and Sadist.

If anyone were to intellectually set out to design the ultimate Sadist, they would arrive at the Abrahamic God. He simply cannot be rivalled as the ultimate sadistic cosmic psychopath. And is that not the definition of the Devil?

The Monadic God

It is said that, for Hegel, God was not a transcendent being. Rather he was “immanent”; part of the spiritual selves of all human beings. God is “Absolute Reality” – the dialectical culmination of cosmic evolution.

Hegel wrote, “There is only one Being ... and things by their very nature form part of it, and there is in the believer a divine element which rediscovers itself, its true nature.”

Thus Hegel was able to reinterpret the Christian “Incarnation” not as a singular event, but as an allegory for the capacity of all human beings to find the kingdom of God within themselves i.e. to become God. The divine and human natures are not radically separate at all. In fact, there is no intrinsic difference. We are all human but we can all attain divinity. Why? Because we are all part of God, of the evolving Absolute. As he evolves, so do we. Our evolution is his evolution – and he reaches perfection only through our perfection. It is our divinity that completes the cosmic divinity.

What are the Illuminati looking for?

The leadership of the Illuminati subscribe to the “great human being” theory of history. Individuals are always the catalyst for great changes. The common herd, the flock of sheeple, can be viewed as automata or puppets. They will dance to whatever tune world-historic individuals compose.

Secondly, the Illuminati cite the Spartan mantra, “Sink or swim.” World-historic figures are those who, by definition, succeed. They are the swimmers. All obstacles placed in front of them – and there are always many – are overcome. They find the answers. They solve the problems. They defeat the opposition.

If the Illuminati recruit as many would-be world-historic figures as possible, sooner or later one of them will live up to their billing and command the zeitgeist. They will inspire the world to give birth to itself anew, free of all the mistakes of the past, particularly of Abrahamism, free market capitalism and privilege.

The Mathematical Arche

Try imagining a world without any mathematics at all. Is such a thing possible? Is mathematics therefore essential? If it is, why should it only be partial? Why shouldn't it be all-embracing, everything, the *totality*? Why should mathematics not be reality itself? After all, is there any better candidate for defining reality?

Everything we have said flows from the single inference, first drawn by Pythagoras, our first official Grand Master, that all things are numbers, hence everything is mathematical.

If mathematics is the arche, the foundation of existence, then existence must be configured mathematically i.e. according to a mathematical coordinate grid, and each point on the grid must be an actual, existential thing – a monad, an entity, a dimensionless point, an unconscious mind. If you deny this to be so, how can you account for the overwhelming mathematical nature of science? And how can there be a type of scientific mathematics that is different from actual mathematics? If mathematics is our supreme tool for unlocking the mysteries of unreality, how can reality NOT be mathematical and how can it not be based on an ontological Cartesian set of axes forming a monadic plenum that covers everything?

The Divine Subject

If you are inclined to bow to anyone, it certainly shouldn't be to the murderous, lying Torture God of Abrahamism. Instead, it should be to mathematicians. Mathematicians, far from being the geek gang, the freak parade, the dork division, the uncool collective, are the true Master Race, the Chosen People, the Community of Saints, the Elect, the Saved, the most favoured of God, the Chosen Ones, the real Messiahs. Above all, they are closest to becoming God because they are closest to understanding the true nature of the universe.

Everything ontologically mathematical is real and everything real is ontologically mathematical... this is the gospel of the Illuminati.

If mathematics is the language of God then if you are mathematically illiterate you will never know the mind of God. Why have the idiotic Abrahamic religions of faith and fanaticism fared so well? It's because they cater for the legions of the irrational, mathematical illiterates. How is it possible for holy texts not to mention mathematics? What do you think is more likely? – that God speaks Hebrew, Arabic or mathematics? You would need to be retarded to believe that God is a Jew or an Arab or that he was born in a stable to a 14-year-old Jewess (claiming to be a virgin to avoid being stoned to death for fornication).

So, you think you know better than the Illuminati?

If think you can outsmart the Illuminati, you would be asserting that you are more intelligent than intellectual giants such as Hegel, Pythagoras and Leibniz. Hegel's influence over humanity has been astounding, particularly via the distortion of his teachings that found expression in Marxism. Without Hegel, there would have been no Marx. Marx was certainly right about one thing: the dialect is at the core of any possibility of human progress.

Pythagoras is one of the most influential individuals of all time. A powerful echo of his philosophy is publicly available via Plato, also an Illuminatus.

As for Leibniz, he is almost certainly the most intelligent human being who ever lived, infinitely smarter than Moses, Buddha, Mohammed or Jesus Christ. Do you seriously think you

can out-rationalize the inventor of calculus? Is your logic superior to this seminal figure in the development of mathematical logic? Leibniz's Monadology is the summit of human thinking. It is the answer to everything. This is not a question of faith. This is a fact. No one is asking you to believe a single thing we have said. No one is threatening you if you choose not to accept the truth. That's your problem.

The Illuminati are idealists, panpsychics, dialecticians, monists and, above all, rationalists. Illumination is the culmination of idealism and rationalism. It asserts the absolute primacy of mind over matter, of intellect over will, of reason over faith.

Absolute knowledge and absolute truth are available to humanity for one reason alone: mathematics. All true statements about the universe are mathematical. All true knowledge about the universe is mathematical. There is nothing other than mathematics. Mathematics is the quintessential subject of the mind. It does not require any empirical knowledge at all. It does not require any engagement with the world of the senses. The reason why we need science to explore the world is that humans are not yet good enough mathematicians. If we were, we could answer everything without any reference to science.

All possible knowledge is contained in the numbers, functions and equations of mathematics. No knowledge exists externally to mathematics. The only truly problematic aspect of mathematics arises when it is subjective rather than objective. We are mathematical subjects and our inner experience of mathematics is not one of pure reason but of feelings and sensations, desire and will. That is, we do not encounter our own mathematical natures mathematically. Subjective mathematics is completely different from objective mathematics. Mathematics experienced from the inside is the realm of the senses, of consciousness. Yet if seen from the outside, everything you experience is just mathematical signals.

Eventually there will come a time when every objective mathematical signal can be interpreted subjectively and the masters of mathematics will know everything that anyone is thinking or feeling. This, in fact, is what happens when you achieve gnosis and become God.

The old philosophical debate between empiricism and rationalism turns out to be a mathematical misunderstanding. Empiricism is subjective mathematics while rationalism is objective mathematics. They are not opposed to each other at all; they are two aspects of the same thing. Empiricism, the arena of our senses, is telling us what it's like to experience mathematical signals. Rationalism, the arena of our logical mind, is telling us how to perform mathematics objectively. Naturally, both approaches should be used in tandem. No empiricist should ever reject pure reason out of hand, and no rationalist should reject sensory information as completely irrelevant.

“We must know. We will know.” – Mathematician David Hilbert
Zero – the Missing Number

The earliest known record of zero is from the ninth century in India, although it was probably in use centuries earlier.

Why were the Indians so amenable to zero? How were they able to take this astounding imaginative leap when no one else could, including the brilliant Greeks? (In fact, the Pythagoreans knew about zero too but it was one of their greatest secrets. It was the number of the immaterial universe which preceded the number one, the first number of the material world. However, it was a concept that was never properly developed until Leibniz made it the centrepiece of his Monadology.)

The concepts of nothingness and eternity lay at the heart of Hinduism. For the Eastern religious mind, the universe is born out of nothingness and nothingness is the ultimate goal of humanity (the return to the origin). The Eastern mind was fixated on the void. What was more

natural than to present it mathematically?

Growth

It is not enough to live. One must grow. The basic urge of life is not mere existence; it is development; it is ascending the scale, becoming more actualized, more Godlike. If you have not embarked on a project to become God then you are an insult to life and you do not deserve life. You are a life blocker, preventing another soul from having its opportunity. Piss, or get off the pot, as the saying goes.

Heraclitus

Heraclitus was a rationalist, regarding reason as more important than sense perception. He believed that the rational life was the best life, but he was fully aware that most people prefer the life of feeling and sensing, the life of passion and sensuality. It was through reason, Heraclitus thought, that we made contact with the divine order. The controlling element of the cosmos was rational, so the more rational we were, the more we reflected the cosmic intelligence.

Socrates and Plato also rubbished the notion that truth could be found in the sensory world and the world of the passions.

Socrates said, "The unexamined life is not worth living." Sadly, almost all human beings lead unexamined lives. Examining your life is a rational undertaking, and most people aren't rational.

The Truth

How do we attain true knowledge rather than mere opinion? What is our method? What's for sure is that truth is not democratic. It is never the majority that determines truth. As Robert Heinlein observed so astutely, "Democracy can't work. Mathematicians, peasants, and animals, that's all there is – so democracy, a theory based on the assumption that mathematicians and peasants are equal, can never work. Wisdom is not additive; its maximum is that of the wisest man in a given group."

For everyone who doesn't like mathematics, too bad. You'll never understand reality. Truth is not "democratic". It's not for everybody. It's reserved for smart people, and if you're not smart, you had better stick to the Bible, Torah, Koran or whatever other irrational, ignorant, faith-based, superstitious claptrap you find comforting.

Illumination is about the complete removal of faith and doubt from the world and their replacement by certain mathematical knowledge. Pythagoras, the first formal Grand Master of the Illuminati, saw two and half thousand years ago that mathematics was the most important thing of all – and he made a religion of it. But this is no religion of faith. This is a religion of reason that proves the existence of the soul, God and the afterlife. What's more, it offers EVERY SOUL the chance to become God, just as in chess, every pawn is capable of being promoted to the Queen, the most important piece on the board. "Living Chess" is almost a perfect allegory of the mathematical universe.

Humanity's greatest thinkers are those most in contact with truth. The truth does not reside in ancient books of revelation by bearded prophets. The very idea that truth hasn't changed for millennia despite all of the immense advances in human knowledge is insane. How can books reporting the words of semi-literate and even illiterate prophets (like Mohammed) written before the Renaissance, the Enlightenment and the rise of modern science and mathematics possibly outgun the greatest intellectual achievements of humanity's modern geniuses? It's bizarre to imagine that the truth isn't always progressing. How backward would you have to be to think that desert books devoid of any mathematical, scientific or philosophical content could have anything

worthwhile and relevant to say in the modern world?

Idealism versus Materialism

“Is the universe actually just a great mind, or is it really matter throughout? Is matter mind or is mind matter? If it is mind and matter, what is the relation between the two? How can mind influence matter or matter influence mind? Have philosophers found a solution to the problem of the relationship between mind and matter?” – S. E. Frost, Jr

“But, with the coming of the present-day world, a world in which men are questioning the materialistic premises seriously, there are indications that some new form of idealism is just over the horizon. Values, spiritual experiences, ideals and aspirations do not seem to be accounted for completely by materialism. There is a growing feeling among present-day thinkers that the next step in philosophy will be a new Idealism.” – S. E. Frost, Jr

Illuminism is this “new” Idealism that the world has been waiting for.

Perfect Plato

For Plato, the true universe is a place of perfect, changeless, pure and eternal Forms, while the “false” universe of appearances is imperfect, always changing, impure and mortal. The true universe is one of pure being while the universe we experience is one of pure becoming.

Plato, it transpires, is exactly right if we translate all of his ideas into mathematics. The domain of perfect, unchanging forms is that of the laws of mathematics. Numbers, geometrical shapes, the laws of mathematical relations, the laws of logic, the formulas, equations and identities of mathematics are all fixed forever. They are absolutely, eternally true, and they wholly control and shape the world of becoming.

How can the world of becoming be understood mathematically? It couldn't be simpler. The domain of becoming is the domain of ever-changing and interacting mathematical functions. Functions are dynamic entities. While the definition of any particular, basic function is a Form – eternally true – all combinations of functions are new, transient, mutable. Why? Because while the basis functions are unchanging, any complex function comprised of basis functions is inherently unstable since it can always be broken into its parts. We can think of basis functions as the “atoms” of functions while they can be combined in infinite ways to create “molecular” functions. The molecular functions, like all molecules, are unstable because they are not basic and anything not basic will, in the long run, always decompose into its basic parts. That's what it means for something to break down or malfunction. That's what “death” is.

The world is thus composed of two elements: the fixed laws of mathematics, including fixed definitions of basis functions, and the molecular functions which are derived from the basis functions and which give rise to all the complex phenomena of existence. A universe of atoms that can't combine would not be an interesting or fruitful place. But once you have atoms that can combine in endless different ways, you have a Leibnizian universe “simplest in hypotheses and richest in phenomena”.

Think of the English language. You have 26 unchanging atomic letters that can be combined to form a dictionary of words and, from these words, an infinity of different thoughts and ideas can be expressed.

“Language” in its broadest sense defines the whole world. The cosmic language is of course mathematics. All whole numbers can be constructed from the prime numbers alone i.e. the primes are the letters of the alphabet and the other numbers are the words (albeit words whose meaning never changes – unlike words in the English language).

In ontological mathematics, the letters of the alphabet are the set of simple sinusoidal waves (incorporating sine and cosine waves). These “letters” can combine in specific ways to form stable “words”. These mathematical “words” are what we know as the elementary particles of physics, from which we get atoms, the building blocks of nature – and these can then combine endlessly to form the sentences, paragraphs, poems, short stories, reports, studies, academic treatises and novels that we know in the scientific world as molecules, and as “super molecules” such as DNA that can define something as astonishing as a conscious human being, made from nothing but food and water!

Building complex entities from simpler ones is the essence of existence and evolution. Creating the novels of life from the letters and words of life is what it's all about. Without the building blocks, there can be no complex marvels. But every complex marvel is always in danger of degenerating back into its components. The struggle between simplicity and complexity is eternal. All simple things might be said to have a desire to become more complex, but this

complexity leads to all sorts of stresses and strains, meaning that all complex things have a tendency to revert to their simpler building blocks.

As we have said, language in all of its forms is the essence of reality. A language needs letters, words, sentences, syntax, grammar, correct spellings (wrong spellings are like genetic mutations – some of them might be naturally selected and prosper, killing off the old spellings). All languages are ultimately based on the inherent mathematical language of reality. A language such as English is just mathematics expressed in letters rather than numbers. Human languages tend to emphasise feelings. They are not about precision. They abandon rigorous logic and syntax in favour of “self-expression”. Many of the problems of the human race flow from bad choices of language. The ludicrous Abrahamic texts would be impossible to express in terms of mathematics.

Why is science so much more successful and powerful than religion in terms of its positive achievements for the betterment of humanity? It’s because it does not stray far from the rigour and accuracy of mathematics. The Abrahamic texts, on the other hand, are based on illogical, imprecise emotional claptrap that appeals directly to the feeling and sensing parts of the brain and avoids the intellectual and rational parts.

Religious beliefs are a function of personality types. Those who are not configured as thinkers and/or intuitives have been cast adrift in the ocean of knowledge and reason. They flounder. They drown. So, they flee that deadly ocean and plant themselves in the intellectual desert wherein flourishes a delightful oasis of feelings and sensations. Here, no awkward questions are asked, no complex equations are presented. Everyone’s feelings are as valid as everyone else’s. Everyone can feel empowered. No one criticises them and exposes them as morons.

These people do not proclaim cogito ergo sum. Only a mathematician-philosopher, as Descartes was, would ever say such a thing. Most believers declare, “I feel therefore I am.”; “I sense therefore I am.”; “I believe therefore I am.” Above all, Abrahamists say, “I OBEY therefore I am.” They are defined by their submission to their God. Their agenda is nowhere clearer than in the case of Islam. This word means SUBMISSION. It is the perfect religion for slaves. It is an insult to human freedom and dignity. All Muslims have declared war on the human race and declared their absolute loyalty to their master – Allah/Satan. They should not be defined as part of the human race. The Jews and Christians are barely any better. These are also archetypal slave religions.

The Language of Life

“Our DNA lives inside our bodies. It is not concentrated in a particular part of the body, but it is distributed among the cells. There are about a thousand million million cells making up an average human body, and, with some exceptions which we can ignore, every one of those cells contains a complete copy of the body’s DNA. This DNA can be regarded as a set of instructions for how to make a body, written in the A, T, C, G alphabet of the nucleotides. It is as though, in every room of a gigantic building, there was a bookcase containing the architect’s plans for the entire building. The ‘book-case’ in a cell is called the nucleus. The architect’s plans run to 46 volumes in man – the number is different in other species. The ‘volumes’ are called chromosomes. They are visible under a microscope as long threads, and the genes are strung out along them in order.” – Richard Dawkins, *The Selfish Gene*

Here, Dawkins presents us with a wonderfully effective and clear metaphor. Each cell, the basic building block of the body, contains the whole body’s design plan (DNA). The design plan is divided into volumes (chromosomes), pages (genes), words (nucleotides) and letters (atoms).

We contend that this basic scheme applies to EVERYTHING. Basic elements are built up in organised layers to form more complex units, and eventually an infinitely diverse expression of complex phenomena becomes possible. This is the essence of EVOLUTION. The entire universe of becoming is evolutionary, and it takes its laws and basic units from the eternal world of being: the domain of the laws of mathematics. Plato’s dream of reconciling Parmenides (the philosopher of pure being: nothing ever truly changes) and Heraclitus (the philosopher of pure becoming: nothing every truly stays the same) is thus triumphantly vindicated.

The Illuminati once held a relentlessly Heraclitean view of the cosmos and considered that everything was becoming. Mathematics itself was regarded as evolutionary, as something the cosmic mind learned by trial and error. Mathematics was not regarded as a given but as something that developed in conjunction with the evolving mind. In some sense, therefore, it was deemed a construction of the mind rather than as entirely separate from the mind. It eventually became clear to Leibniz that this view was mistaken. With a flash of godlike intuition, he had a wondrous epiphany. He realised that all elements of mathematics are true simultaneously. If one part is true, the entirety is true. All elements are dependent on each other. If one falls, the whole edifice falls.

Mathematics embodies the ultimate principle of existence that we have named the Holographic Principle (holos = whole; graphos = writing; holography = the writing of the whole). Each part is contained in the whole and the whole is contained in each part. It is for this reason that ONTOLOGICAL ZERO (pure existence), the most important number of all, is so vital and so different from ABSTRACT ZERO (non-existence).

Ontological Zero contains, of necessity, the WHOLE of mathematics. All the numbers, laws, equations, basis functions, geometrical shapes and logic of mathematics are encoded within Ontological Zero. What this means is that Ontological Zero can be considered as the cosmic living cell. Its “DNA” is mathematics itself. Every one of the infinite ontological zeros that constitute existence is encoded with the entirety of mathematics. That encoding is permanent and unchanging. Mathematics is Platonic – eternal, immutable and perfect.

Just as Ontological Zeros are eternal – they can neither be created nor destroyed; they are pure existence itself – so is mathematics itself. All elements of mathematics depend on all of the other elements. Ontological mathematics is entirely self-consistent and coherent. Each element is defined with respect to the others. Each makes sense only in relation to the others. It’s an all or

nothing scenario. If any element were removed, the rest would no longer make any sense. If anything were added, the system would no longer make any sense. Mathematics, exactly like existence itself, can be neither created nor destroyed. Nothing can be added to it and nothing subtracted.

Humanity's view of mathematics is currently limited. We don't yet see the whole picture, but the whole picture nevertheless exists and is known to the Mind of God. We make mathematical discoveries, not mathematical inventions. We are continually making advances in our understanding of mathematics. We are like jigsaw players piecing it all together. But the big picture, the complete jigsaw, is out there right now, and has always been. It's eternal. It's complete.

Mathematics is the unchanging cosmic DNA. It's pure, immutable being. Everything obeys mathematical laws because mathematics is encoded in everything. Everything "understands" mathematics and operates mathematically precisely because of that inherent coding. The mystery of where the laws that governed the Big Bang were prior to the Big Bang is solved. Those laws are mathematical and they are encoded in the fabric of existence itself. Ontological Zero, the basis of existence, IS mathematics. It contains the entirety of mathematics and that is eternally true. Existence IS mathematics. The two are synonymous. Try to imagine a universe without mathematics. Imagine a science not based on mathematics. It's impossible. A non-mathematical universe is inconceivable.

Mathematics determines everything. Mathematics creates God; God does not create mathematics. Mathematics is a single, eternal, self-consistent system. We could say that mathematics is the eternal Mind of God, God in himself, God Unconscious.

Mathematics is Deus Absconditus – the Hidden God. It seeks to become Deus Manifestus – the Revealed God, the Conscious God.

What is the final purpose of reality? What is the meaning of life? It is for mathematics to become conscious of itself, to recognize itself in the mirror of existence, to know itself as mathematics. That's why the supreme God is the God of Mathematics.

Hegel declared in the final section of his Phenomenology that absolute knowledge is "mind knowing itself in the shape of mind." We could rewrite this as "mathematics knowing itself in the shape of mathematics."

Absolute knowledge is attained when mathematics realizes that what it seeks to know is itself. Mathematics is the answer to "life, the universe and everything." Mathematics is the eternal truth of existence. The reason why we don't perceive that to be the case is that we are experiencing mathematics from its subjective inside, a domain of feelings and sensations, strivings and desires, fears and dreams.

The inside of mathematics is the domain of Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem. "Objective mathematics" is complete: it is fully coherent and self-consistent. But "subjective mathematics" is the domain of self-reference, of "truths" that are true for the subject but are often meaningless in terms of objective mathematics.

If a person deliberately tells a lie, he has thrown a spanner in the works of objective, causal mathematics. If he exercises free will, he causes bizarre things to happen. Free will and lies – impossible in objective, provable mathematics – are the exclusive province of subjective mathematics.

When Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem is added to objective mathematics, it makes mathematics finally "complete". Mathematics, in order to be capable of explaining ALL of existence must be able to account for lies, delusions, feelings, hallucinations, imaginings, free will and subjectivity. All of that is impossible within objective, causal mathematics where everything is provable, mechanical and deterministic (i.e. that defines the domain of scientific

materialism with its strange, dogmatic denial of free will).

Gödel's Incompleteness Theory is necessary to prove the existence of subjectivity, of self-reference, of free will and personal feelings. The Incompleteness Theorem is one of the greatest discoveries of all time because it constitutes the mathematical proof of the existence of free will. Without the Incompleteness Theorem, we would live in a purely objective, clockwork universe in which everything could be predicted with astonishing accuracy (even quantum mechanics doesn't radically change that picture). With the Incompleteness Theorem, the universe can be subjective and it can exercise free will. It can feel. It can lie. It can love. It can invent. It can DREAM.

The Incompleteness Theorem declares that mathematics is not just a relentless, inflexible set of unchallengeable proofs. It actually contains a magic ingredient called self-reference or subjectivity which sabotages mathematics as a system of absolute logic – and allows us (mathematical subjects) to be free. It was essential for mathematics to have such a possibility, and Gödel, the great genius, provided it.

Gödel revered Leibniz and it's fitting that he should have completed the Leibnizian project of defining existence as 100% mathematical. The Incompleteness Theorem was the final logical brick – the proof of the existence of free will within the mathematical framework. Who could have guessed that mathematics could be used to reveal its own greatest strength (or weakness from the point of view of scientific materialists) – the ability to subvert itself through the exercise of unpredictable free will!

The Incompleteness Theorem guarantees that the universe is not clockwork, and not subject to the relentless machinery of cause and effect that would make freedom impossible.

So, to gain absolute knowledge of the universe is to gain absolute knowledge of mathematics. That is what it means to be “all knowing”, “all powerful” and “all seeing” i.e. to be God. Anyone who achieves perfect knowledge of mathematics and the ability to control mathematical functions at will ipso facto becomes God.

Ancient Greek Atomism

“Their point of view was remarkably like that of modern science, and avoided most of the faults to which Greek speculation was prone. They believed that everything is composed of atoms, which are physically, but not geometrically, indivisible; that between the atoms there is empty space; that atoms are indestructible; that they always have been, and always will be, in motion; that there are an infinite number of atoms, and even of kinds of atoms, the differences being as regards shapes and size. Aristotle asserts that, according to the atomists, atoms also differ as regards heat, the spherical atoms, which compose fire, being the hottest; and as regards weight, he quotes Democritus as saying, ‘The more any indivisible exceeds, the heavier it is.’ But the theory of whether atoms are originally possessed of weight in the theories of the atomists is a controversial one... There is considerable reason to think that weight was not an original property of the atoms of Leucippus and Democritus. It seems more probable that, on their view, atoms were originally moving at random, as in the modern kinetic theory of gases. Democritus said there was neither up nor down in the infinite void, and compared the movement of atoms in the soul to that of motes in a sunbeam when there is no wind.” – Bertrand Russell

The Atomist Leucippus was the first to declare a principle of sufficient reason: “Naught happens for nothing, but everything from a ground and of necessity.” Although the Atomists were often accused of attributing everything to chance, they were, as we see from Leucippus's statement, strict determinists. Nothing at all happens by chance. All atomic collisions are fully determined. Mechanical laws governed all. As Bertrand Russell noted, the theory of the atomists was closer to modern science than any other theory of antiquity. There was no teleology in this

system, no specific end for which the atoms were striving. In other words, atomism was pointless and meaningless system – exactly like modern scientific materialism. Atomism was essentially the first appearance in history of atheistic scientific materialism.

Teleological versus Mechanistic Questions

“The atomists, unlike Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, sought to explain the world without introducing the notion of purpose or *final cause*. The ‘final cause’ of an occurrence is an event in the future for the sake of which the occurrence takes place. In human affairs, this conception is applicable. Why does the baker make bread? Because people will be hungry. Why are railways built? Because people will wish to travel. In such cases, things are explained by the purpose they serve. When we ask ‘why?’ concerning an event, we may mean either of two things. We may mean ‘What purpose did this event serve?’ or we may mean: ‘What earlier circumstances caused this event?’ The answer to the former question is a teleological explanation, or an explanation by final causes; the answer to the latter is a mechanistic explanation. I do not see how it could have been known in advance which of these two questions science ought to ask, or whether it ought to ask both. But experience has shown that the mechanistic question leads to scientific knowledge, while the teleological question does not. The atomists asked the mechanistic question, and gave a mechanistic answer. Their successors, until the Renaissance, were more interested in the teleological question, and thus led science up a blind alley.” – Bertrand Russell

This is a brilliant synopsis of the difference between teleological and mechanistic questions. The latter questions are superb for answering “how” but say nothing at all about “why”. Mechanistic questions are fundamentally anti-religious. The mechanistic view simply refuses to ponder the whys of existence. Everything is analyzed in terms of the immediately preceding causes. There is no notion of anything aiming for any particular future state, no intentionality.

Russell rightly says that teleological questions are valid in relation to human conduct, yet surely he means a much more general point: teleology is all about MIND while mechanism is all about MATTER. The debate about teleological versus mechanistic questions is just another way of framing the mind-matter problem. Minds are purposeful; dead, mindless matter is not.

According to mechanistic theories, mind just happened to emerge from purposeless, mechanistic collisions and interactions. There are several enormous problems here. How CAN mind emerge from matter if it is so radically different from matter? This immediately raises the problem of Cartesian dualism. Two radically different substances cannot interact, and neither can one emerge from the other. Descartes consigned them to two totally separate domains. Materialists will never answer the problem of mind. Mind, as understood by Descartes, is permanently outside the materialist paradigm. Mechanistic questions and answers, no matter how useful up to a point, will never address any of the fundamental questions of existence concerning souls, God, consciousness and the afterlife. Mechanistic explanations will never explain “why”. They will never provide purposes and meaning. For that, idealism must be invoked.

The essential feature of mind is not consciousness and nor is it reason. The key to mind is purpose, teleology. All mental activity is directed towards an end. It is intentional. It might be utterly hopeless at securing its ends; it might have no clever plan or no ability to reason its way to where it wants to go. Yet its purpose is not at all difficult to define. It is not some far distant grand plan. Its purpose is the one Nietzsche identified: to achieve more power.

Imagine a mind operating across many eons. All it ever does, unconsciously, is ask itself a single question: how do I acquire more power? 49.9% of the time it might fail to increase its power, but that means that 50.1% of the time it succeeds and that tiny difference over countless years means the difference between inert rocks and Leonardo da Vinci. Minds are always pushing to become more powerful minds; to exercise more power over their environment.

The difference between a) an unconscious mind struggling and groping blindly towards more power and b) mindless mechanistic behaviour, is at any instant impossible to determine. We have no way to distinguish the two situations. Mechanists have simply concluded that no mind is at work. They say that evolution is not a minded process but simply comes about by accident. Random, purposeless interactions and collisions produce certain outcomes and these outcomes are either naturally selected by the environment, in which case they prosper and multiply in the environment, or they do not flourish and die off. But what is natural selection if not a contest for power? If two boxers are trying to win a fight, they will struggle and one will win. Both boxers are fighting with a specific purpose – to win – but only one achieves it. The winner is “naturally selected” and prospers. The loser fades away one way or another. Would we ever say that the two boxers randomly threw punches and that one accidental set of punches was more successful than the other, and that this was the basis of evolution?

Because we can't see any evidence of mind at the atomic and molecular level, scientists treat atoms and molecules as nothing but mechanisms, but in fact, they have no way to eliminate the possibility that natural selection is minded and teleological rather than simply mechanistic. If atoms and molecules are themselves “minded”, there can be no surprise that they eventually give rise to beings like us that are unmistakably minded beings with intentionality. If atoms and molecules are not minded it is the greatest miracle of eternity that random collisions between dead, mindless particles create mathematicians, philosophers and writers of love poems.

The maxim that something can never come from nothing is equally applicable to this situation. Something (life, mind, consciousness) cannot come from antecedent states in which these qualities are non-existent (i.e. in which they are nothing). A wholly new phenomenon cannot emerge from an environment or constituents in which it is entirely absent. That would be the equivalent of an existent springing from non-existence. It's impossible. All the qualities that manifest themselves in existence MUST already be present in much simpler form in the elementary units of existence. In other words, life, mind and consciousness must exist explicitly or implicitly within the monads of existence. They are released by the process of evolution, by simpler things becoming more complex. Life, mind and consciousness – all barely noticeable at a simple level of existence – become evident only when complexity is sufficient to start expressing them meaningfully. Until such meaningful expression is attained, it's simpler to apply mechanistic thinking, but that does not mean that teleology isn't in operation. The mistake the scientific materialists always make is to take absence of evidence as evidence of absence.

Russell is wrong. There is no sharp division between teleological and mechanistic questions. We should apply mechanistic thinking to situations where there is no obvious evidence of mind at work, but in the full knowledge that mind eventually comes into play only because it is already present at the simpler, so-called mechanistic stage of existence.

Here is Russell's metaphor for humanity's position in the universe, and all scientific materialists share the same sentiment. He says that the human race resembles a group of shipwrecked sailors on a fragile raft in a vast sea at a moonless midnight. One by one, the exhausted sailors slip off the raft into the water, never to be heard from again. Finally, the last man falls off and disappears beneath the waves. The ocean rolls on, heedless. It cares not for humanity. It doesn't even know of its existence. The universe is just like the ocean. It's a vast, implacable machine governed by inexorable mechanistic laws. Humanity has no significance at all in this picture.

Human beings are meaningful only in a teleological universe that is entirely concerned with meaning and purpose. In a mechanistic universe, devoid of meaning and purpose, humanity can never be anything more than a bizarre and supremely pointless sideshow. In a teleological universe, on the other hand, it's all about us. We, and higher consciousnesses, are the whole point

of existence. We are the culmination of the universe's purpose, the actualization of its potential.

Ultimately, the opposing views boil down to this: 1) If the universe is mechanistic, we are machines and our notion of free will is a spectacularly odd illusion. How likely is it that lifeless, mindless atoms would randomly collide until a certain group of creatures (us) had been naturally selected to delude ourselves that we are free against all the mechanistic evidence refuting us? This is about as perverse and unlikely as cars that dream of electric sheep. 2) If the universe is not a machine then it is an organism. It is alive. It has the quality of mind. It is capable of generating consciousness, and with consciousness something remarkable enters the universe: free will, the ability to freely choose between different options. In a universe containing consciousness and free will, the universe cannot be mechanistic and deterministic. There is no such thing as a law of nature or science that can capriciously do whatever it likes. A law that possessed free will would not be a law since it would never be certain what it was going to do.

So, is the universe a mechanism or an organism? To express the problem in another way: is free will real or an elaborate illusion? All scientific materialists, according to their own dogmatic ideology, are not free and never freely choose to do anything. When they stand there pondering what to do, they are merely inefficient machines taking far too long to perform the inevitable actions that the inescapable chain of cause and effect will impose on them.

As for the Illuminati, we know we are authentically free and we know that means the universe is fundamentally alive and teleological.

Your turn... are you free or a machine?

One great problem with teleological thinking is that it naturally lends itself to animism. Thunder happens because the thunder god is angry, so the god must be appeased, probably by a sacrifice! Animism "evolves" into monotheism. "God" floods the world because he is displeased with humanity. God helps to kill the Canaanites because he promised their land to the Jews (the Chosen People). God parts the Red Sea to permit the Jews to escape Pharaoh. God lets the Babylonians sack Jerusalem and enslave the Jews because the Jews failed to worship him properly. God sends his son to redeem humanity.

Abrahamic thinking is entirely teleological – in the worst possible way. Mythos in general is wholly teleological. All narratives revolve around intentions, purposes. All of us are natural teleological thinkers for the simple reason that we apply teleological thinking all the time. We do everything for a calculated purpose.

Logos thinking is primarily mechanistic, reductive, analytic. Teleology in Logos terms is completely different from teleology in Mythos terms. The Second Law of Thermodynamics is a classic example of mechanistic thinking, yet it is in fact also completely teleological. It is stating that the purpose of the universe is to maximise its entropy. It's as if every process in the universe is contemplating how best to increase disorder. As long as teleological thinking is applied in this kind of way, there's nothing anti-scientific about it. Teleology degenerates into nonsense when it posits a conscious personality – a God, angel, superbeing – making things happen in the world. Teleology is sensible when it analyses what the purpose of natural laws are and what state they are inevitably heading towards. The concept of the expanding universe allows us to ponder the teleology of this process – where is it leading, what will its final outcome be, and why does such an expansionary process exist in the first place? What is the sufficient reason for it?

All scientific laws are in fact teleological because all things are happening for the sake of "final causes". Should we say that all entropic processes have a tendency to increase entropy or that the "final state" of maximum entropy is an event in the future for the sake of which all of these entropic increases take place? They are the sine qua non for that final state. We can look at

the same issue both mechanistically and teleologically with no sacrifice of intellectual rigour. Any law whose implications can be examined from the perspective of the “end of time” is teleological. If we predict how the universe will end, we are engaging in teleology. Teleology is simply the study of the “telos” – the end, completion, the omega point, the final Absolute state. We can study that question via Logos means (mathematics, science and philosophy) or via Mythos means (the Last Judgment, the Apocalypse, Armageddon, the End of Days, the Rapture, Judgment Day).

Teleology does NOT imply anti-scientific thinking. Only when it is linked with Mythos thinking is this the outcome.

In the mechanistic view, the universe and human beings are machines. All the mechanisms that apply to the cosmos equally apply to us.

In the organism view, it is just as true that the cosmos is us writ large. Whatever processes are evident in us are present in the cosmos too.

Whether you accept that the universe is a machine or an organism, you are committed to the position that man is a microcosm of the macrocosm (as above, so below). A machine universe produces machine humans. An evolving cosmic organism produces evolving human organisms. Hegel characterised this evolution as proceeding by way of the resolution of contradictions through the dialectic process of thesis, antithesis and synthesis, being repeated over and over again at higher levels until an omega point of perfection is attained: the Absolute.

If the universe gives rise to an Absolute then that is equivalent to God. If the universe is a machine, it will never produce God, except as the most improbable accident of natural selection.

Theologian Friedrich Schleiermacher expressed the view that each individual part of the universe is vital to the whole. For the universe to realize itself to the fullest, every part must also achieve its fullest potential. That is also the position of the Illuminati. The best possible universe is the one in which every monadic soul has attained the status of God. In terms of humanity, the greatest world is one in which all human beings have maximized their abilities. Therefore, politically, the Illuminati are opposed to any forces that stand in the way of people achieving everything of which they are capable. The greatest obstacle to global achievement is the global system of privilege in which a tiny elite appropriate a vast share of the world’s resources for themselves, thus denying others the chance to prosper. They live like kings while the rest are reduced to little more than feudal servitude. The elite regard an optimized world as one in which their families have achieved permanent dynastic mastery over everyone else. They are the antithesis of an optimized human race, hence must be eradicated. Dialectically, this outcome is inevitable.

Guilt

If humans are machines without free will then, of course, they cannot be held morally unaccountable. A serial killer is no different from an earthquake or tornado: just a natural phenomenon, part of an inexorable and inescapable causal chain. The serial killer had no choice. He was not free. The whole legal system is therefore absurd. In materialism, sentencing serial killers to death is as meaningful as sending a lion to the electric chair for murder, or giving a shark a lethal injection. To regard humans as machines acting with scientific inevitability is to make the human condition insane. Even the writing of these words denouncing the machine view of life is a machine activity, entirely driven by inevitable cause and effect? What a pisser!

The Foundation of All

Arche = fundamental substance (foundation of all: existential building blocks) + inner experience + outer experience + process + relation + dialectic.

The most important task facing any rationalist is to define the arche. This was the subject that consumed the pre-Socratic philosophers of ancient Greece, and it remains the most significant endeavour of philosophy. Unless you know exactly what the arche is you can make no further rational progress. Of necessity, you are driven into the provisionalism of science which builds up a picture, bit by bit, but with no sure rational foundations. Any part of science can be overthrown at any time by new experimental data. That very fact proves that science is not strictly rational since no experiment can overthrow the laws of reason.

Only now, with M-theory, is science tackling the subject of the arche, and it's making a spectacular mess of it because scientists simply aren't philosophically minded. They keep making childish blunders and relying on demonstrably false assumptions – which are obvious to philosophers well versed in mentally testing ideas and assumptions to destruction.

The Submarine Thought Experiment

Imagine a submarine deep in the ocean. As it moves forward, it pushes water out of the way. Now let's imagine replacing the water with air. The submarine will plunge downwards because its weight is no longer being supported, but it will continue to push aside air just as it did the water. Now let's imagine replacing the air with aether, the most rarefied element of the ancient Greeks. The submarine's deadly descent will continue and it will push the aether aside just as it did with the water and then the air. Now let's replace the aether by non-existence. What will happen? Strictly speaking, we have no idea because we have no experience at all of non-existence since it doesn't, by definition, exist.

There must be a radical difference between something that exists, (albeit rarefied like hypothetical aether), and non-existence. If there's no difference between aether and non-existence then by Leibniz's Law of Indiscernibles an existent thing (aether) and non-existence are the same thing, which is impossible by definition.

Think of some of the things that might happen if existence hypothetically meets non-existence. An explosion (like matter encountering anti-matter)? An implosion? A vanishing (existence is simply swallowed)? A catastrophic and instantaneous descent (faster than light speed!) until the submarine (the existent) reaches the end of the zone of non-existence (after all, there's nothing there to slow the descent in any way)?

What's for sure is that existence and non-existence cannot ever be found together because this would destroy the laws of reality. Anything could happen. Utterly bizarre phenomena would erupt. There would be no scientific predictability. Whatever space is, it's something and it's not non-existence. It's not void, it's not vacuum, it's not nothingness. In fact, it's made of an infinity of undetectable dimensionless monads.

Universals and Particulars

William of Occam asserted that "universals" (general concepts such as "mankind") exist only as ideas or thoughts in the human mind and have no other reality. Thomas Aquinas, as per Aristotle, asserted that universals exist in particular objects as the essence of things and matter is the substance in which these universals are implanted. Man, then, is the universal "mankind" embedded in matter, and creating endless particular instances of mankind (each person is a particular, sharing in the essence of the universal "mankind"; matter differentiates one particular from the next i.e. we all have different material bodies). Roscelin argued that the universal "mankind" does not exist, but is merely a name for a collection of men. The ancient Jewish philosopher Philo asserted that all universals exist in mind of God.

The Conservation of Movement

Thomas Hobbes, an ultra materialist, asserted that the world consisted of material bodies in motion. That's it. That's all there is.

Descartes, a mind-body dualist, agreed with Hobbes that motion was an essential component of the physical world. Physical reality is governed by the continual transference of motion between physical particles. Descartes held that the total motion in the material universe is constant, and that this particular amount of motion was imparted by God at the beginning of the physical world. Thus Descartes was arguing for a law of the conservation of motion.

No new motion can enter the universe, and nor can any of the universe's existing motion be destroyed. If one object speeds up, another must of necessity slow down. For Descartes, all of the laws of the physical world were concerned with motion. His picture of the material universe was one of material bodies created by God and endowed with motion. Everything about the material universe could be understood by studying particles and their motion. The laws of motion are fixed and mechanical. By understanding these laws and exploiting them for our own purposes, we can scientifically take control of the world. There is no mind in this material universe. The mind has its own separate domain.

The views of Hobbes and Descartes concerning the material world were reminiscent of those of the ancient Greek Atomists. For the Atomists, atoms in motion were the fundamental basis of material reality. This was an arena of relentless, deterministic cause and effect. Mind had no role. There was no possibility of free will. This general view remains the stance of modern scientific materialism. Even a subject such as the study of the brain is an attempt by materialists to vanquish the mind as an independent entity and show that all mental states are in fact materialistic brain states that are part of the general materialistic paradigm of inescapable cause and effect. In other words, brain scientists are attempting to prove why free will is an illusion and that not a single thing we do is ever anything other than the outcome of a preceding causal chain determined by the inflexible laws of science.

Even though Descartes believed passionately in the existence of mind as an independent substance, by separating mind and matter so completely, he created a mind-free zone of mechanism that was perfectly suited to the progress of scientific materialism. His work, and to a lesser extent that of Hobbes, provided the intellectual and philosophical framework for the rise of modern science. Mind was kicked out of touch and left to the grandiose dreams and conjectures of the idealists, above all the German school of idealists.

Cartesian dualism has had an enormous effect on the world. Even today, the mainstream academic world is as baffled as Descartes was by how two absolutely distinct substances can interact. How can a mind "know" the alien material world? How can I raise my material arm just by mentally choosing to do so? Where is the link between thoughts and physical consequences? How can any such link be possible? The mystery seems as deep as ever.

Science still has total contempt for the mind and fundamentally denies that it has any reality beyond material, mechanistic interactions. Science, if properly understood, is pure atheism. It denies any possibility of any afterlife, any soul, any God. When our bodies die, so do our minds. There's nothing left. Everything is linked by cosmic laws that contain no element of freedom or caprice. Everything is relentlessly determined scientifically. God himself, even if he existed, would simply be part of the invincible causal nexus and have no more free will than a rock at the bottom of the ocean.

Scientific causality crushes all religious concepts. Scientific causality renders the mind redundant. There is therefore no more important question than whether there is any escape from the ghastly prison of scientific causality. Our lives are valueless, pointless and meaningless if

scientific causality is the reality of our universe, if causality dictates to the gods themselves.

If scientific causality is true, the universe becomes a farce. It's just a machine that mindlessly rolls forward for no reason other than to fulfil the causal, inevitable program built into it by the laws that govern it. These laws have no purpose. They just are. We might say that the universe is the ultimate black comedy, but of course, we would only reach that conclusion if the relentless causal chain permitted it.

Illuminism achieves the ultimate goal: it frees the universe from scientific causality, establishes the primacy of mind, shows how matter is controlled by mind, and proves beyond any question that existence is teleological and imbued with meaning. Indeed, the universe wants to confer the supreme meaning on each of us personally – because it wants all of us to become God.

The Most Amazing Fact

The universe is made of souls! Souls are all there is. The whole of existence, including the material world, is a reflection of the mathematical interaction of dimensionless souls.

Substance

The arche, the underlying “stuff” of the universe, is infinite, self-caused, and self-determined. It has no limits and is determined by nothing but itself. A “substance” is defined as something that is unique and depends on nothing else for its existence. The “essence” of something is that element of it which makes it part of a class e.g. the essence of a mind, for Descartes, is that it thinks; the essence of matter is that it's extended. For Descartes, matter does not in any way depend on mind, and, equally, mind is in no way dependent on matter. But this automatically raises the dread problem of dualism. How CAN two totally different substances interact? What possible common ground can they have? Neither needs the other, hence there could be a universe of one and not the other without logical contradiction. What sufficient reason would make them co-exist and interact?

The Encoded Laws of the Cosmos

One problem that has been enormously overlooked philosophically and scientifically is how every atom in the world “knows” how to obey the laws of scientific causality. In relation to each and every atom, where are the laws actually stored?

Imagine a human race consisting of human beings each of whom obeys a different set of laws from everyone else. There would be chaos. Organisation, civilisation and the social order would be impossible (that's anarcho-capitalist libertarianism for you!). It's essential for everyone to sign up, more or less, to the same set of laws. How do atoms accomplish this? Why don't they have their own unique laws and do their own thing? What prevents atomic anarchy and libertarianism? From where comes the astonishing obedience to cosmic law that is required by scientific causality? If any two things obey radically different laws, they are effectively different substances, in the manner of Cartesian mind-matter dualism. How can two different substances communicate? How can they be coordinated and causal with regard to each other?

They MUST have exactly the same laws encoded within them. That's why we say that every monad contains the entirety of mathematics built into its very fabric. That's why everything belongs to the same substance. That's how order and organisation, scientific cause and effect are embedded in the world.

It's essential that each part of the universe, each dimensionless point, should contain all of the cosmic laws. Illuminism is built on this principle; science is not. Since scientific materialism denies the independent existence of mind, the cosmic laws must somehow be physical, so where are they? A scientist might argue that the “laws” of a human being are encoded in physical DNA,

but what is the atomic equivalent of DNA? Science is silent. What is the DNA of an electron, a photon or a quark? Of a 1-dimensional energy string? How does each entity know exactly what to do? Is it achieved by magic and miracles?

If atoms are the hardware, where is the software and how do the atoms get programmed? It has been argued that human minds are software and our bodies hardware, but if we are made of atoms then where is the atomic equivalent i.e. does an atom have a mind?

With Illuminism, IDENTICAL software is inbuilt in everything – and that software is the entirety of mathematics.

Regardless of how convinced you are by Illuminism at this stage, what our greatest critic cannot deny is that we have presented an entirely rational, scientific, philosophical and above all mathematical framework in which religion sits entirely naturally and comfortably.

Science cannot interact in any way with the mad, irrational, superstitious and fanatical claims of Judaism, Christianity and Islam, but it can with the religion of Illuminism. There is no need for science and religion to be sundered. Illuminism provides the perfect reconciliation, via mathematics.

Now the great debate of science and religion can be conducted on a rational basis. We have shown the yawning gaps in the coherence of the current scientific paradigm and we have shown how Illuminism explain all of these gaps and, moreover, provides an overarching account of everything. Life, mind, mathematics and free will are built into Illuminism, so there's no mystery about where they come from (as there is in mainstream science).

Let's abandon all of the old, silly, anti-mathematical, irrational religions. Let Illuminism now be the sole standard-bearer of religion. You no longer have to be an atheist if you're a person of reason. Illuminism allows any rational person to commit fully to religion and, moreover, it promises the greatest adventure the cosmos can offer – becoming God!

Artificial Intelligence

To say that machines could ever be conscious is just another way of declaring yourself a scientific materialist. Can a living mind *ever* be linked to a machine?

Reason – the Law of the Cosmos

Mathematics, in its objective aspect, is entirely rational. In its subjective aspect, it is *irrational*, an expression of Will. Will grows in proportion to freedom and consciousness. At the elementary level, particles have negligible Will hence are governed by rational, objective mathematical laws. That's why the universe is so regular, organized and ordered. If it were pure Will, as Schopenhauer believed, it would be chaotic.

When humanity first became conscious, it was a vehicle of Will. Almost no reason and logic were apparent in the first humans. Humans were driven by their desires, feelings and Will – and the same is true to this day. However, reason, as a conscious rather than unconscious force, began to appear here and there amongst the human population. Only a small proportion of humanity can be considered rational – ten to twenty percent at most. These people are identified by their interest in science, atheism, agnosticism and skepticism, in debunking conspiracy theories, in academic subjects, in philosophy. They all despise Abrahamism and anything to do with faith.

The most rational human beings of all are the mathematicians. With them, we see mathematical minds consciously becoming aware of their own mathematical nature; indeed of the fundamental mathematical nature of the whole of existence.

All people, no matter how irrational, are intuitive mathematicians. They are all attracted to music – a profoundly mathematical enterprise (there is no better way of disguising complex

mathematics than musically) – and look at how easily most people can catch a ball. Most wouldn't have the vaguest idea how to write down a set of equations to describe where they should position themselves in order to catch a fast-moving ball. Yet they can solve these same equations unconsciously with astonishing accuracy and achieve a spectacular success rate.

Even if most people loathe mathematics, they are intuitively using it all the time. It's part of the fabric of their unconscious. Look at the incredible calculating feats performed by autistic savants. These individuals are human computers. Like computers, they are entirely unconscious of the mathematical operations they are performing and yet they can get the right answer in a flash – as if the answers were simply presenting themselves to them. This is the essence of intuition, reflecting underlying cosmic processes.

With mathematicians, the mathematical nature of reality starts to become conscious of itself. Make no mistake, there are only two ways to become God. One is to become so intuitively powerful that you master the entirety of mathematics by that route; the other is to consciously master the entirety of mathematics and understand every mathematical nut and bolt of existence. In mathematicians, the mathematical universe is achieving self-awareness.

Hegel promoted reason as the driving force of the universe. Strictly speaking, he ought to have replaced “reason” with “mathematics”. Reason is a reflection of mathematics and rational human beings are those whose minds are best configured for mathematics. Look at Abrahamists – most of them can barely count. They are innumerate and illiterate. Muslims proudly proclaim that their prophet, Mohammed, was illiterate. Who in their right mind would want someone wearing a Dunce's cap to be the founder of their religion?

The Riddler

Heraclitus was called the “weeping philosopher” because of his melancholic view of life and his view that the world was relentlessly driven by dialectical strife. He was a notorious misanthrope yet attracted a cult following. Prone to making oracular statements, he was called “The Riddler” and “The Obscure”.

Heraclitus was a monist and the particular monism to which he subscribed was that of intelligent “fire” – or teleological energy as we might say today.

He was a primary model for Nietzsche's “Zarathustra”, and Nietzsche felt warmer to Heraclitus than almost anyone else (Goethe was Nietzsche's other great hero, although Wagner once spellbound him). Heidegger was another great fan of Heraclitus, and he believed that Socrates and Plato started the rot in philosophy with their metaphysical emphasis. He wanted to return to the Pre-Socratics and to Heraclitus in particular.

Heraclitus criticised both Homer (“He should be beaten with a stick.”) and Hesiod. He encouraged people to think for themselves and not accept authority. He thought that “eyesight” was better than “hearing”: look for yourself; study for yourself; don't slavishly listen to others.

When Heraclitus noted that members of the Illuminati had become too awestruck by Pythagoras's reputation, he shocked them by explicitly criticising Pythagoras. (If there is any danger of a cult of personality growing around any person, it's advisable to puncture the inflating reputation before it takes off and soars off to join the stars in the celestial plane.)

Heraclitus loathed democracy, seeing it as “ochlocracy” – rule by the ignorant mob. He thought that most people went through life as automata: “Men don't pay attention to what they do when they're awake just as they don't pay attention to what they do when they're asleep.”

He was a firm advocate of Logos – the ordering force of the universe. There is a rational, regulating, unifying order of the universe and Logos is that ordering principle. It controls the dialectical opposites. As we perfect our reason (Logos), we become more Godlike.

Everything flows like a river, he said, and he compared the whole universe to an endless

river of life.

He declared that we could never step into the same river twice. Cratylus was even more extreme and said we couldn't even do it once. You and it are changing even as you step into it.

The Evolution of the Subjective Mind

Man began as an individual, subjective mind, exemplifying primitive, native egoism. Then he emerged from himself, from his isolation, and recognized himself in other men. So, he formed a community, a society, a State. These reflected the *objective* rather than the *subjective* mind – the subjective mind had been transformed into concrete, objective institutions. Finally, returning into himself, but at a much higher level than when he set out, Man found within himself three astonishing gifts: 1) the ideal of art and the beautiful, 2) the religious ideal: God, and 3) the philosophical ideal: absolute, rational truth. When an individual has mastered all three of these within himself, he has achieved supreme independence, perfect freedom, complete knowledge and understanding. If he has succeeded to the uttermost degree, he has become *Absolute Mind* – God! It is an evolutionary process; the evolution of the mind.

Hegel, trying to bring on board Christians, asserted that we could consider Jesus Christ as the perfect unity of the finite (humanity) and the infinite (God). However, the implication was that we ourselves would become the unity of the finite and infinity if we attained Absolute Mind: we too would be Christ! Philosophy, for Hegel, was the key to becoming God and humanity could unlock the keys to existence through his very own dialectical philosophy.

In Hegel's system, philosophy is the culmination of what art and religion seek to accomplish. They are prior and necessary stages, but they must finally be transcended via philosophy. Art and religious faith are born from feeling and imagination, but they falter on the rock of reason. To stand on that rock, we must be philosophers: masters of rational thinking. We thereby achieve the apotheosis of mind.

By finally comprehending the workings of the world, the mind frees itself from the world. It recognizes what is going on in Nature, in the State and its institutions, in history. It recognizes that these are all the work of mind, reflections of mind, manifestations of the rational dialectic. Everything that has happened has not come about accidentally: it is the unfolding of an underlying process. We couldn't have avoided this long messy, struggle. It's inbuilt in the universe. Opposites and contradictions must be generated and overcome. Conflict is inescapable.

People don't see what is rational and proceed rationally. Rather they usually take the downright irrational path, but in doing so they are generating the contradictions that dialectical reason relies on. Dialectical reason isn't sophisticated. In fact, it couldn't be simpler. It says that if something (A) arises then it will surely generate an opposite something (B) and from their conflict something (C) will emerge that is at a rationally higher level because reason is the principle underlying this system and is always seeking to optimize itself. (C) will then serve as a new (A) to which a new and higher opposition (B) will be raised. Eventually, this system must generate rational perfection where all contradictions and oppositions have been resolved, leaving nothing but pure reason itself i.e. the principle that was always inherent in the dialectical process, trying to reveal itself.

“Hegelianism is, without doubt, the most comprehensive and complete synthesis ever attempted by the human mind, – a veritable encyclopaedia, animated by a central idea, and supported by a method that has implicit confidence in itself. Hence, if philosophy is what our opening paragraph defined it to be, we must give Hegel the credit of having come nearer to the ideal of science than any of his predecessors. Furthermore, no one, after Kant, gave to modern thought so powerful an impetus, – no one more completely dominated and fascinated it. Jurisprudence, politics, ethics, theology, and aesthetics, – all have suffered his influence. Nor is

that all. By demonstrating that being is becoming, logical development, history, that history is not only a science among others, but the science of sciences, he ably seconded, if he did not create, the historical movement of the nineteenth century, and impressed upon it the stamp of impartial objectivity which characterizes it, and which was foreign to the eighteenth century.” -- Alfred Weber

Art

Hegel conceived of art as having the role of manifesting the sublime and divine within the realm of the human. By doing so, it elevates our spirit and provokes us to raise our sights higher.

He classified art as Symbolic, Classic and Romantic.

1) Symbolic: Art often developed in tandem with religion. The earliest religions worshipped nature, so did not depict human forms. Animals were often shown, or the sun, moon, or stars. This was the age of symbolic religious art when the divine was represented indirectly and vaguely.

2) Classic: The classical art of the ancient Greeks conceived of the gods as superhuman beings living on Mount Olympus. Many men had perfectly honed bodies because they spent an enormous amount of time training for sport and war. In Sparta, even the women got in on the act. Physical perfection was visible all across Greece and fully captured by the best sculptors. The human form itself was treated as divine. In Hegel's estimation, this was the greatest artistic period because the human and the divine were treated as one. Content and form, message and medium, were in perfect harmony.

3) Romantic: Afterwards, decline set in. Religions such as those of Abrahamism conceived of God infinitely high above us, thus breaking the link between humanity and divinity. Even the man-God Jesus Christ was problematic. For one thing, he was a radically different God from those on Mount Olympus and he was usually depicted as a baby, on a cross, or dead. The preoccupation with the soul (something not apparent in classic art) made art look inwards. All sorts of ideas were in circulation that art struggled to express. It became overly romanticised on one hand, and too much in service of the elites of Church and State on the other.

The five arts are: architecture, sculpture, painting, music and poetry. Hegel considered that architecture was the archetypal form of the Symbolic age, and sculpture of the Classical period. Painting, music and poetry belonged to the Romantic period.

In Hegel's view, art is where humanity first starts to conquer nature; mind masters matter for the first time. The ideas and craft of artists penetrate and mould matter. Matter is transformed into humanity's image. In relation to matter, an artist is God.

Architecture operates at the symbolic level. Think of the Pyramids. What idea is clearly communicated by a pyramid? Are we sure? It's beautiful and it's mathematical (showing our great intuitive reverence for mathematical form), but is it clear what's it's saying? Architecture is suggestive, but it does not directly express what it wants to. The ancient Egyptians, if they had full control over blocks of matter, would not have produced a pyramid as a tomb for Pharaohs. They would have chosen something enormously more divine. Look at Michelangelo's unforgettable image of God giving life to Adam. Imagine a vast tomb, the size of a pyramid, that gave physical form to that image.

Christian cathedrals are superior to the pyramids. They embody the shape of the cross, but their primary effect is one of scale. They make you think of infinite divine spaces by virtue of their size, and they have beautiful stained glass windows which bring images of heaven into the cathedral. But, ultimately, they remain vast edifices of recalcitrant, impenetrable matter. For Hegel, the distance between these structures and the idea they sought to communicate remained as great "as that between heaven and earth." They are the equivalent of inorganic, mineral art. They must evolve into the organic, into vegetables and animals.

In sculpture, the artist is able to achieve much greater control over matter. A sculpture can be brought to the uttermost perfection. A human being can be captured perfectly in marble. The

artist has created himself in matter. Yet, like Pygmalion's perfect statue of Galatea, it remains lifeless. It has no soul. Only the gods can bring it to life. The artist is helpless.

With painting, a much more expressive form of matter is employed – paint on canvas. The artist can much more clearly imbue a painting with a reflection of his own inner life. Edvard Munch's *The Scream* communicates not just the scream of the artist, but an existential scream, the scream of the whole universe.

Yet it remains limited. It's two-dimensional for one thing, in a 3D world. It's all surface. It lacks depth. Only a moment is captured, frozen in time. The artist's idea is still in thrall to matter, to the world of extension.

Hegel referred to architecture, sculpture, and painting as objective art. They are outdone by subjective art, invisible and immaterial: music. This is a true art of the spirit. It can capture the mood of the soul for hours on end. It can summon the deepest emotions. It contains thrilling, almost overpowering feelings and truths of the human condition. It's no surprise that music features so prominently at funerals.

Music can flow and change. It can capture limitless shades of feeling. It seems to communicate with the innermost essence of the human soul. It brings us into contact with the infinite, with eternal longing and Will.

It stands as the direct opposite of objective art. Yet it, too, is incomplete. For Hegel, it's too extreme. He required perfect art to be more moderate, a synthesis of all the contraries. It must effect a harmonious union of subjective and objective art.

Hegel proclaimed poetry as the perfect art, the arts of arts.

It steps beyond music by employing speech. It is the truest and fullest expression of the mind. It can express any and all human thoughts in the most refined, beautiful, precise way. It eliminates everything extraneous. It pares down the idea to its essence. It is the universal art because words are universal and convey all we are capable of thinking.

Sculpture, like architecture, employs gross matter, but it can penetrate it further, imbue it with more spirituality. It can turn a mere symbol into a deep reflection of human reality.

Poetry is to music as sculpture is to architecture. Poetry and music both employ sound, but wordless music is vague and turbulent, imprecise and indefinite. It's all about feelings. Where is the cerebral component – the idea? It can hint at profound issues but it never captures them. While architecture makes symbols of matter, music makes symbols of sounds.

It takes the poet to shape ideas properly, to articulate the kernel. Poetry delivers definite, precise sounds not as musical notes but as sharp, penetrating words.

Hegel summed up the fine arts as follows: 1) architecture suggests the power and majesty of the awesome Divinity reigning beyond the stars, 2) sculpture humanizes the gods and locates them on earth, 3) painting idealizes a given subject matter (“[The artist] must omit little hairs, pores, little scars, blemishes, and grasp and represent the subject in its universal character and in its steadfast individuality. It makes a great difference whether the artist merely reproduces a person's physiognomy, as it quietly presents itself to him in its surface and external configuration, or whether the artist insightfully represents the true features which express the subject's own soul.” – Hegel). Unlike classical sculpture, painting can depict something of the soul, 4) music converts the infinite into feelings expressed in sound, and 5) poetry restores the infinite to its realm beyond the stars, and yet within us all. As above, so below. Poetry, with its endless quarry of words and ideas, is as all-powerful and inexhaustible as God himself. Is there any idea that God can think that cannot be expressed in poetry? In fact, wouldn't we conceive of God's thoughts as the perfect poetry, with not a single wasted word?

Hegel sees architecture as a “theistic” art form, pointing to a transcendent God, and music as a higher link to theism. Sculpture, painting and poetry, on the other hand, are pantheistic forms, penetrating this world of ours with divine ideas, bringing the gods amongst us. Note that the monotheistic Jews and Muslims are happy to use architecture to celebrate their God, but painting is forbidden, music more or less forbidden, and poetry, if not forbidden, is merely tolerated. The Jews and Muslims want to maintain the distance between man and the infinite God. Only symbols are permitted, never true depictions.

Protestant Christians despise even architecture and loathe beauty. During the Reformation, they smashed and looted churches and monasteries. They burned paintings and tore down statues, declaring them idolatrous. Go to a Protestant place of worship and it will be ugly, plain and unadorned. They are terrified of bringing divine beauty down to earth to live amongst them.

Architecture and religious music are submissive; sculpture, painting, and poetry are not. Sculpture is often pagan, depicting many gods. That’s why the Jews, Protestants and Muslims condemned sculpture. Catholicism, with its strong pagan roots, has felt no such aversion and is easily the most beautiful mainstream religion. It’s not afraid of art.

Poetry, at its best, is pagan. The greatest poets almost never subscribe to any conventional religious systems. The vast majority of religious poetry is shockingly bad because it’s mere propaganda. The greatest poets sense that they themselves are Gods, so they have no need of any religion other than themselves.

Epic poetry corresponds to architecture. Lyric poetry is like music. The greatest poetry is dramatic poetry. Poetry at its most ambitious is striving to be philosophy.

“Hegel treats art as being capable of conveying the deepest metaphysical or philosophical insights and as intimately linked to both religion and philosophy itself. The medium of art is sensation, the medium of religion is mental imagery (or internal pictures of ‘what is Godlike’). The realm of philosophy is pure imageless conception. This parallels the progression in Plato towards pure apprehension of ideas. Art and religion are intimately linked because both are grounded in sensation. Both depend on ‘picture-thinking’ in their attempts to apprehend the divine. But art has the particular task of showing, within the realm of the human, the essence of the divine.” – Lloyd Spencer

Art and religion are simplistic ways of approaching the divine, based on picture-thinking, feelings, faith, sensations and so on. They are the means by which non-philosophers apprehend divine reality. Philosophy is on a higher plane and only philosophers have attained sufficient rationality to grasp the highest truths. They don’t need any picture-thinking, emotion or sensation. It’s as if they have entered the Platonic world of perfect forms and attained genuine absolute knowledge.

Hegel was far too charitable to art and mainstream religion. In truth, these are exclusively concerned with Will while philosophy is a subject of Intellect. They have nothing in common. Art expresses emotional truths and conventional religions express no truths at all. They have zero truth content. They are about lies and manipulation, the exploitation and control of the superstitious and ignorant masses by elites. In terms of Myers-Briggs personality types, art and religion are predominantly for extravert sensing and feeling types while philosophy is for introverted thinking and intuitive types.

As we move from architecture to sculpture to painting to music and finally poetry, the sensuous medium of art becomes less and less pronounced. Firstly, we have vast amounts of rock then single blocks of marble then canvas and paint then musical instruments and then just pen

and paper, which are the same tools used by philosophers. Philosophy dispenses entirely with the sensuous and deals only in concepts. Art, dialectically, moves towards philosophy and precisely for that reason becomes less artistic. Thus we reach the seeming paradox of art reaching its highest expression in the Classical age of Greece, according to Hegel, and yet the poetry of the 18th and 19th centuries being regarded as the highest art. In fact, two different things are being discussed. Poetry is actually the “highest art” because it’s the least like art and most like philosophy. Therefore, it’s not really art at all.

Art as art was essentially over by the end of the Classical period. In that period, art, religion and philosophy were closely linked. As time went on, they separated. By the medieval period, they were quite distinct and growing ever further apart. Christian theologians were more like philosophers while ordinary Christianity was for simple peasants who knew nothing of philosophy. Christian art was romantic and saccharine. It couldn’t capture the complexity of Christian philosophical thinking. Art, unlike in the Classical period, had lost its harmony with religion and philosophy. It could no longer express its meaning artistically. Meaning had moved beyond art. So now art could offer only allegory in relation to meaning. It hinted at meaning and told suggestive stories about its meaning but it no longer itself expressed the meaning. It became increasingly abstract and ironic.

Modern conceptual artists are high priests of charlatanry. They are quack doctors selling nostrums. They never say too much because it would destroy the illusion, the carefully contrived spell. These are the weavers of the invisible fabrics that appeared in the tale of the Emperor’s New Clothes. Modern art isn’t art; it’s parody. It’s showmanship and brass neck. It’s the hustle, the con.

Art is now used as an instrument of the powerful. The art world is almost the perfect expression of the elite’s control of all aspects of the social space. Every year, the UK’s Turner Prize demonstrates that it’s a manifestation of “Emperor’s New Clothes Syndrome” – stark naked nonsense being presented as fully clothed majesty. “Artists” and those who hang around the art world are the modern equivalent of the Pythia (oracular priestess) and the priests of Apollo in ancient Delphi. The oracle spouts out meaningless garbage and the priests “interpret” it for the benefit of the gullible, ignorant masses – and receive a vast fee for their trouble. Nothing ever changes. As Hegel rightly observed, art as a meaningful activity ended long ago. It’s now just a parody and in-joke of the elite, disguising a lucrative investment opportunity.

Conceptual art is the worst art possible because rather than dealing with art’s proper domain – aesthetics, feelings, sensations – conceptual art tries to deploy intellectual concepts, but these conceptual artists are no philosophers. Moreover, many of them can barely draw and have no painting or sculpting skills. Most have no craft at all. They are inept artists and inept philosophers, so conceptual art represents the worst of both worlds. It’s a philosophical and artistic disaster.

Strangely enough, philosophy then suffered the same fate as art. Philosophy and natural philosophy (science) once walked side by side but after the rise of modern science, the two subjects parted company. By the second half of the 20th century, philosophy was struggling to have a role and had all but given up in its contest with science. It became “postmodern” and radically more abstract, literary, ironic and artistic.

By the end of the 20th century, culture was divided into three separate camps: 1) scientific materialism promoting a hardline atheist stance, 2) religion, often strongly opposed to science, particularly in relation to evolution, and 3) art and philosophy: conceptual, postmodern, ironic, literary, filmic, sociological and psychological.

Much of postmodern philosophy is a joke, as is most art. In fact, it’s no longer obvious that art exists at all in any true sense. What passes under the label of art is really just a reflection

of ironic postmodernism. No talent at all is necessary in modern artistic circles other than showmanship. A lot of art asks us to ponder what art is i.e. it's meta art – art about art, the theory of art masquerading as art. Anyone can be a meta artist. It's a bit like being a Reality TV star. Art is now a joke. It has ended as a serious enterprise, although it refuses to announce its own demise because it still provides a lucrative investment opportunity for rich patrons and allows the high priests and Pythias a delightful living. But don't be fooled – art is over.

Illuminism is all about reconciling religion, philosophy (not of the postmodern ilk), science and mathematics. As for “art”, the conceptual phase should be brought to an end and art should return to earlier forms: sculpture, painting, craft, architecture, and aesthetics.

It has rightly been said that art has exhausted all its significant possibilities and is even explicitly labelled in some circles as the “art of exhaustion”. All it can do is repeat old themes. Let's see a return to skilled artists. We want Michelangelos and Leonardos, not conceptual artists.

The Holographic God

Imagine the process of “divine suicide” shattering God into an infinite number of fragments. The whole (God) is in each part and each part is in the whole. But the fragmentation has destroyed consciousness. Now God has to regain consciousness, and he does so through each fragment becoming conscious. When all the fragments are conscious, God is conscious.

We might also think of the shattering of the hologram as equivalent to the shattering of God's psyche. He forgets who he is and becomes mad (Satan). The universe then has to heal itself and become sane again, and as it does so, Satan is slowly converted into what he once was: God.

Satan lost all of his reason and became a creature purely of desire, Will, feelings, lust for power and paranoia. Satan is God after a mental breakdown, and we are all fragments of this breakdown. As we become more rational, we become saner, and Satan's mind starts to repair itself. We leave the insane Age of Satan and enter the sane Age of God.

Satan is the “mad God”, and his sanity comes back to him only after a long process of cosmic evolution. His insanity affects all of us, and we are all mad until the rule of reason (Logos) is established. Satan is pure will and he becomes God only when Intellect replaces Will, when Logos replaces Mythos.

The Abrahamic God is the quintessence of the insane God. He is the Demiurge, the False God, the Impostor God.

The Consciousness Mill

“Suppose that there be a machine, the structure of which produces thinking, feeling and perceiving; imagine this machine enlarged, but preserving the same proportion, so that you could enter it as if it were a mill. This being supposed, you might visit it inside; but what would you observe there? Nothing but parts which push and move each other, and never anything that could explain perception.” – Leibniz

Imagine a functional human brain the size of a warehouse. Imagine you could walk through it and see all of the neurons firing and different parts of the brain lighting up as they become active. Would you learn a single thing about consciousness? These physical events tell you nothing at all about the nature of consciousness and feeling, of will and desire. The reason, of course, is that we are seeing the brain objectively but consciousness is SUBJECTIVE.

You can't “see” consciousness; you can only experience it. There is no bridge at all from the outside, objective view to the inside, subjective experience. It's the duck-rabbit optical illusion. You can see one or the other but never both at the same time. We can investigate brain states and we can investigate consciousness (mental, psychological states), but we can never do

both. We might be able to correlate particular brain states with particular kinds of thoughts (sexual thoughts, for example), but we will never what the precise thoughts are or how they are being subjectively experienced.

The Unbearable Lightness of Reason

To rational people, Abrahamism is spectacularly silly. But that isn't the case to feeling and sensing types. Reason doesn't mean much to them. Why would it? – they're not rational! They take their feelings as gospel truth. If something feels right and good to them, they believe it's true. They don't subject it to any critical analysis.

Rational people are adults. Feeling and sensing types are children. When you deal with feeling and sensing types, just imagine them as hysterical toddlers who don't and can't understand the world.

Abrahamism makes complete sense when you realise that Abrahamists are irrational children seeking a father figure to dominate them and tell them what's "right" and "wrong", without having to think for themselves – because they *can't* think for themselves.

Static and Dynamic Platonic Forms

Plato asserted that absolute knowledge resided in perfect, eternal, immutable Forms located in a transcendent realm. All the things in our world were inferior copies of the Forms and, only through reason, could we make contact with the Forms and hence attain absolute knowledge rather than mere opinion.

Aristotle asserted that Forms must be immanent rather than transcendent.

What does Illuminism say? Illuminism asserts that Plato and Aristotle are both right. The Platonic Forms are nothing other than the laws of mathematics and they are both transcendent and immanent. The laws of mathematics are everywhere and yet they are not part of the physical universe per se. They are encoded in monads, which are not physical.

The laws of mathematics are exactly as required by Plato and Aristotle: immutable, eternal and perfect. But there is another kind of Form – dynamic rather than static.

The universe is a combination of eternal laws and evolution. Dynamic Forms are the evolutionary Forms, those that arise as a consequence of the interaction of energy waves (energy waves are numbers as ontological entities i.e. a number isn't a squiggle on a piece of paper but the frequency of an energy wave: there are infinite different energy waves hence infinite different numbers), these interactions being mediated by the eternal mathematical laws. The laws themselves can be considered fixed and "dead" while the dynamic Forms are unfixed and "alive".

Dynamic Forms are simply complex mathematical functions created from the addition of simple basis functions. Different Forms compete with each other and some flourish (are naturally selected) while others fade away, unused, to oblivion. Those that flourish can mutate. Slight amendments can take place and thus new Forms are born, but closely related to their parent Forms.

What we are describing is evolution, of course, except as a mathematical rather than biological process. It's these mathematical functions that direct biological evolution. In fact, these dynamic mathematical Forms dictate all inorganic and organic existence. A dialectical feedback process is switched on. The dynamic mathematical Forms (which are transcendent and immanent, just like the static Forms) shape the material world but the events that take place in the material world contribute to the amendment and mutation of the original dynamic Forms.

Never forget that all atoms and molecules are just mathematical functions. The entities to which they give rise are also mathematical functions. Mathematical entities and functions are the only things that exist. The dynamical mathematical Forms are "template" functions – archetypes

– which can then be universally imitated. All of the different chemical elements are just “mutations” of an archetypal atomic function (based on the simplest atomic system: hydrogen, comprising one electron and one proton).

The dynamic mathematical Forms are also dialectical, meaning that they converge towards an omega point – an end-point where they are completely stable and become like the static Forms of the laws of mathematics. All of the most common atomic elements are stable. All of the most common molecules (especially water) are stable.

“The chimpanzee-human last common ancestor (CHLCA, CLCA, or C/H LCA) is the last species, a species of African apes, that humans, bonobos and chimpanzees share as a common ancestor.” – Wikipedia

We can conceive of terrestrial DNA originating as a highly unstable mathematical function that rapidly mutated. Humanity and the apes once had a common ancestor. Then came various human species, including the famous Neanderthal Man. Today, humanity as *homo sapiens* is biologically stable. Any future evolution of humanity will be mental rather than physical, or involve genetic engineering or cyber enhancement (such physical enhancement would be caused by our mental mastery of our human dynamic Form, not by biological evolution).

Each DNA line tries to reach an omega point. Many species are unsuccessful and become extinct. Dinosaurs ruled the world for millions of years before conditions turned against them and they became extinct. We ourselves could become extinct through something like global warming, a virus pandemic or an asteroid strike.

The dynamic mathematical Form of humanity would continue to exist. It just wouldn't have any instances on this planet.

A theory that accords with this system is Rupert Sheldrake's morphic resonance. Sheldrake says of his theory, “Things that happen in the past, even if they're separated from each other in space and time, can influence similar things in the present, over, through, or across – however one cares to put it – space and time. There's this non-local connection. This seems to me to be very important because it would mean that these fields have causal (but non-local) connections with things that have happened before. They wouldn't be somehow inexplicable manifestations of an eternal, timeless set of archetypes. Morphogenetic fields, which give repetitions of habitual forms and patterns, would be derived from previous fields (what you call 'cosmic memory'). The more often a particular form or field happened, the more likely it would be to happen again, which is what I am trying to express with this idea of morphic resonance and automatic averaging of previous forms. It's this aspect of the theory that makes it empirically testable, because this aspect leads to predictions, such as: if rats learn something in one place, say a new trick, then rats everywhere else should be able to learn the same trick faster.”

Focusing on this last example, how would it work in practice? In terms of Illuminism, everything in the material world boils down to mathematical functions. Any trick learned by a rat is itself a mathematical function. All such functions exist as dynamical Forms in the mental Singularity, outside space and time, and are available to the whole universe, and can be amended and mutated. Other rats “instinctually” pick up the neat trick developed by the first rat. They intuitively sense it will be useful and adopt it. Some might refine it and the refined version (the successful mutation) then becomes the main version of the Form, and the original version is increasingly ignored. All simple functions/Forms can be picked up easily, but the more complex a Form is the less it can be universally adopted. If we consider quantum theory as a Form, most human beings do not easily adopt it. Only a small number of people can “tune into it”.

So, we are saying that the mental domain is full of archetypes (like those hypothesized by Jung in terms of the collective unconscious) and are available for everyone to access. Clearly, a new rat trick is of interest only to rats, but in principle any human could access the details of the same trick (though who would want to?). The archetypes are not fixed; they are dynamic and can mutate. Although all human cultures entertain the archetype of the “hero”, the precise details vary from culture to culture i.e. the archetype exists in numerous mutated forms and people will tune into the mutation most appropriate to them.

All of the information we could ever possibly want is available to us via the mental domain. The most intuitive of us have the easiest access. Intuitive people can pluck ideas seemingly out of thin air. So what is intuition? It is defined as knowledge arrived at spontaneously, without conscious steps of reasoning. That’s exactly what it would be like to tune into the Forms.

Sheldrake includes behavioural and social fields in his concept of morphic fields. We can imagine that ideas or social trends that “take off” – that go viral, that capture the zeitgeist – are perfect examples of powerful morphic fields into which many people are tuning. The trends are almost “in the air”. When the tipping point is reached, a morphic field becomes so strong that almost everyone tunes in, whether they want to or not. We could conceive of Christianity and Islam as Forms or morphic fields that achieved overwhelming support at one time or another, and generational brainwashing has kept them in force millennia later despite the fact that they are preposterous.

Cultural Forms/morphic fields (such as religions) can be immensely successful without being remotely true. Humanity’s tragedy is that it chooses to tune into many of the worst options available. Sensing and feeling types invariably reject everything rational. They are an ongoing brake on humanity’s enlightened, rational progress.

Mathematics: the laws of mathematics are universal. Simple basis functions are universals. Complex functions are dialectical, dynamic universals, associated with particulars, with which they are in a feedback relationship.

Homo sapiens v Neanderthal. Each has its own species DNA. The DNA is very similar in each case, but different enough to constitute two different species. The DNA for each species can be considered a different dialectical, dynamic universal.

Memory

“It is not possible to demonstrate the isolated localization of a memory trace anywhere within the nervous system. Limited regions may be essential for learning or retention of a particular activity, but within such regions the parts are functionally equivalent.” – Karl Lashley

“If all conscious experience is simply an accompaniment of, or runs parallel to, the morphic fields acting upon the brain, then conscious memory, like the memory of habits, must depend on morphic resonance from past states of the brain. Neither conscious nor unconscious memories would be stored within the brain.” – Rupert Sheldrake

Memory is one of the greatest mysteries of the human condition. Where are memories stored? How are they stored? Why are they so susceptible to modification?

One productive way to think of memory is to regard each memory as a mathematical function stored in the mental domain. It can be accessed whenever you want. The trouble is that it’s not some “playback” function that provides perfect reproduction every time. You actually interact with your memories and subtly and sometimes not so subtly alter them. This means that you change the mathematical function, so next time you recall the memory you are

“remembering” the altered memory rather than the original one. You may not wish to remember some things at all, so these are “repressed”. It has been found by some researchers that after training rats to perform certain tasks – implying that the knowledge of how to perform tasks is stored somewhere in the brain – it has proved possible to cut out vast chunks of the rat brain without affecting the rat’s ability to execute the task. No matter what parts of the brain the researchers removed, they could not eradicate the instructions for solving the task. This is strongly suggestive that memories are somehow diffusely spread across the brain, or, more likely, are not present in the physical brain at all.

Researcher Karl Pribram regarded the memory as a holographic system. He argued that just as every part of a holographic film contains the information pertaining to the whole, every part of the brain contains the whole memory system.

“It isn’t that the world of appearances is wrong; it isn’t that there aren’t objects out there, at one level of reality. It’s that if you penetrate through and look at the universe with a holographic system, you arrive at a different view, a different reality. And that other reality can explain things that have hitherto remained inexplicable scientifically: paranormal phenomena, synchronicities, the apparently meaningful coincidence of events.” – Karl Pribram

In Illuminism, all memories are asserted to be stored as mathematical functions in the mental domain, so are not tied to any physical locations, although there may be mappings between specific brain locations and particular memories, although if these mappings are destroyed, the mappings can be re-established in new brain locations. To that extent, the holographic metaphor is highly appropriate. Memories are dynamic rather than static Forms, hence can be amended and manipulated. False memories can be constructed.

What is our aim? To have religion, science, philosophy, psychology and even the paranormal treated as branches of mathematics. Since religions such as those of Abrahamism have no mathematical content, they would be discarded as literally irrational nonsense. All philosophical concepts would be matched to mathematics and those that could not be converted into a mathematical form would be rejected. Psychology becomes the study of the interface between objective and subjective mathematics. As for the paranormal, it can be seriously studied in relation to the Singularity and Sheldrake’s morphic resonance theory. All the junk elements that have nothing to do with mathematical reality can be discarded for the nonsense they are. We can move forward on all fronts on a united mathematical basis, the surest possible, and indeed only, foundation of true knowledge. Mathematics is IT. There’s nothing else.

Many atheists describe religion as a con trick to delude us that death is not the end. Yet it has always been a feature of Eastern religion and Western Gnosticism that, in fact, birth is not the beginning. Where were we before we were born? According to atheists, we were nowhere before we were born and we will return “there” when we die. According to the Illuminist Monadology, we are eternal. Each birth, life and death is literally just a “phase we are going through” as we evolve towards the maximum actualization of which we are capable. And, for the best of us, we can go all the way to divinity. To use Aristotelian terminology, we can become pure Form, completely divorced from matter. We can exist as a divine monad, a point of infinite capacity with complete knowledge of the mathematical universe.

Never forget, monads guarantee that you cannot die in any absolute sense, but you will certainly die in a relative sense. In fact, you will die countless times, just as you will be born countless times, and you will keep learning and growing and becoming more powerful with each

new life lived. You are a participant in the most remarkable journey of all – towards apotheosis.
Perceivers and their Perceptions

“Extension, mass and motion are no more things than images in mirrors, or rainbows in clouds . . . Anything in nature apart from perceivers and their perceptions is invented by us, and we struggle with chimeras created by our own minds, as if with ghosts.” – Leibniz

In philosophy, a phenomenalist is an advocate of the position that nothing exists apart from perceivers and their perceptions (“phenomena”). A realist is someone who argues that a real world underlies our perceptions i.e. our perceptions are based on fact, not fiction; they are not imagined but correspond to things that are actually there. Although realism accords with common sense, it can never be proved. Most scientists are realists, but science itself cannot be proved. We accept as evidence of science’s validity the fact that it gives the right answers. Yet the correct answers do not in any way prove that perceptions are based on real things. In Kant’s philosophy, things as they are in themselves are completely unknowable, yet there is nothing at all in Kant’s philosophy to prevent scientists getting the right answers when they analyze Kantian phenomena: in fact the whole system is set up to guarantee that outcome. The success of science is irrelevant to whether a material world is out there or not. It cannot in any way be cited as proof of materialism. In fact, we have hopefully shown that it is rather more likely to be proof of idealism.

Leibniz’s system, hence that of the Illuminati, is based on an infinite number of perceivers (monads – minds, souls), but all of which are initially unconscious. So, what are they perceiving? Are they living in their own little dream worlds, with no connection with the perceptions of any other monads? Or do they all cooperate to create an infinite universe which is the same for all of them i.e. it’s an objective universe. Illuminism is based on the latter view. The only difference between the monads is that they all see this common universe from their own unique perspective. Every spectator at a football match is watching the same event, but every one of them is seeing it from their own unique angle.

The “material world”, full of material things including human bodies, is the equivalent of the football match. All of the monads are “watching” it (perceiving it, albeit unconsciously, from the mental Singularity), yet, remarkably, they can perceive it consciously only by becoming the footballers on the field i.e. they have to become linked to physical reality through a body. Only God can be conscious yet completely disembodied. Anyone who achieves gnosis – complete enlightenment – becomes God and escapes from the cycle of reincarnation that keeps plunging souls into bodies.

The monads build a common, objective universe through the only mechanism possible: mathematics. All monads come inbuilt with the same mathematical laws. All that is required for a universe is for all monads to occupy a different position (in terms of Cartesian coordinates) and for them to emit mathematical waves (energy) into this common Cartesian arena. By that fact alone, an objective universe is created and every monad has its own unique view of it.

We therefore have infinite perceivers (monads), an infinite objective mathematical universe composed of infinite energy (from monads) moving through an infinite Cartesian coordinate system (comprised of monads). This universe is objectively real. The monads perceive the reality all of them have created amongst themselves mathematically: they do not perceive individual universes unique to each of them, or some universe created for them by God (as in Bishop Berkeley’s philosophy).

The perceivers perceive a real world of which they contribute an infinitesimal part, but which is otherwise completely independent of them. It truly is an objective universe. Leibniz has thus brilliantly reconciled phenomenism and realism. There are no mysterious and unknowable Kantian noumena. Each monad has a perfect understanding of the world because

each monad is based on exactly the same mathematical laws that govern the real universe. Unfortunately, the monad's infallible knowledge is unconscious. Consciousness actually has the effect of distancing us from the mathematical universe. We become far more preoccupied with feelings, desires and will. Yet a few brilliant people, like Leibniz, are able to consciously probe the mathematical laws of existence. These are the individuals in whom mathematics is achieving consciousness of itself. They are Gods!

Illuminism might seem bewilderingly complex to non-mathematicians but it is really exceptionally simple. It's all about an infinite number of mathematical points, each of which contains an infinite number of mathematical waves (energy). These waves can interact and build up exceptionally complex mathematical waves on the basis of the addition of much simpler waves. This is evolution.

This is the universe as objective, ontological mathematics, and nothing besides. It is IMPOSSIBLE for the universe to be explained in any other way. Mathematics is embedded in reality because mathematics IS reality. Any opponents of Illuminism are faced with the insurmountable problem of explaining why reality is so mathematical if it is not inherently based on mathematics. How could mathematics co-exist with non-mathematics? It's impossible. It's the classic Cartesian dualism problem. If we regard mathematics as a "substance" then there can be no other substance. It would be impossible for any other substance to interact with the mathematical substance. How would they communicate if not mathematically? How could mathematics be "created"? It's impossible ergo it must always have existed.

Illuminism explains everything and it does so via mathematics alone. No other system of thought can achieve what Illuminism has.

The most important fact to grasp concerning Illuminism is that it involves two aspects of mathematics: objective and subjective. Music (a quintessentially mathematical subject) provides the best metaphor for mathematics. Music can be broken down into its component waves (objective analysis) and it can be experienced emotionally (subjective analysis). Everything is like this. Mathematics is perceived both objectively (the scientific, material world) and subjectively (the mental world of feelings, desires, impressions, ideas, intuitions, will). What could be simpler?

What is free will? It's our ability to introduce our own, self-generated mathematical signals into the objective world. When I choose to raise my arm, I have impacted on the physical world through my own actions, not through any imposed on me. I am the causal agent. The universe didn't cause my arm to move: I did.

How can I raise my arm at all? Because my mind is mathematical, my body is mathematical and when I instruct my arm to move, I am doing so by issuing a mathematical signal. A paralyzed person is someone whose mind and body are no longer properly connected mathematically because of physical damage to the body that has screwed up the necessary mathematical protocols that allows the mind to control the body. A Godlike human would be able to repair himself, but there are so few Gods!

Souls and soul energy – that's all there is. Souls are the basis of ontological mathematics. Souls are mathematical points.

Ancient Gnosticism

Gnosticism does not teach that there are two separate physical universes – one containing the True God and another created by Satan. Rather, Satan's universe exists within the greater universe of the True God. In modern terms, the "Big Bang" represents a temporal event within a

pre-existing, limitless universe. The universe of the Big Bang has a beginning and an end, but the universe enfolding it does not. The Big Bang universe is expanding, but it won't go on expanding forever – it will be returned to the greater universe of which it is a mere part. The True God – the God of Mind – always defeats the Demiurge (Satan – the God of Matter).

Hyperborea – the land of the Illuminati

“Neither by land nor by sea shalt thou find the road to the Hyperboreans.” (Pindar, Illuminatus)

Hyperborea: the perpetually illuminated paradise beyond the north wind where Apollo, god of Reason, spent his winters. Illumination, the religion of the Illuminati, is the world's only rational, mathematical, scientific and philosophical religion. We condemn all religions of faith, superstition and irrationality. We condemn the slave religions of Judaism, Christianity and Islam that worship a Torture God who orders fathers to kill their children and revels in sending those who disobey him to eternal hellfire. We condemn all prophets, “holy” books and “Messiahs”. As Kafka said, “The Messiah will come only when he is no longer necessary; he will come only on the day after his arrival; he will come, not on the last day, but on the very last.”

No one's coming to save us. We must save ourselves. We condemn all those who claim that human beings are not potential Gods. God is not outside you – he IS you. God did not create the universe: the universe created God. The “First God” – Abraxas – is the divine template. We all have the opportunity to join Abraxas in a Community of Gods who know everything and have absolute power. Moreover, this can be proved as a matter of science, philosophy and, above all, mathematics – the sole source of absolute truth.

“Number rules the universe.” — Motto of the Pythagorean School.

What happened to Pythagoras's mysterious secret society (whose roots extend far back to the dawn of human civilisation and whose ancient adepts included Solomon the Apostate, the genius who heroically tried to kill Jehovah, the monstrous Torture God)? It became known as the Illuminati – the enlightened ones – and it has survived to this day, despite relentless Abrahamic persecution. Mithraism, alchemy, Hermeticism, the Gnostic religion of the medieval Cathar heretics, the outlawed Knights Templar and the original anti-establishment Freemasonry (nothing like pro-establishment modern WASP Freemasonry) were all guises of the Illuminati.

The Illuminati are humanity's true hope and light, the voice of the Enlightenment. Join the army of Light and Reason. The only “sacred text” is mathematics, the language of God, of existence itself.

This is the most complex series of books ever written, bringing Pythagoras, Leibniz and Hegel completely up to date. No series in history has ever analysed the nuts and bolts of existence more exhaustively than this one. Our promise to all intelligent people is that the God Game series will reveal to them the secrets of the innermost workings of existence – without the need for any “Creator”. We will show exactly how existence can be configured in one way and only one way – via what we call “ontological” mathematics, the mathematics of existence.

We will show the big picture of how EVERYTHING can be explained by a single Grand Unified Theory of ontological mathematics, embracing religion, science, philosophy, psychology, sociology and even the “paranormal” – which isn't paranormal at all.

The universe is a rational, not an irrational place, and that means that any rational mind can work out all of the rational principles by which the universe operates. There is no mystery at all. Everything has a rational solution.

Illuminism explains everything. It has a sufficient reason for everything. It doesn't need to

appeal to faith or revelation. It doesn't look to anything external to the universe. All of the answers to the universe lie within it. The universe is the perfect self-building system. It requires nothing else. Above all, it requires no Creator. The concept of the Creator is the most ludicrous ever proposed and wrong in every way.

It's undeniable that "the Illuminati" has been turned into a toxic brand by the highly effective propaganda of our enemies. That simply shows the extent to which they fear our message. In fact, in normal circumstances the Illuminati never directly refers to itself as the Illuminati precisely because of a) the hostility to the name and b) it has always been inherently secretive because it has been historically subject to regular persecution. The "Armageddon Conspiracy" website was established to set the record straight, but we are under no illusions that most people instantly switch off or become angry as soon as they hear the word "Illuminati".

Pythagoras

Pythagoras = Son of Heaven.

Illuminati = Sons and Daughters of Heaven.

Pythagorean (Illuminati) communities: The School of Gods. The training ground for divinity.

Pythagoras had astonishing mathematical intuition. It was said that he could do elaborate calculations with almost no conscious effort. Like some modern-day savants, he could imagine calculations as landscapes and, as new numbers were introduced into the calculation, the landscape changed. Just by looking at the landscape, he could see the results of the calculations emerging. Numbers appeared to him like physical objects. Imagine doing calculations where someone reads out two long numbers to you, asks you to multiply them and then to divide by another long number and the answer simply appears right before your eyes with no mental arithmetic required. The answer presents itself, and you need only speak it aloud. Moreover, you're always right. *Awesome*, right?!

It was said that Pythagoras responded emotionally to numbers, patterns and shapes. He could feel them, sense them, and see incredible beauty in them. In the present day, there are examples of people who can see the number pi as a great panoramic landscape and read off large numbers of its decimal places. They don't remember these numbers; they *see* them. They just read off the numbers they see in their mind as they travel through the landscape of pi. For such people, each number has a distinctive shape and texture. Often, the numbers have a colour or they provoke a feeling or a sensation such as a smell. This mixing up of mental ideas with sensory information and emotions is known as synaesthesia. Pythagoras was almost certainly a person with an exceptionally unusually wired brain. Such people are often those who "see" much further than others, who perceive patterns invisible to others. They are the people who can change everything.

"Give me a place to stand and I can move the world," said Archimedes. Give people new ways of viewing the world and they will move it that way too.

"Aethalides was a son of Hermes and Eupolemeia, a daughter of Myrmidon. He was the herald of the Argonauts, and had received from his father the faculty of remembering everything, even in Hades. He was further allowed to reside alternately in the upper and in the lower world. As his soul could not forget anything even after death, it remembered that from the body of Aethalides it had successively migrated into those of Euphorbus, Hermodimus, Pyrrhus, and at last into that of Pythagoras, in whom it still retained the recollection of its former migrations." – Wikipedia

In the ancient world, Pythagoras was said to be a reincarnation of Aethalides, son of Hermes. The god Hermes was the herald of the gods and the messenger between gods and humans.

Hermes offered his mortal son a gift: anything except immortality. Aethalides asked for an eternal memory so that he might remember, through death, all of his reincarnations.

Pythagoras said that after Aethalides, he was Euphorbus, a Trojan hero killed during the siege of Troy by the Spartan king Menelaus (husband of Helen of Troy). Then he was Hermodotus of Clazomenae, an ancient Greek thinker said to have been the first to propose the idea of mind as the cause of change: mind was the active principle of life, and matter passive.

According to one story, Hermodotus' soul could depart from his body during sleep, and go on trips (out of body experiences). His wife betrayed his secret and his enemies burned his body while he was asleep, leaving his soul in a "limbo" (Hades) – where he learned incredible secrets of existence. During this time, his soul entered animals and plants. Later, he became Pyrrhus, a humble fisherman of Delos. And then he was reborn as Pythagoras himself, beloved of Apollo.

So, Pythagoras was the "son of a god" and descended into "hell" – rather like the later Mr Yehoshua ben Yosef.

According to calculations, Pythagoras reincarnates every 216 years, and is due back in 2026 – the Nth Coming!

For Pythagoras, the number 1 was the number of intelligence and 2 of opinion (two sides to every story).

Pythagoras was the first advocate of meritocracy (or rather the intellectual "aristocracy" – rule by the best – later championed by Plato).

Pythagoras spoke of this life consisting of three kinds of people that he compared to those who went to the Olympic Games:

- 1) The vulgar merchant class and consumerists, buying and selling.
- 2) The competitors, caught up in the conflicts of life, and preoccupied with status.
- 3) The contemplative spectators, the philosophically minded, well on their way to escaping the cycle of reincarnation and attachment to the physical world.

Pythagoras had a meritocratic view of the soul. The more talented it was, the more intelligent, the quicker it was promoted to higher stages of soul development.

Prodigiously intelligent, Pythagoras was preoccupied with reconciling reason, mathematics, philosophy, science, religion and mysticism – and this has always remained the core of the Illuminati's mission.

Pythagoras, when he was the leader of the Greek settlement of Croton in southern Italy declared war on the super rich, decadent and corrupt Sybarites – an act that proved a great inspiration to Adam Weishaupt in later times.

The Pythagorean Illuminati were the world's first formal secret society. They lived in a community and at sunset every day they were required to consider their efforts for the day and ask themselves: 1) What good have I done? 2) What evil have I done? (and what recompense shall I make?) and 3) What have I omitted to do?

These are three questions that everyone ought to be asking themselves every day in the present.

Pythagoras was the effective inventor of what we now call mathematics. He was the first to use the terms *mathematics* ("that which is learned") and *philosophy* ("love of wisdom"). Pythagoras wandered for many years, studying amongst the Egyptian priests, the Chaldean

occultists, the Persian Magi and the leading sages of Greece. He was often called the son of Apollo. He presented a “sermon on the mount” and, on the strength of it, eight hundred people left their homes and families to join his secret society based in a commune in a Greek colony in Southern Italy. Many thought that he was semi-divine, a higher being situated between men and the gods. He proclaimed that heaven is number and harmony. He treated women and men equally, virtually unprecedented in that ancient era. All property was held in common. There were no rich and no poor. Divisions were on the basis of merit alone.

Why did the clowns of Abrahamism triumph rather than the genius of Pythagoras? – because humanity is a stupid, debased race.

The divine triangular symbol of the *tetraktys* ($1 + 2 + 3 + 4 = 10$) also had a secret reference to zero for the highest initiates of the Illuminati: $0 + 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 = 10$ i.e. 0 was the magic quintessence, the unseen fifth element that bound the four other elements (earth, water, fire and air). The tetraktys was therefore the symbol of all that is: the entire universe and all of its contents. 10 is the number of existence and of course, it contains the two numbers of the binary system (1 and 0), the basis of computing. Moreover 1 (the unit) and 0 are the two numbers associated with the monad, the fundamental unit of existence. The tetraktys is therefore also a means of referring to Leibniz’s Monadology.

Mind = 0; Matter = 1.

People with a severed corpus callosum (the band of fibre connecting the two hemispheres of the brain), or born with little or no corpus callosum, are said to be able to read two books simultaneously, one with each eye. Each hemisphere operates independently (like a separate brain). Imagine if all human beings could develop the ability to use their brain hemispheres in different ways depending on the circumstances: 1) to suppress the corpus callosum and thereby separate the hemispheres, thus generating two separate, independent brains, with very different capabilities or 2) enhancing the functioning of the corpus callosum to super-connect the hemispheres and create one ultra powerful brain or 3) deactivating either hemisphere to allow one hemisphere full rein without any distraction or disruption from the other. With such an ability to transform how we think and feel, how we sense and intuit, how we respond to Mythos and Logos, could we not become the GODS THEMSELVES?

Our brain architecture, and what it means for our mental function, is THE most important factor in our journey to the glittering stars of the celestial plane. Our left brain is the centre of our mortal consciousness and our right brain is the centre of our unconscious, linked to our immortal soul and the rest of the Monadic universe. We have to release the staggering power of the right hemisphere, but in a controlled way that brings it under the rational, conscious control of the left brain. That is the route to divinity.

Sink or Swim

“What does not kill me makes me stronger.” -- Nietzsche

This is one of Nietzsche’s most famous statements. People use it all the time, but almost never realise that Nietzsche was its author.

In a universe of reincarnation, where we never truly die, it logically follows that we keep getting stronger and stronger with each new life we lead. If nothing can kill us then we become infinitely strong – we become God!

We often hear about PTSD – post traumatic stress disorder (where a terrible trauma of the past haunts us in the present, and undermines our ability to function properly) – but we rarely hear of its opposite PTG: *post traumatic growth*. With PTG, a person who has survived some catastrophic event, even if horribly injured, feels an astonishing new lease of life and love of life. The fact that they almost lost their life makes them now see it as infinitely precious and they cherish every moment of it. They find it wondrous, an amazing gift, and they become radically self-fulfilled, using every second to its maximum.

Is it not astounding that a traumatic event that destroys some people mentally can be the trigger for remarkable growth and contentment in others? We have to learn the secrets of the latter group and apply them to the former group.

Mysterium Cosmographicum – the Cosmographic Mystery

It has been solved by the Illuminati!

The Illuminati say to the whole world, “Welcome, for the first time in your lives, to REALITY.”

Prisca sapientia = sacred wisdom = Illuminism.

Consciousness

“Bodies act as if there were no souls ... and souls act as if there were no bodies, and both act as if each influenced the other.” – Leibniz

Consciousness = when reason becomes autonomous, an active agent. Consciousness belongs to the phenomenal world of becoming. But our “transcendental ego”, our higher self, is located in the noumenal domain outside space and time. And therein lies the mystery of life and death. Our phenomenal self is sure to die, but it is linked to a noumenal self that *cannot* die. Our “mind” straddles the two domains of noumenon and phenomenon, transcendence and immanence. In fact, it is the decisive link between the two domains.

Monad – our transcendental ego, our higher self, our immortal self, our unquenchable, eternal life force.

“Genius” is derived from the Latin word meaning the guardian and guiding spirit that each person is given at birth, and to whose inspiration his original ideas are due. In ancient Gnosticism, the “genius” was your own higher self. We might now call it your transcendental ego, your noumenal, immortal self.

Dreams – “sleeping consciousness”. Dreams are outside space, time, logic and causality. Dreams provide us with our best channel to our noumenal “genius”.

We can speak of “waking consciousness” – directed by space, time, causality and direct sensory input – versus “sleeping consciousness”, where space, time, causality and direct sensory input are all absent. We are still conscious in our dreams, even though we are asleep. It’s a different form of consciousness. It’s the consciousness we have when we’re dead!

Thought is dialectical and evolves out of itself. The thought of being (thesis) turns into the thought of nothing (antithesis) and then, as a synthesis, into the thought of becoming, which then propels thought *forever*. The simplest thought dialectically transforms itself into the most complex thought of all.

What happens when a monad contemplates itself? It is being, yet it is also nothing (zero;

dimensionless), and thus it becomes a mental entity of eternal becoming. It is becoming God.

Qualia – what it actually *feels like* to be in a particular state of mind, to *experience* a particular state of mind. Materialism is inherently incapable of explaining this phenomenon of consciousness.

Phenomenology –what is it? Carl Jaspers defined it as the “science of experience.” We can therefore relate it to qualia. How can materialism have anything to say about mental experience? Since when has materialism had anything to say about what it feels like to be human? Materialism is silent on all the important issues of life, mind and consciousness. Why does it continue to be treated seriously in the mental domain where it is so insufficient for the task? It has no means of exploring the *inside* of things. Materialism is all about the *outside*.

Socrates said, “Imagine now that there are two ruling powers. One of them is set over the visible or physical world and the other over the invisible or mental world. ... Understanding and reason belong to the invisible or mental world ... there abides the very being with which the knowledge is concerned, that colourless, formless, intangible essence visible only to the mind. The divine intelligence of souls is nourished from this pure knowledge.”

What bridges the gap between mind and matter? What’s the interface between them? It’s our senses. It’s our senses that allow us to experience physicality. Our senses are what bring colour, taste, smell, touch, sound, sensation and spectacle into our minds. A universe without sensing entities is a cemetery. It’s drab, sterile, invisible, colourless, soundless, tasteless, odourless. It is really nothing at all. For a mind to engage with matter, sensory apparatus must evolve.

“Is there no way out of the mind?” -- Sylvia Plath

A “substance” is something that is unique and depends on nothing else for its existence. Each monad is unique and depends on nothing else for its existence, hence is a substance. Yet each monad also belongs to a general monadic substance in that it has the same general qualities as all other monads.

DNA – the information pattern necessary for monads to interact productively with the material world through physical bodies.

Kant believed he had affirmed the limits of human understanding with his noumenal/phenomenal dualism. However, his successors immediately overturned his model.

Kant was a “transcendental” idealist, and he provides a summary of what this entails:

“We have therefore wanted to say that all our intuition is nothing but the representation of appearance; that the things that we intuit are not in themselves what we intuit them to be, nor are their relations so constituted in themselves as they appear to us; and that if we remove our own subject or even only the subjective constitution of the senses in general, then all constitution, all relations of objects in space and time, indeed space and time themselves would disappear, and as appearances they cannot exist in themselves, but only in us. What may be the case with objects in themselves and abstracted from all this receptivity of our sensibility remains entirely unknown to us. We are acquainted with nothing except our way of perceiving them, which is peculiar to us, and which therefore does not necessarily pertain to every being, though to be sure it pertains to every human being. We are concerned solely with this. Space and time are its pure forms, sensation in general its matter. We can cognize only the former a priori, i.e., prior to all actual

perception, and they are therefore called pure intuition; the latter, however, is that in our cognition that is responsible for its being called a posteriori cognition, i.e., empirical intuition. The former adheres to our sensibility absolutely necessarily, whatever sort of sensations we may have; the latter can be very different.”

Schopenhauer said, “*Transcendental* is the philosophy that makes us aware of the fact that the first and essential laws of this world that are presented to us are rooted in our brain and are therefore known *a priori*. It is called transcendental because it goes beyond the whole given phantasmagoria to the origin thereof.”

In other words, transcendentalism goes beyond mere appearance to the underlying truth. The truth transcends our experiences.

Illuminism can be called transcendental rationalism. It mathematically bridges the phenomenal and noumenal universes and renders the noumenal domain fully knowable (in agreement with Plato). Rationalism is what allows us to escape from Kant’s baffling noumenal domain. All mathematical knowledge is *a priori*. Mathematics is a precondition of experience – there can be no experiences without it.

Satan, Lucifer and Abraxas

Satan: Will, Desire, Greed, Self-interest, Selfishness, Power over others, Domination, Bad empathy, Immorality, Vanity, Narcissism.

(Doesn’t that sound like the denizens of Wall Street and Washington D. C.?)

Lucifer: Altruism, Sympathy, Pity, Morality, Good empathy, Equal power, Community. (The Luciferians are the saints amongst us.)

Abraxas: Intellect, Reason, Knowledge, Wisdom, Understanding, Intuition, Imagination, Amorality (not concerned with moral issues but with rational issues), Power over oneself.

Satan is the False God, the Evil God. Lucifer is the God most people actually want to believe in (if they did but know it) – the Good God. Abraxas is the True God – the God of Reason, Philosophy, Science and Mathematics.

The Mythos species worship Satan, but imagine him to be Lucifer. The Logos species aspire to join Abraxas in the Community of Gods.

Will and Intellect. Uncontrolled Will pulls us *down* to the level of beasts. Will is associated with Satan. Intellect raises us up to the level of the divine. Intellect is associated with Abraxas.

The Chain of Being: the world is conceived of as a chain extending from the humblest, most basic particle of inanimate matter all the way up to the supreme expression of actualisation – God. The chain includes all the possibilities of existence. Everything in the chain has an inner striving to improve, to ascend the scale, to become more like God.

Principle of Plenitude – the notion that all possibilities are realized in the world: everything that can happen will happen. There are no unrealized potentialities. All potential is actualised. That being the case, if the universe is capable of a maximum realization of its potential (“God”) then God MUST exist, or at least be coming into existence.

Creation

A concept that goes to the heart of the non-existence debate is “Creation”. The Abrahamist religions explicitly declare that God made Creation out of non-existence. Before

Creation, there was God alone. He was the entirety of existence. Now, if he had created the world from his own substance rather than out of nothing at all, it would mean that the universe was made of divine substance, hence every part was Godly. It would be a pantheistic universe, meaning that God was everything and everywhere. This would of course raise horrific theological issues in relation to the problem of evil. How can evil exist if everything is made of perfect God substance?

Strangely, Creationists condemn pantheism while nevertheless maintaining that God is everywhere. If he is indeed everywhere then he must be where evil is occurring – so why isn't he stopping it, and indeed why is it happening at all if he's there and he's morally perfect and incapable of evil? The Creationist theologians are silent.

Creationism says that God did not use his own substance to create the world but rather he made it from non-God material that he summoned from non-existence. Nevertheless, all of this material was touched by him, created by him and processed by him, hence divine at one remove, so again we are confronted by how evil is possible in a world created by a perfect being from a substance that he himself devised and defined (and, in any case, how can a perfect God create anything less than a perfect substance?). There's no escaping the conclusion that God created evil – since he created *everything* – but how can a perfect being of perfect goodness create evil? It's IMPOSSIBLE. Hence, the Creationist God cannot exist. As soon as you observe one act of evil, you know there is no Creator. The idea that evil is the absence of good, that evil is where God is never found, doesn't wash since God is everywhere.

Creationism is an outright denial of the First Law of Thermodynamics that energy can be neither created nor destroyed. If God made the world out of nothing then he made energy exist that didn't exist before, and, by the same token, he can annihilate it. Therefore, he could certainly annihilate energy that had somehow become "evil". The fact that he doesn't either means that he doesn't exist or he condones evil and sees no reason to remove it. He is the God of Evil i.e. the Devil! Creationism is nothing but an anti-scientific, Satanic ideology.

If God *didn't* create anything then it means that all of the stuff of the world has always existed. It's immortal. It can never be destroyed. It means that everything we see around us is infinitely old and will endure eternally. We ourselves are infinitely old. It's true that energy, although incapable of being created or destroyed, can be endlessly transformed and indeed the history of existence has been this perpetual process of energetic transformation, of eternal BECOMING.

The scientific theory of the Big Bang also seems to be a Creationist ideology. It suggests that the universe sprang from non-existence via some bizarre and spectacularly improbable quantum event that was subject to some equally bizarre "inflation" event that turned a virtual particle into a full-blown, perhaps infinitely large universe. Now that's some trick! It seems much more like Creationist magic than science. Scientists account for the apparent violation of the First Law of Thermodynamics by claiming that the total energy of the universe is zero (the positive energy of matter being exactly offset by negative gravitational energy).

No thinking person is likely to find the current Big Bang theory persuasive. It may well have many correct features consistent with observation, but it needs to be radically recast to be rationally acceptable. One of the most pertinent points about the Big Bang is why didn't it happen sooner? Are scientists claiming that there was no universe prior to this one? If so, what was happening infinitely long ago? Scientists will say such things as "time and space didn't exist before the Big Bang, so it's meaningless to talk about what came before". Is that a satisfactory and coherent answer, or just anti-philosophical prevarication?

Hegelian Panlogism: Logos is everywhere. All thoughts are, ultimately, the thoughts of a single mental substance that is evolving and developing towards the Absolute – the final condition of perfection.

The Christian Trinity
God the Son (Jesus Christ) – God Incarnate – matter.
God the Father – God Disincarnate – immaterial – pure mind.
The Holy Spirit – mediating between Father and Son, between mind and matter.
Another Trinity
Matter is an extended fluid – filling all of space.
Spirit is an unextended fluid (aether) – filling all of mental space.
The individual mind mediates between the extended domain of matter and the unextended domain of spirit.
Spirit is the Collective Mind, a mental fluid, while mind is localised, individualised spirit.

Question. “I discovered the Armageddon Conspiracy site in December – I consider that moment the threshold of a major paradigm shift in my life. I have since completed about 2/3 of it and plan on reading every other publication released once I’m done with the site. I am intellectually ravenous with it – I rush home after work every day in almost giddy excitement to type in the url and to discover what wonder of treasures I will discover with my next read.

“There are so many revelations that have utterly transformed my psyche – the alchemical process has begun, and while I understand that there is an oceanic horizon of where I am yet to go, the process hitherto made is practically infinite.

“I am certainly of the demographic you sought to expose this information to. I am an ENTP (although after introspection I’ve come to realize that I have become significantly more introverted. This psychological rounding has, I’ve discovered, provided the impetus to immerse myself in your material, as while I previously sought external social stimulation on weekend nights, I now prefer to spend time alone reading :) Of course, my mission to conquer all my internal insecurities, flaws, and socially constructed biases is far from complete, yet constantly progressing.

“I went to Catholic school as a child. I was the kid who never bought their disgusting crap for a second. As you can imagine, I was never a favourite student. Even in pre-pubescence, my incessant questioning and digging would produce stupid, unsatisfactory answers, and my rebuttals would keep probing their premises until all that was left was ‘well, that’s where faith comes in!’ What the fuck? I was lucky enough to have an atheist father and a new-age spiritual mother, so robotic indoctrination wasn’t a part of my early childhood, but I wonder, was it inherent in me genetically (or any other type of pre-determining type of mechanism) to be one to love philosophy and hate blind faith? Why was I at odds with the majority of the other students who just accepted these stupid doctrines? Of course, I found great satisfaction in reading the ‘Outsiders’ article, as you would imagine.

“When I was a younger adult, I remember specifically being taught about Hegel, and the idea of Thesis-Antithesis-Synthesis struck a very resounding chord, it was so intuitive in me! I remember later having an intellectual debate with a quintessential Ayn Rand worshipping anarcho-capitalist. At that time, I too was enthralled by Ayn Rand, but deep, deep down I knew there was something profoundly missing in the assumption that what we’ve thus far accomplished could possibly be the pinnacle of what the potential humanity could fulfil. I

remember his revolted response. He was intelligent insofar as his IQ was relatively high and was capable of utilizing Aristotelian logic effectively (in order to justify his pre-conceived notions, of course). But his response to my Hegelian proposal was that Marx himself was a fan of Hegel and that the dialectic is a Communist ideology. I of course smelled the fallacy immediately that Communism itself was merely an incomplete phase of the dialectic itself and not the teleological synthesis. It was at that moment I realized there was more to it all. I had read *Atlas Shrugged* and was utterly blown away by it initially. In retrospect, I see it as a spell cast on me. I have always been highly intelligent and logical – one to debate often and philosophize (that’s the ENTP in me!) But I realized then that while I believed capitalism empowered individuals and was a hitherto superior system, that eventually humanity could dialectically evolve past it. (This was WHILE I was still a fan of Mammon!) Throughout my entire adult life, my ideological perspective on society has been a constant fluctuation. I have gone from anarcho-capitalist to communist and back more than once! “Over this process, I began to refine my worldview to realize that all ideologies take certain subjective values into perspective while ignoring others, and that the Particular Will guides almost all people (automaton). This is why those born into the elite prefer to favour policies that perpetuate their perverse wealth, and those born into poverty favour government welfare policies. This realization was one of my first intellectual awakenings of discovering that the majority of people’s psyche’s and worldviews are based on psychological constructs and not reminiscent of a reality that empowers humankind itself. Finally, each *Zeitgeist* movie blew me away, and ‘Moving Forward’ completely changed my worldview on capitalism. The shackles of Ayn Rand and Mammon were once and for all dispelled.

“*Atlas Shrugged* was a book that for a long time held enormous influence on my ideology. I considered it ‘the best book I’ve ever read’ and the one that had had the greatest effect on me. To some credit, the book did inspire me to be the best person I could become (of course, the ‘best’ of Mammon is not the same as the true platonic ‘Best’ which would assumingly be defined as Gnosis), and the book did sharpen my mind. Also, while the central tenet as well as the conclusions of Rand’s work are actually evil and the antithesis of spiritual health, a few aspects of what Ayn Rand described, I believe, are worth at least respecting in isolation. (I don’t wish to rouse any type of debate, but merely am curious to express a philosophical thought.) For example, the chapter ‘Racism’ in *The Virtue of Selfishness* made the case against any judgement on a human being based on anything other than their merit. Also, while I disagreed with much of *For the New Intellectual*, I thought her discussions of ‘Attila’ and ‘The Witch Doctor’ were interesting: Attila being a metaphor for those consumed by the mindset to destroy, and The Witch doctor a metaphor for those who sought to control the minds of people with superstition. To me these are different intellectual routes to a similar conclusion you have made – the evil of hegemony, of monarchic, dictatorial systems, and of religious institutions over the psychological. So, just as you mention that the Abrahamic doctrines, while fundamentally evil have a few words of wisdom, so too did Ayn Rand in some respects. Of course, her completely blind disconnect from the fact that we are One is pathetic. I used to believe through this influence that there was no such thing as a forest, only trees. Of course, I realize now, not only is there a forest, there is the universe.

“Of course, this is merely a brief and greatly incomplete introduction to myself. I admit though that the sense of fulfilment on discovering this material was so vast that it’s left me with an almost childlike awe. I truly feel like the entire holistic approach of psychology, history, math, science, spirituality and politics wove together a theory of everything that truly resounded with me on the deepest of levels. Coming from an atheistic/agnostic scientific rationalist background, the nihilistic gap to spirituality and intuitive truth has finally been bridged. Truly, my spirit has arrived at home.

“I bought a kindle for the sole purpose of being able to download the many works released on Amazon, and I’ve already read the *Kybalion*. I look forward to the immersion ahead of me. I have no idea what I will become, but I know I have reached the escape velocity – the threshold in which I can never return, and with it, meaning and purpose have begun to arise. There are of course a plethora of thoughts and questions yet I yearn to discuss but I recognize it is not my place to do so until I am fully acquainted with all of your released material. But the true purpose I wanted to reach out prematurely was because I wanted to tell you about a book I’ve read, and the concepts it espouses. It’s a book that, prior to really discovering esoteric spirituality and the massively corrupt world order, I spent a great portion of my time thinking about, and I bring it up to you because I’ve discovered interesting parallels.

The idea is called the technological singularity, and one of its greatest proponents is Ray Kurzweil.

“It posits that due to the exponential increasing of technology, humans will begin to transcend their own biological limitations. When virtual reality and ‘real’ reality become indistinguishable, when genome therapy both makes death obsolete and enhances our strengths, when we begin to replace our systems one by one with technological counterparts (eyes that see better, nanobots that stimulate our neurons, etc) and when artificial intelligence begets even more advanced AI in a recurring function, we are to see an explosion of advancement- this is the Singularity.

“Of course, the school of thought in this realm is inhabited, as far as I can tell, vastly by a purely scientific materialist, non spiritual (in the conventional sense) crowd – mostly tech entrepreneur Silicon Valley types. However, the parallels are staggering, and, being someone who was slightly obsessed with this concept prior to discovering your site, this foundation allowed me to hit the ground running with Illuminism. For example, I already readily subscribed to the idea that humanity was merely a manifestation of the universe evolving into God, and that the boundaries of the mind, quantum physics, and the big bang were all forefronts of science, and that this final frontier was none other than ‘knocking on heaven’s door.’” Chapter 2 of Kurzweil’s book, specifically, provides his philosophical theory on the universe, essentially making the case that the physical universe at its inception was purely simple matter, and that each particle actually contained information (mind), and that this simple information and the laws of physics allowed it to manifest over time into various stages: Physics-Chemistry-Biology-Brain-Technology, and finally- Brain/Technology fusion.

“In a stunningly intuitive stroke, Kurzweil, a man very much in the realm of scientific materialism, provides a theory close to Reality, and with no desire to provide a spiritual answer. Granted, I did disagree with him on his theory about the final phase of the universe’s evolution – he believes physical matter, in the form of a mega-computer if you will, would begin to convert ‘dumb’ matter into ‘intelligent’ matter ad infinitum, essentially espousing the ‘grey goo’ theory, while I in turn believed that once we reached the Singularity the need for our spirituality to be confined in this realm would be transcended altogether.

“Of course, I approach you cautiously, as I know it’s very likely you’re well aware of this widely espoused idea (there’s even a university backed by one of Google’s founders dedicated to it), and that my recommendation is largely redundant to you. But in the off-chance that I’m providing you an interesting and alternate perspective that could dialectically refine all available paths to your vision of humanity’s future, I will feel good to know I’ve shared it with you.

“I have one final thought – I am thoroughly convinced a massive economic crash is looming. I have spent time truly wondering how a practical overthrow of the OWO would actually come about while the masses are numbingly content with their junk, and while the mainstream media propaganda machine continuously perpetuates the status quo dogmas that

these masses masochistically accept. My conclusion, albeit a highly speculative one, is that this crash is what's actually *needed* to snap people out of it, to wake them up at the horrible condition of our current world order, and to incentivise the masses to finally act. Perhaps when the drones of people who hitherto were sedated by junk values wake up to a lost country, it will act as the final wakeup call to revolution. As a mere squire on my fool's journey, I just want to ask your opinion on this stance.

"Forgive my long windedness. I still reside in a sea of wonder. I want to let you know that while you must and rightfully should be indignant towards the vast number of paranoid conspiracy theorists and pseudo-intellectuals that reply to you and perhaps have exemplified an unsatisfactory response to your communication project, even by touching the lives of a few, I believe the universe has been positively advanced in its dialectical evolution, as I am one of the few who 'click' with it, and my OWN universe has done exactly so.

"Technological singularity refers to the hypothetical future emergence of greater-than-human intelligence through technological means. Since the capabilities of such intelligence would be difficult for an unaided human mind to comprehend, the occurrence of a technological singularity is seen as an intellectual event horizon, beyond which events cannot be predicted or understood. Proponents of the singularity typically state that an 'intelligence explosion' is a key factor of the Singularity where superintelligences design successive generations of increasingly powerful minds. This hypothesized process of intelligent self-modification might occur very quickly, and might not stop until the agent's cognitive abilities greatly surpass that of any human. The term 'intelligence explosion' is therefore sometimes used to refer to this scenario. The term was coined by science fiction writer Vernor Vinge, who argues that artificial intelligence, human biological enhancement or brain-computer interfaces could be possible causes of the singularity. The concept is popularized by futurists like Ray Kurzweil and it is expected by proponents to occur sometime in the 21st century, although estimates do vary." -- Wikipedia

The "technological singularity" is essentially a scientific materialist version of Illuminism. It's for people who want to be God but are terrified of death and don't accept any possibility of an afterlife.

Illuminism is about the universe being an organism evolving towards perfection, and all natural events (especially the birth – death – birth again – death again ... cycle) are essential to this. We **MUST** die in order to become God, and when we actually become God we must die again – "divine suicide" – because otherwise the universe would become frozen perfection and frozen perfection inevitably becomes absolute tedium, hence hell itself.

Scientific materialists want to skip the death part and to find a technological means of keeping their existing mind and consciousness intact, and to keep artificially enhancing it until it has Godlike capacities. They are putting up technology against nature. Implicit in their approach is the idea that robots and humans are really the same – and that is an exceptionally controversial statement in philosophical terms. Their approach is anti-nature, and that's never going to work. It will create freaks and monsters, and probably madmen. It's a kind of Dr Frankenstein vision of the future, except Frankenstein is engaged in attaching cybernetic parts to himself.

The technological singularity is certainly worthy of consideration because of the issues it raises about human nature, but it's also exceptionally dangerous.

Question. “Hello, I’ve just finished reading the Armageddon conspiracy website and I want to congratulate you on the enormous work you’ve done. I’m a staunch atheist and I don’t believe in any religion, especially those that try to inhibit reason and discourage thinking. I’m suspicious to everything supernatural. I usually quickly abandon sites that deal with conspiracies, supernatural and spiritual development, because so far I’ve noticed that the only result from taking interest in such stuff is usually the emptying of your pocket. However, during the last year I spent a lot of time on your site. It is a serious read and it really made me change my beliefs on various subjects. Illuminism is the only rational religion that can compare with materialistic thinking. It was quite interesting to see my views on existence put to the test and countered by equally probable but radically different ones. Thanks to you, I’ve seen the limits of science and rational knowledge. The scope and aims of your philosophy – creating a frame which will unite everything – religion, philosophy, science, mysticism – are breathtaking. It is a pity that humanity cannot put to the test both scientific materialism and Illumination. As an atheist, I’ve relied on axioms about the nature of existence, as unprovable on our stage of development, as those of Illumination. However, they are the only shows remaining in town. Therefore, after all it is about belief or a leap of faith.

“I’d like to make sure that I interpret Illumination correctly. Here are 18 statements that describe what I’ve understood from it. As a critical person, I’ll try to deconstruct them in another letter. I think it will be interesting to you what a former very staunch atheist has made of what you said and what weak points he finds:

1) Everything in its fundamental form is the arche – which can be both material and non-material.

2) Arche is ever-changing, ever becoming. Change is what unifies existence with non-existence, something with nothing. Nothing is Something due to be (a potential), Something is Nothing that was (an actualization).

3) The arche, in its most rudimentary form has discrete nature and consists of an infinite number of massless and formless particles, outside of space and time, called monads.

4) These monads are not only objective entities, they can subjectively experience events, i.e. they’re alive.

5) The immaterial aspect of the universe is mind. It is eternal, spaceless and timeless, although mental time and space occur there. Mind has infinite potential, infinite ideas, that need to be actualized.

6) In the beginning of the Universe all monads exist unseparated, forming a great Oneness.

7) So that the monads can experience separation and individuation and gain self-knowledge, the material world is created (by them).

8) Through a large number of lives and deaths souls gain more and more experience of the material world with the final goal to achieve complete knowledge of themselves, their purpose and all the mysteries of existence. Life and death are in fact different aspects of the existence of the soul. Life represents the soul existence in both material and immaterial domains, while death – only in the immaterial. The soul is eternal. It moves from body to body via reincarnation. It is the bearer of individuality.

9) Consciousness gradually develops through many lifetimes. The degree of consciousness separates non-living from living entities, humans from animals etc. Humans are between the stages of narrating sentience and meta-consciousness, i.e. consciousness reflecting on itself.

10) Evil comes from separation, both spacetime and separation between different

consciousness. A third layer of separation is also suggested – between the soul and the ego. Good comes from the desire for unification and regaining of the oneness.

11) The nature of the universe is dialectical – it is a battle of opposites – good vs. evil, separation vs. oneness, matter vs. mind, entropy vs. negentropy. This opposition, however, doesn't lead to an eternal standstill rather it produces new conditions and states of existence, where all contradictions are resolved. The synthesis then becomes thesis on its own account and produces an antithesis, because the Universe always strives for balance. From the new contradiction, a new synthesis arises and so the story goes on until the final synthesis of mind and matter – the Universal Synthesis. Then the end of history, the Omega point, occurs when no events of significance happen. A divine suicide takes place. The Universe begins a new cycle.

12) The Universe can actually be described as a computer performing the mathematical operations of differentiation and integration. Existence is cyclical, but no cycle looks like the previous one. Existence itself is an end and not a means. Big Bangs and Big Crunches alternate. Mind and matter separation and re-unification occur in an endless cycle. It is best described by an ever unfolding spiral. One of the weak points of Illuminism is that it (as far as I know) doesn't answer the question when the first cycle of this succession of cycles took place and what was there before it. Because in a succession, even if infinite, there always has to be a first member. Of course one can say that between two cycles there is no physical time, so they cannot be determined in such a manner, but succession of cycles means that one precedes the other regardless of whether time flows or not.

13) Humans are potential Gods.

14) Understanding of the secrets of Nature can be achieved by inner experience, through Gnosis. The Holy Grail is an object that can accelerate the process.

15) Humans use their dominant left brain, which is responsible for details, material reality, the things that happen now and here. It is egoistic, concerned with the I and its immediate survival. In their right brain resides a second personality, their eternal self, their soul. The right brain is holistic, mathematical, philosophical, and represents the connection humans have with the eternal mental domain. It is concerned with the global picture and is more altruistic. Gnosis is achieved by establishing contact with this second personality, with our unconscious. The process is described best by Jung and his Individuation Program, the God Program.

16) Humans can choose to perpetuate the existence of their ego, by trying to achieve a physical immortality, or to establish contact with their immortal self. (Well it is my conclusion – it is based on the dialectical logic – if immortality of the consciousness can be achieved by becoming our higher self, then the antithesis of it will be immortality, based on avoiding contact with the eternal self and perpetuating the ego instead.)

17) I also draw a conclusion, from all I've read during the past year, that the current State of Man is not natural. In the past, we had a connection to the right brain and no fear of death, could use telepathy, build giant monuments. But because of the intervention of an egoistic power (the Demiurge) we lost this connection and our perspective of the world shifted – we were more separated than ever, now even separated from ourselves. We entered the world of Good and Evil, of existential fear the world of the ego, of the left brain.

Answer. There is certainly no leap of faith involved in Illumination. What it does involve is absolute confidence in reason, particularly as regards mathematics. Illuminism is based on the numbers zero and infinity – which are, by definition, beyond the reach of scientific materialism. Scientific materialism, the basis of atheism, is the faith-based position that the numbers zero and infinity do not have ontological reality, although it has no means of disproving their existence

and, in mathematical terms, it's irrational to deny their existence.

Illumination, on the contrary, is the position that existence is "living mathematics" and that all numbers have ontological reality, including zero, infinity, negative numbers and imaginary numbers. Illumination then becomes a "simple" exercise of explaining what all the different numbers mean. Imaginary numbers are time, real numbers are space and the spacetime continuum is therefore an arena of complex numbers. Negative real numbers represent "anti-space" (antimatter) and negative imaginary numbers are anti-time. Zero is the number of immaterial existence (the mind/"soul"/life), and infinity (infinite mathematical energy) can be contained within zero as long as positive infinity is cancelled by negative infinity, and positive imaginary infinity is cancelled by negative imaginary infinity, leaving a resultant of zero.

Illumination is based on the absolute, immutable, eternal truths of mathematics, not the provisional truths of science (which can be overturned at any time by new experimental data inconsistent with prevailing scientific paradigms). Science is inherently not a subject that can deliver absolute truth. Atheism, which derives its justification from science, can therefore never be anything but a provisional position – waiting to be falsified/refuted.

Mathematics is not provisional. It provides unarguable knowledge. If everything is mathematical then there is an absolute, unarguable answer to existence. Illumination is based on the Monadology of Leibniz, the inventor of calculus and the greatest genius in human history. Leibniz was the supreme logician and rationalist.

You're absolutely right that Illumination and atheism are the only credible shows in town. We reduce these two positions to how consistent they are with mathematics, and calculus in particular. Our approach is extremely technical, and that's the level at which we wish to have any fruitful discussion. In this series, we will demonstrate the numerous logical fallacies – blatant contradictions of mathematics – that lie at the heart of scientific materialism.

Science and atheism both fail because they are insufficiently mathematical.

Illumination is the religion, philosophy and science of MATHEMATICS. We assert that absolutely everything can be explained mathematically, and that only our system offers the eternal, immutable certainties that people seek. Whether people like the answers is quite another matter. The truth has no obligation to be nice and comfortable. As it turns out, mathematics offers everything that any religious person could ever want, but that's because of the extraordinary properties of numbers, not because of any preposterous "Creator".

Most of us were atheists too before we found Illumination. We've all tried putting dents in it, but we have all failed. If you can find a flaw, we'll be delighted to hear from you – but you will need to express your findings in mathematics before we can engage with them.

Our website is about giving people a feel for what we're talking about without laying heavy-duty mathematics on them – but the real position of Illumination can only be understood via highly technical mathematical considerations.

Question. "What troubles me most with the mathematical explanation of reality given by Illuminism is that the timeless and spaceless domain is considered to have subjective experience, or that in other words that zero is 'alive', but I'm sure I'll find the topic covered extensively."

Ah, spoken like a good materialist. Yes, this is the key issue. Is it possible to have an outer, "objective" event without an inner, "subjective" experience of that event? If so, how? (What sufficient reason is there for accepting an outer but not an inner, a without but not a within?) If not, what is "subjectivity"?

Is your own mind subjective or objective? Could someone else know objectively exactly how it is to be you? (which is the implication if you are a well-defined object rather than a unique

mental subject).

We repudiate the position of scientific materialism that the number zero has no ontological reality. It is *impossible* for there to be an existential form of mathematics that lacks the number zero. Ontological mathematics MUST contain all of the same numbers as abstract mathematics (which no one disputes contains the number zero). It is irrational and anti-mathematical to claim otherwise (as science does).

Once “ontological zero” is accepted, the question becomes – what does it correspond to? It clearly isn’t a physical object, so it must be mental. It fits perfectly with the Cartesian definition of mind being “unextended” i.e. dimensionless. More importantly, it also accords perfectly with a) a mathematical point and b) a Leibnizian monad. It is impossible to conceive any other ontological definition that can be applied to it other than that of a unit of fundamental mental existence – a soul. A soul is of course a living, immortal entity. It is not inherently conscious, but it has the capacity to become conscious.

The status of “ontological zero” is the supreme issue of religion, science, philosophy, mathematics and psychology. It’s the key question of existence and what we know for certain is that it is beyond any scientific experiment, it is beyond our senses and can be grasped through reason alone. It is the perfect Platonic Form and it defines EVERYTHING!

The whole realm of thought can be reduced to “what is the ontological meaning of the number zero?” From that answer, everything else flows. The whole of Illuminism flows directly from Leibniz’s mathematico-philosophical treatment of monads (the basic units of existence, the existential zeros).

Remember, zero must ontologically be *something*. It cannot be absence, void, nothingness or non-existence. Equally, it is nothing material. What’s left? Only one thing remains, no matter how unpalatable to materialists – it’s the principle of mind, of life itself. It is the life quintessence, the most rarefied and special number, the number that both IS and ISN’T, that is being and nothingness, dialectically resolved in eternal becoming. A monad is an eternal becoming of the unquenchable, irresistible life force. Zero is the number of subjectivity. That’s what life is too. When a person dies, what remains in the material world? Just an objective, material corpse – a “thing”. The life force has departed to the mental domain. That which animated the physical body has gone. The body is no longer a meaningful, conscious subject.

Zero = subjectivity; zero has infinite capacity. Zero is the *inside, the within*. It is the *inner* experience. Zero is the number of mind, life and will.

All numbers greater than zero and less than infinity = objectivity. These are the numbers of materialism, of the outside, the without, the outer event.

We cannot, of course, ever experimentally locate a monad (it is beyond the senses, beyond materialism, beyond the reach of any scientific experiment). We understand it rationally, not empirically. We offer no materialistic “proofs” since none are possible by definition. So, what will you do – fallaciously agree with scientists that absence of “evidence” is evidence of absence? Or will you rationally make contact with the domain of transcendental reason? Life and mind are things we directly experience. They cannot be accounted for in any theory of scientific materialism. So, where shall we look for their explanation? They must be rationally explained since they are rational just like everything else. Only one place is possible, the “hidden” domain, the domain we can never reach materially – the domain of zero and infinity.

Those who mentally resist the concept that that zero is the number of life and mind are those so deeply wedded to materialistic conditioning that they just can’t get their heads around the reality of an independent domain of life and mind, one not controlled by matter in any way. Theirs is a position of faith that materialism can account for everything – even though it has manifestly failed to do so. They refuse to accept the TOTALITY of mathematics, including zero

and infinity, and they refuse to assign ontological reality to zero and infinity. Even if they do come round to the idea that zero and infinity must be *something*, they still contest the concept that they are the numbers of mind and life. Why do they hate mind and life so much? Why are they so determined to make matter rule mind and life? They have no rational reason for doing so – just brainwashed, materialistic prejudice. If they can't observe it, it doesn't exist, they say. They have made a God of observation (using our flawed and defective human senses!) and they have relegated reason to a sideshow even though it is reason, and not experiment or observation, that proves that $1 + 1 = 2$ immutably and eternally.

Abandon materialistic faith. Embrace rationalism!

Remember this – matter is almost entirely empty space, and materialists have no idea what empty space actually is and how it can be expanding. Talk about the blind leading the blind. They talk of atoms of space, atoms of the void. They have descended into the uttermost absurdity: and all because they dogmatically refuse to acknowledge zero and mind.

Parmenides

“Parmenides of Elea (flourished early 5th century BC) was an ancient Greek philosopher born in Elea, a Greek city on the southern coast of Italy. He was the founder of the Eleatic school of philosophy. The single known work of Parmenides is a poem, *On Nature*, which has survived only in fragmentary form. In this poem, Parmenides describes two views of reality. In ‘The way of truth’ (a part of the poem), he explains how reality (coined as ‘what-is’) is one, change is impossible, and existence is timeless, uniform, necessary, and unchanging. In ‘The way of opinion’, he explains the world of appearances, in which one’s sensory faculties lead to conceptions which are false and deceitful. These ideas strongly influenced the whole of Western philosophy, perhaps most notably through its effect on Plato.” – Wikipedia

Parmenides is right to the extent that the *laws* of mathematics are timeless, but mathematical functions themselves (the entities that *obey* the laws of mathematics) are forever moving, changing, combining, separating. This is no illusion. This is reality.

Although Hegel is a philosopher of dynamics and the dialectic who greatly admired Heraclitus, the philosopher of change, he might be said to be surprisingly in agreement with Parmenides.

Parmenides says: “Thinking and the thought that it is are the same; for you will not find thought apart from what is, in relation to which it is uttered.”; “For thought and being are the same.”; “It is necessary to speak and to think what is; for being is, but nothing is not.”

These all point to a false distinction between the thinking world and the material world, which is Hegel’s point too. Matter, for Hegel, is “alienated mind”. It is mind that is not yet understood to be mind. Ultimately, with the completion of the dialectic, the distinction between subject and object disappears. If something isn’t of the mind, it doesn’t exist at all. Above all, it must be rational: “What is rational is real and what is real is rational.” -- Hegel. Something that cannot be, cannot be the object of thought either.

The mystical, final union of all subjects and all objects in Absolute Mind has been referred to as the ultimate transcendental experience of *unio mystica* (“mystical union”), which Buddhists would describe as *nirvana*, and is in general the state of final enlightenment.

Parmenides was insistent that “nothing comes from nothing”; that existence is eternal (thus he is absolutely anti-Creationist).

“Nothing comes from nothing (Latin: *ex nihilo nihil fit*) is a philosophical expression of a thesis first argued by Parmenides. It is associated with ancient Greek cosmology, such as presented not just in the opus of Homer and Hesiod, but also in virtually every philosophical system – there is no time interval in which a world didn’t exist, since it couldn’t be created *ex*

nihilo in the first place. Note that Greeks also believed that things cannot disappear into nothing, just as they can't be created from nothing, but if they cease to exist, they transform into some other form of being. We can trace this idea to the teaching of Empedocles. Today the idea is loosely associated with the laws of conservation of mass and energy. ... The law of conservation of energy states that no energy is created nor destroyed, it merely changes form. A zero-energy universe hypothesis states that the total amount of energy in the universe is exactly zero. That is the only kind of universe that could come from nothing. Such a universe needs to be flat, a state which does not contradict current observations that the Universe is flat with a 0.5% margin of error." – Wikipedia

Parmenides has the same position as the Illuminati in that reason, not the senses, is the route to truth:

"Parmenides claimed that the truth cannot be known through sensory perception. Only Logos will result in the understanding of the truth of the world. This is because the perception of things or appearances (the *doxa*) is deceptive. Genesis-and-destruction, as Parmenides emphasizes, is illusory, because the underlying material of which a thing is made will still exist after its destruction. What exists must always exist. And we arrive at the knowledge of this underlying, static, and eternal reality (*aletheia*) through reasoning, not through sense-perception." -- Wikipedia

Nobel-Prize winning physicist Erwin Schrödinger wrote of Parmenides, "His attitude is that he does not take the material world around us as a granted reality. The true reality he puts into thought, into the subject of cognizance as we should say. The world around us is a product of the senses, an image created by the sense perception in the thinking subject 'by way of belief'."

In other words, the unchanging, immortal entity at the heart of Parmenides' worldview is really just the conscious self, the soul. Only our thoughts are changing, not anything "out there". We might say that ultimately he considers that there is just one universal Super Soul, and we are all fragments of it. Our thoughts are thoughts within its thoughts (the thoughts of God). This is a position very similar to that of the more modern champion of the anti-materialist school, the ultra idealist Bishop Berkeley who declared that "to be is to be perceived". Anything not perceived doesn't exist i.e. everything results from mental and not physical processes, and it is God who sustains all things, including us, by perceiving them. There is no "material" world. There is no physical movement. There is just the thinking of God. That's all that's needed for "reality".

The God of Thinking

"There are, [Aristotle] says, three kinds of substances: those that are sensible and perishable, those that are sensible but not perishable, and those that are neither sensible nor perishable. The first class includes plants and animals, the second includes the heavenly bodies (which Aristotle believed to undergo no change except motion), the third includes the rational soul in man, and also God." – Bertrand Russell

Here we see the view that animals don't have immortal souls. Heavenly bodies do. As for humans, only the rational, non-sensing part of the soul is immortal, and that, in fact, can be considered a fragment of God's perfect rational soul.

For Aristotle, the "Mythos" part of the soul is animalistic and perishable. Only the "Logos" part of the soul is divine and survives death. The more rational you become, the more Godlike you become. The stupid die. The rational live on.

"Because in a succession, even if infinite, there always has to be a first member."

Is this true? This is not the first time such an assertion has been made. Consider the

following observations:
First cause.

“The main argument for God is the First Cause: there must be something which originates motion, and this something must itself be unmoved, and must be eternal, substance, and actuality. The object of desire and the object of thought, Aristotle says, cause movement in this way, without themselves being in motion. So God produces motion by being loved, whereas every other cause of motion works by being itself in motion (like a billiard ball). God is pure thought; for thought is what is best. ‘Life also belongs to God; for the actuality of thought is life, and God is that actuality; and God’s self-dependent actuality is life most good and eternal. We say therefore that God is a living being, eternal, most good, so that life and duration continuous and eternal belong to God; for this *is* God.” – Bertrand Russell

“The First-Cause argument is simple. It points out that everything finite has a cause, which in turn had a cause, and so on. This series of previous causes cannot, it is maintained, be infinite, and the first term in the series must itself be uncaused, since otherwise it would not be the first term. There is therefore an uncaused cause of everything, and this is obviously God. ... The First-Cause argument rests on the assumption that every series must have a first term, which is false; for example, the series of proper fractions has no first term.” – Bertrand Russell

[A proper fraction is a fraction where the numerator is less than the denominator e.g. 1/4 and 5/6.]

Leibniz’s principle of sufficient reason – for every fact there is a reason why it is so and not otherwise – can be used to show there was no beginning of time. Why should time have begun at *this* moment rather than *that*? Since there is no sufficient reason (other than a Creation Event involving a Creator of some kind) then time had no beginning. A Creatorless universe has no beginning in time. If a Creator existed then he would have no beginning in time. Either way, time has no beginning. The universe is eternal.

In a Creatorless universe there is no first cause. If there is a Creator then the question can immediately be asked of what was *his* cause. There is no sufficient reason for there to be any such thing as a first cause. Just as there is no beginning to time, nor is there any beginning to the cosmic causal sequence. The universe is an eternal motion machine. It has always been thus and it always will be. We can think of cyclical Ages and we can think of the beginning of an Age (the rebirth of the universe), and the end of an Age (the death of the universe – divine suicide), but that’s as good as it gets. We can never know what happened in the Age before this one, or what will happen in the Age after this one (except in terms of the general pattern all Ages follow).

Since the universe is all there is, there is no sufficient reason for it to have a cause outside itself. It must therefore be self-causing, or, in fact, to be causeless. Nothing caused it to come into being. It *always* existed. The true definition of existence is that it is uncaused. All existents (monads) are uncaused. They have no Creator, they are eternal. We are all monads – and we are all immortal. No one caused us. We owe nothing to anyone. We are in debt to no one. We do not suffer from karma and we do not suffer from Original Sin.

“Consider the following series: $1 - 1 + 1 - 1 + 1 - 1 + 1 - 1 + 1 - 1 \dots$ It’s not so hard to show that this series sums to zero. After all,

$$(1 - 1) + (1 - 1) + (1 - 1) + (1 - 1) + (1 - 1) + (1 - 1) + \dots$$

Is the same thing as

$$0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + \dots$$

Which clearly sums to zero. But beware! Group the series in a different way:

$$1 + (1 - 1) + (1 - 1) + (1 - 1) + (1 - 1) + (1 - 1) + (1 - 1) + \dots$$

Is the same thing as

$$1 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + \dots$$

which clearly sums to one. The same infinite series of zeros can equal 0 and 1 at the same time. An Italian priest, Father Guido Grandi, even used this series to prove that God could create the universe (1) out of nothing (0). In fact, the sequence can be set to equal anything at all.” – Charles Seife

So, what is the first term in this series? It doesn't have one. There's no need for any First Cause or Prime Mover. Mathematics can get by without causes, without a kick-start. In fact, it's the only thing that can.

Original Thoughts

If you think all of the thoughts you've had haven't already been thought, you're wrong. Only geniuses have new thoughts. Are you a genius?

We often get attacked by people using false assumptions. They use a fallacy to reject (or cast doubt on) our position. Yet the fault, the error, is entirely theirs.

Frequently, we are astounded by the breathtaking arrogance and stupidity of the people attacking our position, the latest to step up to the plate being “Tiger Hawk”. So, it's time to give these people a lesson in how to think. We shall now deconstruct all of the fallacies in Tiger Hawk's message.

To begin, let's define some terms. Leibniz pointed out that there are truths of reason and truths of fact. To say that all bachelors are unmarried is a truth of reason because it is true by definition. It is an “analytic” statement. That the sky is blue is a fact that we discover about the world; the blueness of the sky is not contained in the definition of sky. It could be any other colour, without contradicting the definition of sky. To say that the sky is blue is to make a “synthetic” statement.

The rationalist philosophical school has always attributed more importance to truths of reason. The empiricists have taken the opposite approach and emphasised truths of fact. (This is the basis of scientific materialism.)

Statements made in the Torah, Bible, Koran or *Lord of the Rings* are neither truths of reason nor truths of fact. They are statements of fiction, fantasy, delusion, speculation, faith i.e. they cannot be justified rationally or factually. They rely on other mechanisms – such as brainwashing or mass stupidity – for being treated with any respect at all. To say that Creationism should be taught as science is insane because science is all about truths of fact and Creationism does not present any facts at all. Instead, it provides Bible stories. Equally, conspiracy theories do not normally contain any truths of fact or reason: they present wild speculation as “evidence”. They create a narrative then call it rational even though it is not based on any truths of reason or fact.

Tiger Hawk wrote: “So, you object to the wealthy elite maintaining control, yet families like the Rothschild support your movement? They aren't the wealthy elite? Nor is Obama? Also, if your goal is to end the ruling elite through money, you have yet to comment on life OUTSIDE of money. What will we be giving up in the name of equal rights to money? Equal rights for everything else? Equal right to be an individual?”

When has the Rothschild family ever expressed any support for the Illuminati? There is no truth of fact here. Either this is false, a deliberate lie or wild speculation based on some absurd conspiracy theory. 100% inheritance tax would bring the power and wealth of the Rothschild family to an end. Only an idiot would claim that they support us. The Rothschilds and Obama are indeed part of the privileged elite, and we are completely opposed to both of them – as anyone would know who had troubled themselves to read our many statements on the matter.

We never said that we were “ending money”: yet another blatant misrepresentation of what we wrote. We said we were ending inherited wealth through a 100% inheritance tax i.e. we are putting the dynastic elites out of business. If money can eventually be removed from the system, so much the better, but that forms no part of what we are presently proposing.

“What will we be giving up in the name of equal rights to money?”

Equal rights to money? This is planet earth we’re living on, you know. It’s no truth of either fact or reason that human beings have equal rights or access to money. The privileged elite have an enormous inbuilt advantage when it comes to wealth accumulation. That is a truth of fact. In a perfect communist country, there would be an equal right to money, but Tiger Hawk is clearly no communist, and nor are we.

“Equal rights for everything else? Equal right to be an individual?”

Note the hysterical “straw man” argument deployed here. An extreme position is deceitfully attributed to us and then attacked. Inheritance tax is in fact a guarantee of equal opportunities, hence is a measure that gives people better and more practical equal rights than they have ever enjoyed before.

Tiger Hawk wrote: “The transference of the bailout money from wealthy elite to wealthy elite by Obama wasn’t exhibiting behaviours of privileged elite running government?”

Of course it was! Who said it wasn’t? We explicitly said we were against government by privileged elites, and the bailout farce was exactly the sort of thing the elites get up to. Tiger Hawk seems to hold an extremely strange belief that left wing groups are NOT opposed to right wing privileged elites such as those of Wall Street and Washington D.C. The people with the breakdown in logic are the far right Americans who oppose the right wing rich elites and regard them as “socialist”. If they think Wall Street is full of socialists rather than ultra free-market capitalists, they have a serious problem with truths of fact. The far right and the right are just two different types of free-market capitalists – and the left are opposed to both.

In Western capitalist democracies, there are no left wing elites. There are no meaningful left wing parties remaining in the West.

“Why didn’t everyone get a bailout?”

Indeed! Wakey, wakey – we aren’t democrats, we’re meritocrats. Why don’t you blame the American dumbocratic electorate who are the idiots who vote the privileged elites (most frequently the right wing free-market capitalist Republican Party) into power?

Tiger Hawk wrote, “Why will the American people be sitting with no money while the elite that is controlling our money is absolutely untouched?”

Have we ever disagreed with such a statement? Why are you attributing positions to us that we don’t hold, and indeed which we have written endlessly about? You have obviously never read even the first page of the Armageddon Conspiracy website. What do you think the point of 100% inheritance tax is? Why don’t you try THINKING for once? You seem to be arguing with someone you think is defending the elites. We’re the last people on earth that defend them. The whole point of meritocracy is to get rid of them.

Tiger Hawk wrote: “Is using descriptive words like ‘insane’, ‘delusion’ a tactic you use in order to get people to cooperate with your words?”

We use them because they are accurate. All people who regard Bible stories as truths of fact are insane and delusional – that’s a fact. No one on earth can defend Bible stories except through “faith” – which is not something relied upon by a sane, rational person. The fact that many people believe in the Abrahamic God does not make the Bible true or Abrahamists sane. The same goes for conspiracy theorists.

“Almost like fear mongering of the Right Wingers, yet on a personal level. Insult their level of sanity and quickly you’ll get many to agree.”

Well, they'll only agree with us if they think we've made a cogent case. Otherwise, they will disagree with us. Do you have some problem with that concept? Maybe you're the victim of Abrahamic brainwashing yourself?

Tiger Hawk wrote, "How can you ever protect people from their own ideas?...That in itself is ludicrous."

The fallacy you have deployed here is that people choose their own ideas. What baby screams out that it wants to be taught Christianity or Islam or Judaism, or free-market capitalism? People's ideas are IMPOSED on them by the culture in which they are raised. They are brainwashed and programmed from childhood – exactly as you have been, judging by your arguments. Only rational, Logos thinkers can break out of brainwashing and social conditioning.

"First, at what cost will you go in order to "control ideas?"

Ideas are already controlled – by the prevailing privileged elite. We will implement entirely different ideas, based on those of the Enlightenment.

"How can this be accomplished, and who exactly gets to decide what 'good' and 'bad' ideas are?"

It can be accomplished meritocratically and the people who get to decide are the independent meritocrats (belonging to NO political parties) elected by the people.

"These are all things you have failed to mention".

Er, we've written two million words on the subject. Never thought of doing some research before opening your big, ill-informed mouth?

"Lastly, your arguments seem less credible with each insulting attack placed on Mr. Martin."

So, you think an argument is credible to the extent to which it is expressed "politely". Is a polite Christian ipso facto making factual and plausible statements? Hey, you wouldn't get far in philosophy class.

"Sure you disagree with him, but tearing someone else down is the only thing you can resort to in order to get your point across?"

Have you ever listened to Alex Jones, whose position he was endorsing? Grow up. What could be more offensive than the 911 conspiracy theory that refuses to blame the attack on the Muslim maniacs who unquestionably perpetrated it? And that is a truth of fact.

"I think a lot of the information on this website is not only convincing, but very valid."

Well, we wrote it, and we don't find you at all convincing. This isn't a vicars' Tea Party. This is life. This is the world. This is a war we're in – against the right wing privileged elite that you refuse to destroy via the weapon we have offered: 100 % inheritance tax. You bleat about them yet won't do anything to remove them. How pathetic. If people attack us, we will train our heavy artillery on them – and we're taking no prisoners. Since you don't like our tone, go elsewhere. We're not liberals, we're radicals. Capiche?

"Logic isn't so extreme."

Pardon? Aristotelian logic is black or white – and that's as extreme as it gets.

"I just wanted to prove counterpoints."

Well, you didn't. You deliberately misrepresented our position in order to attack us. Why should we be polite to someone so rude, ignorant and ill informed?

We want the smartest people in the world coming to us. We want radicals who know what's at stake. We don't want any right-wingers, conspiracy theorists, hippies, Abrahamists, liberals, "love and light" people, fans of Eckhart Tolle, or anyone who wants to waste our time with their whining little complaints. Do you think the privileged elite are "polite" when they trample the people into the ground with their obscene wealth?

We're getting sick of the number of clowns that come to our Facebook page seeking all

sorts of garbage that we're not offering.

We will soon be revealing the true nature of Illuminism. It is based on the hyper rationality of Leibniz – the greatest genius in human history. We want to bring the entire Logos population of the world together. We have no interest in those who are stuck with their sentimental and deluded Mythos nonsense. Haven't we made ourselves clear by now? If you don't like what we say, be rational and go somewhere else. If you're staying, be RATIONAL. We only respect people who can express coherent, rational opinions. Bring your "A" game, or go elsewhere.

The Illuminati are enlightened rationalists. We always have been. In fact, we are the ultimate exponents of the "analytic truths" of mathematics, upon which existence itself is based. Our enemies are irrational morons who have become so insane that they call us pan-dimensional, shape-shifting Reptilians from another world! That says a great deal about them and nothing about us.

We're going to start getting extremely ruthless about what appears on our page. If you don't have something clever to say, don't say it! Ours must become the smartest Facebook page on earth. We actively want stupid people to be intimidated by it and run a mile from it. If you find that objectionable, leave! It's much better for us to have a core of a few brilliant people coming to this page rather than hundreds of people who are more suited to the ravings of the ilk of Benjamin Fulford or Eckhart Tolle.

Truths of Reason versus Truths of Fact

"Leibniz was the first person to formulate explicitly and at length a doctrine which has played a centre-stage role in philosophy ever since, and continues to do so to this day. He argued that all true or false statements must be of one of two kinds. First, a statement may be true in the way a definition is true. If I say: 'All the bachelors in England are unmarried', there is no need for anyone to carry out a social survey to see whether that is true or not. It can be pronounced true without having to look at the facts of the matter at all, because it is *necessarily* true, by virtue of the meanings of the terms employed. But there is another kind of statement which can be pronounced true or false only after the facts have been established. If I say, 'There's a monkey in the next room' – well, there may be or there may not be, and the only way to find out is to go and have a look. So we have this extremely important distinction between statements whose truth or falsehood can be established by analysis of the statement itself, and which have therefore come to be known since Leibniz as 'analytic statements', and statements whose truth or falsehood can be established only by going beyond the statement and setting it against something outside itself. These have come to be known as 'synthetic statements'. . . . The point that this is Leibniz's contribution is especially worth driving home to an English-speaking world because, in our intellectual parochialness, we persistently attribute it to David Hume. The doctrine is indeed to be found in Hume, who probably worked it out on the basis of pointers from Locke, but the fact is that Leibniz said it half a century before Hume did, and said it more clearly, and said it several times." – Bryan Magee

"On the one hand there are truths of reason, things it would be an evident self-contradiction to deny, and so true in virtue of the principle of contradiction, that is to say on logical grounds alone. On the other hand there are truths of fact, statements which it is not a contradiction to deny and which thus report states of affairs that could possibly have been otherwise." – Anthony Quinton

John Locke spoke of "ideas of sensation" – the physical world as perceived, and "ideas of reflexion" – the operation of the mind upon the ideas of sensation; the "world of thought".

David Hume spoke of "impressions" and "ideas". Impressions correspond to Locke's

“ideas of sensation” (i.e. our perceptions of the physical world), while ideas are images of impressions, formed in thinking and reasoning. It follows that we can literally have no idea of anything of which we have received no impression. We cannot know anything we have not perceived. Hume famously pointed out that we do not perceive *causation*. We see sequences of events, but we do not see causes. If a moving ball strikes another ball and it moves, all we’re seeing are two balls in motion; we’re not seeing any phenomenon called “causation”. We assume that one ball caused the other to move, but that’s an interpretation of the facts. That’s an assumption, it’s not *knowledge*. According to Hume, we can never have any authentic knowledge of causation, hence we can never legitimately say that A causes B as a statement of knowledge. In other words, we don’t have real knowledge of the things we think we know. Much of our supposed knowledge is an illusion, grounded in habit and assumption.

Hume also spoke of “relations of ideas” and “matters of fact”, corresponding to Leibniz’s “truths of reason” and “truths of fact”, respectively.

Locke and Hume were main proponents of the school of empiricism, and were highly doubtful about the operations of pure reason and whether they had any connection with reality. Hume was a supreme skeptic; skepticism is a common fate of intelligent thinkers who abandon their confidence in reason.

The Kantian Mind

Kant split the mind into the usual two parts: a perceiving part and a thinking part. The perceiving part receives the impressions conveyed by the senses, and these impressions are called “particulars”. The thinking part is responsible for understanding, and objects of understanding are called “concepts”.

When a concept is applied to a particular, this is called a “synthetic judgment/proposition.”

Kant divides judgments into two types: analytic or synthetic. Analytic judgments are always *a priori* – i.e. independent of experience and available prior to experience. Synthetic judgments, according to Kant, can be either *a priori* or *a posteriori*. A synthetic *a posteriori* judgment is one whose truth or falsehood is determined by experience. A synthetic *a priori* judgment is one that contains information that, unlike an analytic *a priori* judgment is not true by definition, yet is independent of, and precedes, experience.

This was Kant’s ingenious but controversial means of solving the riddle of causation posed by Hume. Although thought true for a long time, it is now invariably regarded as false. There are NO SUCH THINGS as synthetic *a priori* judgments. There are only analytic *a priori* judgments (where experience is irrelevant) and synthetic *a posteriori* judgments (where experience is essential).

Kant considered that all scientific, mathematical and moral judgments were synthetic *a priori*. All mathematical judgements are in fact analytic, not synthetic.

As for science, all experimental observations involve synthetic *a posteriori* judgments. These are then “matched” to mathematical hypotheses (based, as before, on analytic *a priori* judgments), and continually refined via the “scientific method” (the scientific dialectic for arriving at more and more accurate theories). No synthetic *a priori* judgments come into it at all.

Kant, believed by many philosophers to be the greatest philosopher of all, solved the causality problem posed by Hume by creating an entirely fictitious category of “synthetic *a priori*” judgments. There are no such things.

As Leibniz and Hume both knew, there are only two categories of truth: those prior to experience (Platonic, we might say – *a priori*), and those dependent on experience (Aristotelian, we might say – *a posteriori*). All *a priori* statements are true by definition – they are strictly analytic. The question raised against such statements is whether they ever tell us anything practical about the world. Aren't they empty truths, belonging to some fantastical, disconnected Platonic domain?

Kant's ingenious manoeuvre was to link this Platonic domain of analytic *a priori* truths to the "real world" of synthetic *a posteriori* truths (empirical judgments) via the mind. He crammed into the mind all of the "wiring" necessary to link analytic and synthetic truths, and he did it by making the mind the "meat in the sandwich":

- 1) Platonic domain (analytic *a priori*).
- 2) Mind domain (synthetic *a priori*).
- 3) Aristotelian domain (synthetic *a posteriori*).

So, the mind, by whatever means (Kant offered no explanation), was configured to provide us with everything we needed to impose an orderly, organised structure on the world and thus make sense of it in a way that Hume seemed to have rendered impossible.

Even though Kant is wrong, there's no doubting the power and ingenuity of his ideas. But how, then, is Hume's objection correctly met? In fact, Leibniz had already provided the answer before Kant was born, and when Hume was just a toddler.

Kant's key mistake was in his conception of the mind. He thought of the mind as being some extraordinary entity lying between a Platonic domain of analytic truths on one side and the "real world" of synthetic truths on the other. He made no suggestion as to what the mind really is, where it came from and how it came to be possessed of the qualities he suggested, though the clear thrust of his thinking was that "God" had created minds in this way.

If mind wasn't in fact created by God, what then? Evolution would have been useful to Kant (this was before Darwin's time, of course, so evolution wasn't a prominent idea), but in fact it was Hegel who seized on the notion of the mind dialectically evolving to have the qualities it has.

However, if the mind is itself a Platonic object, and space and time are Platonic objects and they are all attuned to the Platonic domain, then there is no reason for mind, at core, to be anything other than analytic *a priori*.

Causality

So, what is the explanation of the statement, "Every event has a cause." According to Kant, this is a synthetic statement because, in his opinion, the predicate is not contained in its subject. (The predicate is that which is asserted or denied of the subject e.g. in the statement "Socrates is a man", "man" is the predicate and Socrates is the subject.) This is a controversial assertion. Imagine a hypothetical world in which all bachelors were *certain* to become married. An analytic definition of bachelor would therefore be: "A man who is not yet married." The definition contains a statement about the future: the bachelor will become married at a point in the future, hence will no longer be a bachelor (he will be a married man). So, the definition of bachelor contains a causal link to marriage. All unmarried men are caused to become married (in this system where all men marry). The event of marriage for a man is caused by his prior status of being a bachelor. The event is implicit in this analytic definition of bachelor. Are all effects implicitly contained in all analytic statements that have a dynamic (future-oriented) component?

We can define two types of analytic statement:

- 1) Those that are Platonic (eternal and immutable; being), and
- 2) Those that are dynamic (becoming).

The former contain no temporal aspect – they are eternal (outside time e.g. $1 + 1 = 2$). The latter are time-dependent: they evolve through time. The effect is implicit in the cause as part of its evolution. Think of the time evolution of a sine wave. No matter at what point we start, all of the ensuing points are ALREADY defined; their trajectory is contained in the analytic definition of sine wave. There's no need for any "synthetic" aspect of the type suggested by Kant.

Similarly, the first law of motion says that objects will move in a straight line at constant speed unless acted upon by a force. This provides an analytic definition (all straight lines can be analytically defined by the equation $y = mx + c$ where m is the gradient and c is where the line intercepts the y -axis).

All equations are analytic definitions since it is being said that what is on the left of the "equals" sign is defined by whatever is on the right of the "equals" signs. All of these equations are *a priori*. They are all eternally true, and they are all independent of experience. In fact, since equations can describe static or dynamic situations, we can, as far as mathematics goes, dispense with the option of defining both "being" and "becoming" types of analytic statements. We can imagine instead a Platonic domain in which an eternal, immutable analytic equation exists for every possible situation that could ever transpire in the physical world. In this way, the world becomes, objectively, all about analytic statements, and nothing besides.

Kant said that causality is *a priori* (independent of experience and, indeed, a precondition of experience). What we are doing, in effect, is replacing Kant's synthetic *a priori* statements with mathematical analytic *a priori* equations, which come with causality built into them, as in the case of the first law of motion where we know exactly what will happen in the future if no other forces comes into play (and if other forces do come into, we have the equations of Leibniz's calculus to deal with them).

A synthetic statement is, of necessity, *a posteriori*. It can never be *a priori*. Kant is simply wrong – because, unlike Leibniz, he was not a mathematical genius and couldn't understand mathematics in terms of analytic equations. All laws of motion are analytic *a priori* and have causality inbuilt because they describe what will inevitably happen next in the absence of any counter force or obstacle.

As Hume rightly said, causation cannot be perceived, but it can certainly be rationally, analytically known – via mathematical equations. When one ball strikes another, the second ball will move away according to whatever Platonic, analytic equation applies to the situation. The fact that causation can't be seen is neither here nor there: it is the unseen, unperceived laws of mathematics that are in control of the situation. This, in fact, is the absolute, unarguable triumph of rationalism over empiricism. Hume is without question wrong, and demonstrably so. Whether or not something is perceived has no bearing on the outcome of underlying objective, rational processes. It is reason, not perception, that counts.

Hume asserted that we can have no idea of anything of which we have received no impression i.e. what has not been perceived cannot be known. This is wholly false. We can have absolute knowledge of the analytic domain of mathematics, and all we need is reason. We don't need any senses or perceptions at all. The entire basis of Hume's philosophy is wrong. The school of empiricism has proved disastrous for the world, and has led to the bizarre form of modern science that slavishly worships experiments and observations over rigorous rational analysis. Reason, not the senses, is primary. The senses simply reveal aspects of the underlying mathematical, rational machinery of existence.

We know what is likely to happen in the future by applying equations, and our perceptions will simply confirm what we have already rationally predicted. Causation has nothing to do with lazy, habitual, sloppy thinking, as Hume claimed. It is hard wired into reality via mathematical equations. We never have any doubt about what will happen to a snooker ball if we

strike it with a cue ball. It's all in the mathematics, and the mathematics is analytic *a priori*.

Hume rightly said that the future does not yet exist so cannot be perceived, but it can be rationally predicted with an extremely high level of confidence, as science demonstrates. The future resembles the past because it is merely a continuation of the processes already in existence and unfolding according to definite mathematical laws (like the first law of motion).

The extraordinary thing about science is that although it is absolutely infected with the empiricist mind-set, its entire success is due to mathematical equations, which are the products of rationalism. Leibniz understood that science was a quintessentially rational undertaking, an application of mathematics; the tragedy is that science did not follow him and instead followed the British empiricist materialism exemplified by Isaac Newton and his followers. Newton's stellar reputation ensured that the rival approach – scientific rationalism grounded in metaphysics (championed by Leibniz) – fell into the shadows, where the Illuminati alone kept it alive.

It can never be sufficiently stressed how critical to intellectual development was the war of ideas between Leibniz and Newton. Newton was the apparent victor, while Leibniz was the true victor. Disastrously, the world followed Newton – which is why science will never deliver an authentic grand unified theory of everything.

Objective Mathematics versus Subjective Mathematics

Only two things happen in the world: objective mathematics and subjective mathematics. Objective mathematics involves nothing but analytic *a priori* statements. Every objective process that can possibly occur in the physical universe already exists as an *a priori* Platonic mathematical Form, independent of experience i.e. an equation is sure to exist that will describe whatever happens, and it can't happen if there's no equation for it. Objective mathematics is all about reason.

Subjective mathematics, on the other hand, is all about the senses. The senses are the means by which objective information is communicated to the subjective mind. The key thing about a subjective mind is that it can be an active generator of self-determined mathematical signals.

We can regard mathematical subjects as passive or active. When mathematical subjects are passive, they simply follow default mathematical behaviour (that we might call "inertial"). They behave like mechanisms, exactly as required by scientific materialism. When they are active, which can only happen on a meaningful basis when mathematical subjects are conscious, they can be agents of non-default behaviour. They can be creative and introduce startling new things into the world. They can be Gods.

Yet the reality is that even amongst conscious subjects, most behaviour is highly predictable. In human populations, the normal distribution curve applies to more or less everything. Most people are clustered around the middle, and there are outliers at the far ends of the distribution.

Even if quantum particles were behaving in a "minded" way, it would be impossible to detect since it would simply seem like "statistical" behaviour, according to the well-known mathematical laws of statistics. That's why it's so easy to see the universe as a mechanism rather than as an organism. Mathematics – so regular and organised, so law-based – has much more in common with machine behaviour than what we typically regard as "life". By default, a mathematical universe resembles a machine. Only the most creative and powerful subjects can break out of machine mode and do astounding, unexpected things.

Locke and Hume both thought that the workings of the mind began with sensory input

(“ideas of sensation” or “impressions”), upon which mental processes then acted (“ideas of reflection”). Kant spoke, more usefully, of a perceiving mind and a thinking mind.

Empiricism says that the thinking mind needs the input of the perceiving mind before it can come up with any reliable knowledge, and if left to its own devices can easily invent things and engage in fantasy. Hume asserted that, to be sure, we have connected “knowledge” of the world but in fact only fragments are based on authentic knowledge, and the rest is an illusory narrative we weave around the true parts, particularly in the case of causation, and also the “self” (Hume denied its existence). For Hume (a probable atheist; if he had any religion at all it was deistic and not theistic), theistic religion was perhaps the greatest illusion of all.

Where Hume argued for the primacy of the perceiving mind (the empiricist stance), Kant made the perceiving mind subordinate to the thinking mind. The structures of the thinking mind determined what could be perceived, rather than the perceiving mind determining what could be legitimately thought.

Kant was an improvement over Hume, but he wasn’t right either.

The reality is that existence is composed of mathematical minds (monads). Objective mathematics is the default behaviour that takes place in this universe of minds, and makes the universe seem machinelike, following inexorable and implacable mathematical laws. Subjective minds need a window onto this objective mathematical arena, and the senses provide that window. They relay mathematical data to the subjective mind, but they don’t do so in a “neutral” way. Because the sense organs are themselves part of the objective world (the sense organs are constructed from genetic information), they add their own processing information to the incoming data (and further processing takes place in linked parts of the physical brains, such as the visual and auditory cortexes), so what the subjective mind finally gets is not the raw external data itself, but highly processed information (like refined rather than raw sugar).

Subjective minds can never see “raw” reality; they can only ever see “processed” reality, but nevertheless they are reflecting a genuine objective reality, not some completely mind-invented reality as Kant proposed. Kant was right that we can never perceive true reality directly (it will always be mind-mediated), but he was wrong that true reality was radically different from our perception of it (the unknowable noumenal universe versus the phenomenal universe of mere appearance).

For Kant, true reality (“in itself”) was outside space and time, while apparent reality was inside space and time. This is false. There is certainly a noumenal reality outside space and time (inhabited by minds themselves since minds are dimensionless points), but there is also an objective universe produced by the energy contained in minds, and it is this objective universe that our senses are directed towards, not the noumenal universe (which they cannot detect at all since it’s not dimensional). Kant’s suggestion was that there are things (“in themselves”) outside space and time that our minds convert into things inside space and time in order to make sense of them: we convert noumena into phenomena. This, frankly, is absurd. Nothing outside space and time can be detected by things inside space and time.

Kant’s blunder was in regarding space and time not as real but as *a priori* intuitions that were independent of, and preceded, any sense impressions. Space and time are in fact objectively real, hence sense impressions are objectively real too (with the provisos we expressed earlier).

Space and time (dimensionality) are the keys to the objective physical universe, while the mental universe is dimensionless and subjective. The senses are the bridge between the objective and subjective universes, how the subjective universe acquires knowledge of the objective universe. On the basis of this sensory information it has acquired, the subjective mind can then take informed decisions and act causally (through its linked body) in the physical universe.

This means that there are two types of causality in the universe: the default causality of

the objective universe (scientific, mechanistic causality) and the causality generated by subjective agents, which is therefore initiated from outside space and time, but intrudes into space and time via our physical bodies. This type of causality is of course absolutely denied by scientific materialists, and by denying it, they thus deny the possibility of free will since free will *must* be external to the physical universe of inexorable scientific cause and effect. By locating free will in the subjective, dimensionless universe outside space and time, Illuminism saves free will; science, conversely, regards free will as the greatest illusion of all and denies any conceivable mechanism through which it can operate.

Just as the senses are the interface between the objective and subjective worlds, so is causality. Default causality is scientific causality, but subjective minds can also intrude into this scientific causality, most especially in the case of conscious beings such as humans. We are the agents of our own behaviour: we are not machine puppets, the helpless victims of external causes over which we have zero control. Mind is not an empty epiphenomenon. It is an active agent in the causal chain.

The Existential Chess Pieces

Using a chess analogy, Hume believed, in effect, that the chess players couldn't be sure of the existence of the board or the game or the rules or the other players or even themselves (!). For Hume, there was a total logical disconnect between what was observed (matters of fact) and what could be known with certainty thought about them (relations of ideas). The thinking mind imposed beliefs on the world that had no basis in anything that could be authentically known. Above all, the mind created cause and effect and understood everything in these terms, even though there was no way to logically connect observations to causes since causes are not things observed.

In short, Hume was utterly skeptical about the game and regarded it as somewhat farcical, full of fantasy and nonsense.

Kant's version of chess was that the players (via their minds) created the board, the game, and the rules. There is no discernible objective reality; everything is mere appearance (phenomenal). Take away the players, and there is no game. The players ARE the game. Chess, so to speak, is built into every mind (by God, by implication) so they all know how to play. They are all wearing "reality-glasses" configured for chess, and it's impossible for them to see or comprehend anything that is not to do with chess. In short, Kant claimed that the mind imposed the chess game on the universe, but that the universe "in itself" had nothing to do with chess.

This is mind-generated reality, disconnected from "true" reality, about which we can know nothing at all. We can have certain knowledge of the chess game at the expense of any knowledge of true reality.

Yet Leibniz had already provided the definitive answer. The chess pieces are monads (basic, *objective* mathematical units (dimensionless points) that are also basic *subjective* mathematical units (minds). The board is made of these basic units i.e. the players ARE the board. Therefore, if the rules of the game are built into the players, they are also automatically built into the board. Players and board are as one; they are not separate as in Hume and Kant. The board is objective because it is not created by any particular mind – it is common to ALL minds. With Kant, minds create the board; with Leibniz, minds *are* the board, and that establishes the critical difference between the two thinkers. Leibniz has an objective board; Kant does not. Leibniz has a direct link to noumenal reality (the minds themselves are noumenal reality); Kant can link only to phenomenal reality (what minds perceive).

Kant is left baffled by the noumenal domain and unable to account for it, explain it or have any knowledge at all about it. He can't relate it to minds. Leibniz on the other hand has total

knowledge of it: it is nothing but the monads (the minds themselves).

It's astonishing that Newton is a better-known scientist than Leibniz. It's equally astonishing that Kant is a better-known philosopher. Each time, Leibniz was right and his opponent wrong. Humanity has spurned its greatest genius of all. Why is that not surprising?

Millennia earlier, Plato had spoken of “intelligibles versus sensibles”, corresponding to Leibniz's truths of reason (intelligibles) and truths of fact (sensibles). Plato wrote, “Since the whole of philosophy is divided into the study of intelligibles and the study of things within the cosmos – and quite rightly so, as the cosmos too is twofold, the intelligible and the sensible – the *Parmenides* comprehends the study of the intelligibles and the *Timaeus* the study of things within the cosmos (sensibles). For the former teaches us all the divine orders and the latter all processions of things within the cosmos.”

Materialists are often associated with “realism” i.e. the notion that the material world is real. Plato was also a realist, but in an entirely different way. He asserted that the domain of perfect Forms was true reality, and the material world was an inferior, defective copy that served to hide or distort the truth.

Aristotle, Plato's greatest pupil, rejected the transcendent domain of Forms, and was essentially an advocate of materialistic realism. He was much more concerned with observations and reflections about the world than with contemplation of a supramundane domain accessible only to reason.

Leibniz was in the Platonic camp and Hume in the Aristotelian camp, and, indeed, everyone will find themselves in one camp or the other.

The essence of the conflict is whether reason is superior to the senses, whether reason or the senses reveal the truth of our world. Scientific materialists are empiricists who revere observation and distrust pure rational theory. But this is not the only possible approach to science. Leibniz was a brilliant scientist but of the scientific rationalist idealist kind.

So, contrary to appearances, two approaches to science are possible:

- 1) Scientific empiricist materialism, based on the primacy of experiments, observations, sensory data, truths of fact.
- 2) Scientific rationalist idealism, based on the assertion that existence cannot be anything other than rational, hence its secrets will be revealed through the exercise of the highest reason. Experiments and observations are invaluable for confirming rational deductions, but cannot be any substitute for truths of reason.

Truths of reason are the fundamental truths of existence. Truths of “fact” are often rationally overturned when new facts are revealed that contradict the previous truths of fact, hence these are not really definite facts at all; they are always provisional.

Nietzsche declared, “There are no facts, only interpretations.” This is absolutely correct. Truths of reason are necessarily true while truths of fact are contingent truths. A contingent truth of fact might be: “All swans are white.” Countless observations might confirm this, and make people more and more confident that it is true, yet the moment a black swan is observed, the truth of “fact” is shown to be false. All truths of fact are contingent, awaiting the arrival of the black swan, hence there is no basis here for establishing necessary truths about the world. Science is never anything other than an exercise in contingency. It is inherently incapable of delivering necessary truths. It doesn't even aspire to deliver them. It simply wants to present more and more facts about the world, linked together by “theories” in which scientists have more and more confidence, but which are never definitive. They may well be “factual”, but fact and truth are not the same thing, contrary to what many people believe.

The only absolute facts are those concerning truths of reason. Otherwise, facts are contingent, hence not absolutely true.

Are you looking for necessary, eternal, perfect truths or contingent truths that are one observation away from being falsified? Don't you want to base your life on certainty rather than contingency? Scientific materialism cannot, by its nature, offer a definitive account of reality. It can offer only a contingent picture in which people can legitimately place great confidence, but no absolute truths are ever offered, or ever can be.

Atheists are often scientific materialists, and they seem to be people who are not particularly interested in Truth with a capital "T", hence it's no surprise that they're not seduced by religion or rationalism, which are both preoccupied with absolute truth.

The whole approach of science, as practised by the scientific establishment, is opposed to rationalism. It refuses to acknowledge that there are rational, analytic truths of reality that are beyond the challenge of experiment. These cannot be experimentally verified, but they are nevertheless eternally true.

Even if science could somehow turn "M-theory" into a "Grand Unified Theory of Everything", it would be a misnomer. It would simply be a provisional theory, like all other such theories, that could be refuted at any time by any experimental data contrary to the theory. So, what's the point? Why not just call it "our best guess" theory? Doesn't have quite the same resonance, does it?

Quantum theory is the most successful and experimentally verified theory in history – yet no scientist on earth claims to be sure what it means! It won't be any different with M-theory. It won't satisfy anyone. It won't be regarded as a comprehensive answer to existence because, quite simply, science isn't in the business of final explanations and necessary truths. By its nature, it's always contingent and provisional.

Only scientific rationalism, not scientific empiricism, can provide the Absolute Truth. That's the whole point of the rationalist approach: to establish what is incontrovertibly, undeniably, incontestably, eternally true, of *necessity*. The universe is *not* contingent, relative, provisional. It's grounded in absolute rationality that any sufficiently rational mind can comprehend.

Illuminism is the true Grand Unified Theory of Everything that definitively explains everything once and for all. Illuminism is about the fundamental, analytic, necessary, rational truths of existence that cannot be contradicted, by definition. Illuminism has identified what the rational arche is – mathematics itself, NUMBERS. "All things are numbers," declared Pythagoras so long ago, but couldn't prove it. Now, his organisation – the Illuminati – *have* proved it.

There are two ways of looking at the world: rationally and empirically, or, as we might say, via reason or the senses. Reason is about OBJECTIVE reality. The senses are about SUBJECTIVE reality.

If we compare existence to a game of chess, the aim of Illuminism is to explain the board, the pieces, the rules and how and why the game originated in the first place.

The board is the spacetime Cartesian arena – a flawless domain of mathematical points. The pieces are numbers (energy waves), which can combine in all manner of ways. The rules are the laws of mathematics, which are built into every point in the board. The game arose in the first place because of the logic of existence versus non-existence, and dialectical, ontological logic. It was a NECESSARY game that could never be otherwise.

Illuminism is about looking down on the game and understanding the game once and for all. This is the view of objective reality. Illuminism does not make any claim to know what moves will be made. That's for the "players" to decide.

However, another view of the game is possible, the view of the players themselves. They

don't have a "bird's eye" view of the game. They're not even sure where they are, why they're in this game or what the rules are. Nevertheless, they are having to make moves. Their experience of the game is subjective, not objective. They are using their senses to gather data about the game, and then trying to make sense of the sensory data with their reason. But sensory data is subjective, not objective. It comes with feelings, fears, desire, Will. It has all sorts of inbuilt limitations. The senses can easily deceive – most especially in optical illusions and systematic internal biases. Different moves in the game can reveal different things about the game, so although a "big picture" of the game eventually develops, there's no certainty that the last word has been said about the game. The game's final nature can never be addressed using this sensory, subjective route.

Scientific rationalism gives us the objective, infallible view of the game. Scientific materialism gives us the player's limited view of the game, full of wrong moves, errors, illusions, speculations, hypotheses, theories, ever-changing evidence, contradictions, interpretations and so on. There is never any END with this approach. There is simply a process of ever more plausible theories that never reaches a limit.

So, what route will YOU follow – scientific rationalism or scientific empiricism? The Illuminati have always followed the rationalist path and found it to be the best possible path – because it's the path of mathematics, the language of existence itself.

It was the British contingent of Hobbes, Locke, Hume and, especially, Newton, who dragged the world into the dead zone of scientific empirical materialism.

To be saved, the world needs to turn instead to the German contingent of Kant, Schopenhauer, Hegel, and, above all, the luminous genius Leibniz. Their vision of scientific rationalist idealism is the only route through which science can be reconciled with philosophy (metaphysics), religion and psychology.

But another group, usually completely ignored, deserves the highest possible praise – the mathematicians!

We will name the following mathematicians as the greatest of the modern era (before the twentieth century):

René Descartes (Touraine; France).

Gottfried Leibniz (Leipzig; Germany).

Carl Friedrich Gauss (Brunswick; Germany).

Leonhard Euler (German-speaking Basel; Switzerland).

Joseph Fourier (Auxerre; France).

Bernhard Riemann (Göttingen; Germany).

Georg Cantor (Halle; Germany).

These were the group of heroes who did the most to fulfil the original vision of Pythagoras, supplemented by Plato. We salute all of these wondrous geniuses.

Contingent: dependent on conditions or events not yet established; conditional; accidental; a factor or attribute that is not essential; neither necessarily true nor necessarily false.

Necessity: an essential requirement; something that must inevitably exist or occur; the state or fact of being indispensable or unavoidable.

The Multiverse

The Multiverse is a scientific hypothesis concerning an infinity of universes. In fact, Leibniz's Monadology was the first Multiverse because it consisted of infinite monads, each of which was its own universe. The big difference, of course, is that each Leibnizian universe

reflected a single collective universe. Each monad had a unique perspective of the same universe. No other monad could have that perspective. So, a monad was both its own universe and part of the same universe as all other monads. Leibniz's is the ultimate quantum universe.

The Two Most Important Things

Remember, Illuminism is all about Pythagoras's astounding observation that all things are numbers. The most important number is zero. Objectively, zero is simply a dimensionless mathematical point. Subjectively, it is none other than the basic unit of life and mind – a monad, a soul. Mathematically, each monad contains infinity (i.e. all possible numbers, both real and imaginary, positive and negative), of such a nature that all the different components of infinity, positive and negative, cancel to zero. So, from one angle, a monad appears to contain nothing, yet from another it is infinitely full of things. That's its supreme paradox, which can only be comprehended rationally and mathematically and can never be subject to experimental verification. You will never get something like a Large Hadron Collider to provide scientific "proof" of this.

So, the nature of the monad is the first critical thing to grasp about Illuminism. The second is that numbers, ontologically, exist as energy frequencies. Each monad contains every possible type of basis energy sinusoidal wave, each one having a unique frequency i.e. unique number. As soon as you grasp that energy is simply number, you will have no difficulty understanding why Pythagoras is right that all things are numbers. No one would have blinked with surprise if he had said, "The universe contains nothing but energy."

The universe contains infinite zeros, each containing infinity that cancels to zero. The universe from one view is eternally nothing – everything objectively cancels to zero (this is the mental domain of zero and "cancellable" infinity); and from another view it is the interaction of infinite numbers (energy waves) between zero and infinity. The two views exist together without contradiction. They are two sides of the same coin: noumenon and phenomenon, intelligible and sensible.

You *know* that we are right – because this is the most rational, beautiful, perfect universe there could possibly be: "The best of all possible worlds", to use Leibniz's immortal description.

The Objective versus Subjective Universe

It's crucial to understand that the universe, objectively, contains no colours, no sights, no sounds, no tastes, no smells, no touch, no sensations and no feelings. If we could somehow "see" the universe objectively, well, we wouldn't see anything at all (!). The universe is an infinitely large mathematical equation – an ontological equation, a living equation.

In some ways, the objective universe resembles the workings of a computer. Look at the spectacular output of a video game console and then consider what's going on behind the scenes – endless boring calculations and machine operations that no one cares about and are never "seen" or perceived in any way.

We only ever perceive the "output"; we never see the machinery in action. We watch TV shows without knowing anything that goes on inside in a TV. It's always that way. We can rationally work out how a TV functions – indeed, it was rational minds that created the TV in the first place – but the average person knows NOTHING about any of that and simply watches the show. Therefore, it is with the ultimate TV – the universe itself. Philosophers, scientists and mathematicians work out how it operates, but everyone else couldn't care less. The Abrahamists say, "God made it", and give it no further thought. The Karmists make mystical pronouncements then give it no further thought. They all just get on with interacting with the output – with the show that the universe pumps out 24/7. They themselves are in the show, of course. In fact,

they're the 24/7 star of their own part of the show.

So, the universe behind the scenes is just an invisible equation – infinitely large with infinitely many variables – seeking to optimise itself. THAT is the purpose of existence: to reach its optimal solution. God and heaven are what the universe produces right at the end of its ultimate cosmic calculation. The universe creates God: God does not create the universe. God is the solution to the cosmic equation.

Douglas Adams famously said that “42” was the ultimate answer to “Life, the Universe and Everything”. A super computer called “Deep Thought” gave that answer after many eons pondering the matter.

Adams was not too far wrong. The universe itself is the ultimate computer and, after pondering the question for an Age, its final answer is, “I am the meaning of life, the universe and everything. For I am God.”

Meaning is invested in two related things: an aim, and the process to achieve the aim. That there is an aim at all immediately indicates the operation of teleology, something that is utterly denied by scientific materialists. They assign no meaning or aim to existence. Existence is all process and no purpose. In teleology, the goal is all that matters. The universe is consumed with that goal, and all processes are dedicated to it.

Meaning becomes associated with this great quest for ... meaning! Meaning itself is the meaning of the universe – what could be more logical? In order to determine meaning, it's essential to know everything, to understand the precise nature of existence. Only the Mind of God can understand everything, so the universe – every part of it – yearns to become God. God is the aim of the universe because God alone can determine absolute meaning. The Will to Power culminates in having absolute power i.e. in being God. God is the terminus of all dialectical strands.

The universe is dialectically converging on God. God – the perfection of the universe – is what the universe strives for. God is all power, all knowledge and all meaning. God IS meaning. That's why religion is so much more powerful than science in terms of the human imagination. Science denies God and denies meaning. It's literally pointless. How could that satisfy anyone? In fact, meaninglessness is not endured by anyone, including scientists. Science makes itself meaning i.e. it replaces God. For the scientist, science is meaning even if it has no ultimate meaning. Understanding as much as possible about the world is what drives the scientist, even if it's to finally arrive at the conclusion that the universe is mere process devoid of meaning. For them, the journey is what matters and not the destination (the object of teleology). For the religiously minded, the destination (the Holy Grail itself) is what matters and if the Grail is not discovered then life has been a failure.

Science has no Grail other than the Grand Unified Theory of Everything, which in fact is simply a best estimate of a “final” scientific theory, but is inherently provisional and doesn't provide any real answer to Life, the Universe and Everything. They might as well have said, “42”.

For scientists, 42 is as good an answer as any to the meaning of life. For Abrahamists, the meaning of life is invested in the belief that their God exists. For Karmists, the meaning of life resides in attaining some mystical union with the universe. For the Illuminati, the meaning of life resides in becoming God and thus knowing everything and having all power.

For everyone other than atheists, meaning revolves around God. The Abrahamists want to worship God, the Karmists want to enter into union with God, and the Illuminati want to become God. So, what's your choice?

In Illuminism, most especially Hegelian Illuminism, the purpose of the universe is to attain absolute, conscious knowledge of itself – to know itself for exactly what it is. Only the

mind of God has the capacity to comprehend the universe in its entirety. If each of us can become God, we ourselves will have that capacity.

We are all part of the unfolding cosmic calculation – the “Divine Calculation” – and we ourselves have the potential to be divine. This book itself is a portal to the divine plan, and anyone who reads and understands it is well on their way to becoming God.

So, objectively, the universe is a gargantuan equation, the biggest there can possibly be – the equation that defines Totality.

Subjectively, the universe is quite different. It is full of colours, sights, sounds, smells, tastes, desires, feelings – a kaleidoscope of sensual information and emotional responses. Each subject gets its own personal glimpse of the universe from its own unique point of view. It has no idea that it is just one node in an equation vast beyond the imagining.

The interface between the subjective universe and the objective universe are bodies with eyes, ears, noses, mouths, skin. Bodies are machines for turning objective mathematical signals into a form which can be experienced by a subjective mind. Sensory information is NOT objective information. It is objective information plus a manipulation performed on that objective information by a body (via its sense organs and brain), which turns it into a new type of information which is then experienced by a subjective mind.

Remove bodies from the universe, and you remove all sensory information. When TV documentaries show a “reconstruction” of the Big Bang, they invariably present a fireball – an immense sensory spectacle. Of course, this is 100% false. There were no bodily subjects at the time of the Big Bang, hence no sense organs, hence no sensory information whatever. Nothing was seen, heard, smelt, tasted or felt for the simple reason that there were no sensing bodies present to process any data. The Big Bang was an entirely invisible operation, happening in an invisible universe completely devoid of any sensory data. Sure, all sorts of signals were being generated that, had sensing bodies been around, would have been converted into a sensory extravaganza. But there were no bodies, hence no senses, hence no actual sensory data. Sensory data is the OUTPUT of sense organs and brains processing objective data. When sense organs and brains are absent, so is sensory information. Objective signals are not themselves sensory: they BECOME sensory after appropriate processing.

Falling trees make no sound at all if they fall and no observer is present. Falling trees generate signals that *could* be converted into sounds if ears and brains were present. If they’re not, no sound is made. It’s an ancient conundrum, and it’s also one of the most profound.

When a subject “becomes God”, the whole universe becomes its body and it senses EVERYTHING. It does not have its own personal body any more. You know you are God when you do not have a localised body, but physical existence itself is your body.

Scientific materialism is a subject that, if understood properly, rejects the whole concept of subjectivity. Subjectivity goes hand in hand with mind, free will, dimensionless existence and the numbers zero and infinity – ALL of which are denied by scientific materialists.

Scientific materialism is incapable of telling us anything at all about life as a mental phenomenon because it doesn’t actually believe in it. It has no model for it, no vocabulary for it, no tools for investigating it.

Regarding morality, Nietzsche declared, “There are no moral phenomena whatever; only moral interpretations of phenomena.” In other words, all “moral” judgments are invariably synthetic *a posteriori*, and aren’t actually moral at all. There is no pre-existing moral code; no

cosmic book of morality and commandments. Absolute morality simply does not exist. It's always relative. Morals are just social conventions, constantly changing depending on the fashions and attitudes of the time. Morality never transcends its time. Christians routinely do things today that would, in the Christian mind of 500 years ago, have warranted eternal damnation. Either the Christians of 500 years ago were completely wrong, or those today are completely wrong. How do we decide? Well, as Nietzsche said, it will be an opinion, an interpretation, we offer – not anything eternally certain and unarguable.

In Illuminism, all minds are mathematical objects (monads) and are part of the Cartesian arena in which physical reality unfolds (a perfect Cartesian grid is the inevitable consequence of an infinity of monads (points) having unique existential coordinates). In Kantian terms, minds are noumena, which come equipped with all of the analytic *a priori* truths of mathematics. Moreover, the Cartesian arena of space and time, itself composed of monads, also, therefore, has all of the analytic *a priori* truths of mathematics inbuilt. What enters this Cartesian arena of space and time are the real and imaginary numbers (energy waves) contained within monads. (Each monad contains infinite positive real numbers, infinite negative numbers, infinite positive imaginary numbers and infinite negative numbers, all of which cancel to zero i.e. a monad can contain infinity energy and mathematical capacity and still remain “zero”.) These numbers are mathematical objects and are ipso facto absolutely consistent with all of the laws of mathematics encoded in the arena in which they find themselves. So, everything in this system automatically “knows” the eternal laws of mathematics. There is nothing non-mathematical in this system. All noumena and phenomena are just mathematical entities. In terms of the chess analogy, every piece, and the board too, has the laws of the game encoded in it. None of the pieces consciously knows it, of course.

In this system, the laws of mathematics are encoded in everything – because all things are mathematical objects (numbers) – and those laws are all analytic *a priori*. All of the laws and rules exist PRIOR to experience and completely dictate the nature of experience and what it is possible to experience. They are the necessary preconditions of experience. In other words, rationalism comes first and empiricism is secondary; mathematics comes first and science is secondary; idealism comes first and materialism is secondary.

Conscious minds typically seek to attain knowledge of their environment through synthetic *a posteriori* judgments i.e. observing what's around them, experiencing it and forming appropriate inferences. In the case of mainstream religions, synthetic *a posteriori* judgments are fitted into a Mythos landscape designed to make sense of such judgments according to a divine plan, divine text, or divine being. The Mythos itself is the important thing, and it does not place any importance on synthetic *a posteriori* judgments if they contradict the Mythos (for example, the discovery of ancient dinosaur fossils is not permitted to contradict the Book of Genesis).

In the case of science, scientists seek to meld synthetic *a posteriori* judgments with analytic *a priori* mathematical hypotheses. Science is thus a combination of the analytic *a priori* and the synthetic *a posteriori*, and has proved highly successful.

However, what is needed is an all-embracing mathematical approach to science rather than a piecemeal approach designed to fit hypotheses and observations, which keep changing as new observations contradict old hypotheses.

The only way to end scientific provisionalism is to accept mathematics itself as reality, and thus all experimental observations are simply reflecting aspects of a mathematical rather than scientific reality.

The difference between Illuminism and science is that Illuminism makes mathematics the

eternally true, immutable, grand unified, Pythagorean-Platonic theory of everything, and regards all experiments as revealing aspects of this mathematical reality. Science on the other hand seeks to work from experimental observations and to make the mathematics fit them via provisional hypotheses which are continually being refined.

Since no experiment can reveal unobservables (noumena) then the scientific approach *automatically* obeys a materialist and empiricist ideology and rules out idealism and strict rationalism.

Rationalism does not accept the primacy of experimental observations and instead embraces idealism and the existence of unobservable rational noumena.

Scientific empiricist materialism asserts the primacy of synthetic *a posteriori* observations, so rules out any mathematical entities (such as ontological zero) deemed unobservable, hence non-existent (because materialism asserts that only the observable exists: absence of evidence is evidence of absence).

Scientific rationalist idealism asserts the primacy of analytic *a priori* judgements, so embraces the WHOLE of mathematics, including all formally unobservable mathematical objects.

Scientific empiricist materialism can never be mathematically complete. It regards mathematics as merely a subset of science, hence it can *never* arrive at a Pythagorean-Platonic absolute theory. It will *always* be provisional. It's all about contingency.

Scientific rationalist idealism, on the other hand, is mathematically complete. It regards science as a subset of mathematics and yields a Pythagorean-Platonic absolute theory of existence that is *necessarily* true and eternal. To be a scientific rationalist idealist you simply need to accept that mathematical analytic *a priori* statements are true whether they have scientifically observable consequences. They are not refuted by lack of experimental evidence for them, and they are in any case outwith the scope of any materialistic experiment.

There's your crystal clear choice. What's it to be?

A Triangle

Why do the internal angles of a triangle necessarily add up to one hundred and eight degrees, the same number associated with a straight line? Take any straight line, and split it into three parts of the same or varying lengths. Fit the three pieces together to form an enclosed shape. You have just created a triangle and, of course, since you made it from a straight line, it will have internal angles adding up to one hundred degrees. A triangle is just a straight line broken into three and made into an enclosed shape. Squares and rectangles (two triangles fitted together) are just two lines, each broken into two equal parts and brought together, thus creating internal angles of two times one hundred and eight degrees (equals three hundred and sixty degrees). A circle of three hundred and sixty degrees can be fitted inside a square of three hundred and sixty degrees, and a square inside a circle. A straight line with a point at infinity can be mapped exactly to a circle. A plane with a point at infinity can be mapped exactly to a sphere. Pi is an infinitely long number. Pi is somehow encapsulating the "point at infinity" that turns a straight line into a circle.

Aren't all of these facts simply incredible? Mathematics produces endless fascinating patterns that humanity has barely begun to unravel. There are countless wondrous mathematical discoveries lying ahead of us.

The Subjective Mind and the Objective Mind

A monad is a mind, a soul, but it is also a mathematical, dimensionless point, containing an infinity of numbers, both positive and negative, and cancelling to zero. The fact that all possible numbers are contained within a monad has a remarkable corollary. It means that the

entire laws of mathematics are encoded in EVERY monad. All monads inherently carry around the laws of mathematics with them. They're inbuilt.

Subjectively, a monad mind is driven by will, desire and emotion. That is the essence of the subjective mind. Note that it is not rational or logical. It is a kind of existential striving, a primal lust to obtain pleasure and avoid pain. Above all, it is a Will to Power (as Nietzsche asserted) because the more power you have the more pleasure you can obtain and the more pain you can avoid. Everyone craves more and more: it is our fundamental desire. When power is increasing, we feel good and confident about ourselves. When power is decreasing, we feel bad, negative and depressed.

In human society, power has become reified (turned into physical form) in the shape of money. The rich are powerful; the poor are powerless. The rich are active and in charge of their own lives. The poor are passive and have to endure whatever shit the rich impose on them. The poor have no control over their lives hence are perennially depressed. The painting *The Scream* by Munch sums up their lives.

So, the subjective mind is consumed with the pursuit of power. Because all subjective minds reflect the same craving, they might be said to constitute a cosmic Will to Power. Each of us individually seeks to maximise our power, and the universe seeks to maximise its. The Will to Power is the essence of BECOMING, and is the driver of the Hegelian dialectic. Power is inherently about a contest, about the great cosmic strife of which Heraclitus spoke. We are all attempting to increase our power and that frequently means crushing someone else and rendering them powerless. We are all trying to steal power from others in order to enhance our own. Very few people realise that cooperation is the best means to enhance our power. Science is so successful because the scientific community cooperates. Religion, politics and economics don't work because they are about vicious competition and absence of cooperation. They are dog eat dog, law of the jungle systems, built on inequality, fanaticism, self-interest, selfishness, intolerance, hate, persecution of the "other", and so on.

There are two ways the Will to Power can unfold: 1) via the master-slave dialectic where we are all involved in countless master-slave relationships with others. Rich people are always the masters and the poor are always the slaves. However, if a poor person holds a gun to a rich man's head, the roles are reversed. All roles can be reversed by strong people willing to take their chances.

Our world reflects almost nothing but master-slave systems, beliefs and institutions. Abrahamists seek to compensate for their own lack of power by allying themselves with the supreme power – God. They believe that if they enslave themselves to him then he will offer them ultimate protection. (In effect, the Abrahamic God is engaged in the supreme protection racket; he's the Mafia God, making an offer no one can refuse.) Abrahamists are natural-born slaves, looking for the strongest master.

The master-slave dialectic eventually resolves itself, in Hegel's opinion, with the demise of both the masters and the slaves. Everyone reaches a condition of mutual self-respect and respect for others. Marx believed that communism was the political system that delivered this perfect world without masters or slaves. He asserted that communism was dialectically inevitable; its success was guaranteed.

Yet communism failed, and in fact there is no evidence at all that the master-slave world is vanishing. It takes on new guises, but the same old patterns are just beneath the surface. Much of the world uses the rhetoric of equality while at the same time maintaining rigid and ferocious hierarchies. The "Old World Order" are the masters of the master-slave dialectic and they are obsessed with permanent dynastic power, passed down their bloodline.

The alternative to the hierarchical master-slave dialectic is the *primus inter pares* (first

amongst equals) Round Table dialectic. What this means is that everyone is imagined to be seated at a round table – as equals. Yet in every endeavour, some will be better than the others. In whatever activity is the focus of the Round Table at any one time, the group best suited for the task becomes the “first amongst equals” – the most meritocratic in that field. In other fields, they will not be the most meritocratic, and they will take a back seat and others will become the first amongst equals.

In this way, we can have a society based on the principle of equality but recognising that we are not all equally talented, and that it is best for everyone if the first amongst equals assume their rightful positions as the head of their area of expertise. This is the meritocratic worldview. Communism declared everyone equal regardless of their merits, and that’s why it failed.

We must be as attuned to inequality as we are to equality if we are to have the best of all worlds.

In capitalist democracy, lip service is paid to equality while, in practice, rigid hierarchies based on wealth, class, background, culture, sex, age (too young or too old), sexuality, race and so on are everywhere.

In a perfect communist state, equality is enforced, even when it’s counterproductive and inappropriate.

Meritocracy is not about equality per se, but about equality of opportunity, leading to *inequality* of outcomes. Everyone at the round table is given the same chance, but some will be more talented and harder working and they will be the ones who prosper most. Nevertheless, they will never form rigid hierarchies. Nothing that ventures too far into master-slave territory will be tolerated. Excesses of power, money or influence will always be prevented.

The Anchor

The Objective Mind is NOT about “becoming”. It is about “being”. The Objective Mind reflects the eternal, immutable, analytic, mathematical Platonic Forms. It is our ultimate anchor in the violent storm of becoming.

The Objective Mind is the Collective Mind of the Universe, and it consists of the laws of mathematics and mathematical logic, and they are built into every single monad.

The more that a subjective mind aligns itself with the Objective Mind, the more objective it becomes itself, and the more it becomes capable of understanding the true mathematical nature of existence.

The subjective mind evolves from irrational will to rational will, from an emotional Mythos view of reality (based on stories, legends, myths, parables, revelations, holy texts, propaganda, fiction, drama, theatre, and so on) to a Logos view (based on reason, logic, mathematics, philosophy, science, academia).

It’s astoundingly easy to tell whether someone is Mythos or Logos oriented. If they have almost no books in their house, they are Mythos people. If they have lots of *fiction* books, they are Mythos people. If they have lots of books about science, philosophy, mathematics, history, psychology, technology, artificial intelligence and so on, they are Logos thinkers.

Evolution is about the gradual conversion of primitive animal minds, to Mythos minds, and finally to Logos minds. Mythos minds have a predisposition towards empiricism and the senses; Logos minds towards rationalism, metaphysics and mathematics.

Science is an odd subject because its reverence for empiricism and the senses over rationalism and metaphysics makes it partly a Mythos, faith-based undertaking that deliberately cuts itself off from rational certainty. It places experimental provisionalism over the eternal, immutable laws of mathematics and logic. Yet, it also grounds itself in mathematics, the ultimate Platonic, rational subject. It’s thanks to mathematics that science is successful, not thanks to

experiments. If scientists were smart enough, they could work out the whole of science mathematically, without any resort at all to experiments. Experiments should be seen as a means of corroborating rational considerations, not determining them.

God is someone who has an absolutely conscious objective mind i.e. God consciously knows all of mathematics in every detail. God is driven by rational will (Intellect), not irrational will. His mirror image in this regard – Satan – is driven by irrational will, not rational will. One need only read the Abrahamic holy texts to see that they are all about the irrational will of God, and they contain no expression of rationality whatsoever. You would have no idea that subjects such as mathematics, science or philosophy even existed if you read the Abrahamic texts alone. You would not know or learn anything about reason or logic, but you would know everything about irrationality, will and the master-slave dialectic.

Satan is a “God” who failed to evolve in rational terms (intellectually). He is extremely powerful in terms of will, but not in terms of reason. All Mythos people are natural Satanists, and all Logos people are drawn to a rational God (a deist rather than theist God).

Deist conceptions of God are intellectual; theistic conceptions of God are wilful. Deist conceptions of God are about Logos and theistic conceptions of God are about Mythos.

The Aristotelian Soul

Wherever there is life there is soul. Aristotle spoke of a hierarchy of souls beginning with the lowest – the souls of plants – and moving up to the highest – human souls. Plant souls are preoccupied with eating and digesting food, with bodily growth and reproduction. Animal souls receive and respond to sense impressions. A human soul has, in addition to plant and animal soul components, the power to think. Just as the animal soul perceives objects in the world, the reasoning mind perceives intellectual concepts.

Aristotle introduced a fascinating distinction between passive (uncreative) and active (creative) reason. Passive reason is something akin to a jumble of concepts and ideas (the mental equivalent of unshaped matter), which needs to be acted upon by active reason to turn it into something useful. (Most people in the world have passive reason – they don’t do much in rational terms because they lack active, creative reason.) Aristotle asserted that creative reason existed prior to the human body or soul i.e. the implication is that it belongs to God or Nature and is eternal.

According to Aristotle, all parts of the human soul die with the body except for the creative reason component, which pre-existed the soul. This is the “divine spark” in humanity. To deploy creative reason is to partake of God’s nature, and the less you exercise reason, the less Godly you are. The divine spark attaches itself to the human soul, but is not an intrinsic part of it, and hence survives death. This doctrine proved highly influential with the Stoics.

With Aristotle, we see an interesting concept of a bifurcated soul in which one part is mortal and another immortal (and actually belonging to God rather than the person: it was as if God lent his reason to selected souls.) The only part of a human soul that has an afterlife is the part that came from God, and it simply returns to God.

Isn’t it time the message went out loud and clear: to be rational is to be Godly, and to be irrational is to be a beast!

Nietzsche

Nietzsche had many perceptive things to say about “natural philosophy” (physics). He rightly saw it as an ingenious description of reality, but not an explanation. He wrote:

“It is perhaps just dawning on five or six minds that natural philosophy is only a world-exposition and world-arrangement (according to us, if I may say so!) and *not* a

world-explanation; but in so far as it is based on belief in the senses, it is regarded as more, and for a long time to come must be regarded as more--namely, as an explanation. It has eyes and fingers of its own, it has ocular evidence and palpableness of its own: this operates fascinatingly, persuasively, and *convincingly* upon an age with fundamentally plebeian tastes--in fact, it follows instinctively the canon of truth of eternal popular sensualism. What is clear, what is 'explained'? Only that which can be seen and felt--one must pursue every problem thus far. Obversely, however, the charm of the Platonic mode of thought, which was an *aristocratic* mode, consisted precisely in *resistance* to obvious sense-evidence--perhaps among men who enjoyed even stronger and more fastidious senses than our contemporaries, but who knew how to find a higher triumph in remaining masters of them: and this by means of pale, cold, grey conceptional networks which they threw over the motley whirl of the senses--the mob of the senses, as Plato said. In this overcoming of the world, and interpreting of the world in the manner of Plato, there was an *enjoyment* different from that which the physicists of today offer us--and likewise the Darwinists and anti-teleologists among the physiological workers, with their principle of the 'smallest possible effort', and the greatest possible blunder. 'Where there is nothing more to see or to grasp, there is also nothing more for men to do'--that is certainly an imperative different from the Platonic one, but it may notwithstanding be the right imperative for a hardy, laborious race of machinists and bridge-builders of the future, who have nothing but *rough* work to perform." -- Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil*

Fascinatingly, Nietzsche considers over regard for the senses as "plebeian" while Plato's disregard for them is "patrician" (aristocratic). We agree with Nietzsche. There is something staggeringly vulgar and infantile about the worship of sensory data. Scientists have clambered into the gutters along with all the others who can't think; those who worship the senses, and the "evidence of their own eyes".

"What is clear, what is 'explained'? Only that which can be seen and felt." -- Nietzsche

This is the key to "stupid" thinking. This is the key to science and common sense, to the thinking of the man in the street. Everything is about what can be seen and felt. This is the crux of the materialist ideology.

Nietzsche regarded Plato as a noble thinker, mastering the uncouth sensual tendencies of the masses. It's time for science to get back on the Platonic track and escape the plebeian doctrine of sensualism.

All higher thinkers can transcend the draw of the "obvious". The real truths are *always* hidden. Secret societies are all about reaching this hidden layer that will never be available to common eyes and common ears.

It's sad that scientists have thrown in their lot with the vulgar masses. Their demands for sensory evidence rather than rational proofs have damned them as second-rate minds. Only rational truths are absolute and incontestable. If you haven't understood that, you haven't understood anything.

To paraphrase Nietzsche, you have committed the greatest possible blunder with the smallest possible effort.

Nietzsche, forever the contrarian and critic, was no fan of idealism either. He delivered a brilliant hammer blow to Kantian idealism in just a few sentences:

"To study physiology with a clear conscience, one must insist on the fact that the sense-organs are not phenomena in the sense of the idealistic philosophy; as such they certainly could not be causes! Sensualism, therefore, at least as regulative hypothesis, if not as heuristic principle. What? And others say even that the external world is the work of our organs? But then

our body, as a part of this external world, would be the work of our organs! But then our organs themselves would be the work of our organs! It seems to me that this is a complete *reductio ad absurdum*, if the conception *causa sui* is something fundamentally absurd. Consequently, the external world is *not* the work of our organs--?" – Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil*

In Kant's philosophy, the mind creates the physical (phenomenal) universe, but in practice that means that the senses must be the mind's instruments for producing the external world since they yield all of our perceptions of it. Yet our sense organs are physical, not mental. Nietzsche, unlike the Kantians, saw the problem. Our sense organs create our bodies but that means that they also create our sense organs since those are part of our bodies. But how can they create themselves?

In fact, certain types of idealism have a major problem. If we inhabit a purely mental world, why do we have bodies at all? Why do we have eyes and ears, noses, tongues and hands? Why don't we have spectral bodies without sense organs? Why don't we just "float" through some beautiful aethereal environment? There are many ways we could arrange a mental world that would be a lot better than the one we have.

Cuttingly, Nietzsche wrote, "Kant asked himself: how are synthetic judgments *a priori* possible? – and what, really, did he answer? *By means of a faculty*: but unfortunately not in a few words, but so circumspectly, venerably, and with such an expenditure of German profundity and flourishes that the comical *niaiserie allemande* involved in such an answer was overlooked. People even lost their heads altogether on account of this new faculty, and the rejoicing reached its climax when Kant went on further to discover a moral faculty in man."

If people asked what makes a sleeping potion work and someone gave the answer, "Aha, its sleep inducing properties", they would be laughed at. Yet Kant essentially said that we can make synthetic *a priori* judgments because of our faculty for making synthetic *a priori* judgments, and we can make moral judgments because of our faculty for making moral judgments. He completely failed to account for where these faculties originated and how they came about – so, like the scientists, he described but did not explain.

Most "explanations" are nothing of the kind. They are elaborate descriptions framed in befuddling language that bamboozle the unwary. Nietzsche was a master at seeing through bullshit, especially moralistic bullshit.

Illuminism is a form of idealism insofar as mind is primary, but it also establishes a strictly objective mathematical world with which minds have to conform rather than create.

As for synthetic *a priori* judgments, Kant invented these for the sake of "explaining away" cause and effect. Leibniz, one of the greatest logicians of all time, had no need of such judgments. Synthetic *a priori* judgments have no logical basis. It is never properly appreciated that they turn science and mathematics into categories of the mind rather than objective truths that apply to an objective world that exists outside a subjective mind.

Nietzsche on Falsifiability

"It is certainly not the least charm of a theory that it is refutable; it is precisely thereby that it attracts the more subtle minds. It seems that the hundred-times-refuted theory of the 'free will' owes its persistence to this charm alone; someone is always appearing who feels himself strong enough to refute it." -- Nietzsche

"Falsifiability or refutability of an assertion, hypothesis or theory is the logical possibility that it can be contradicted by an observation or the outcome of a physical experiment. That something is 'falsifiable' does not mean it is false; rather, that if it is false, then some observation or experiment will produce a reproducible result that is in conflict with it. For example, the assertion that 'all swans are white' is falsifiable, because it is empirically verifiable that there are

swans that are not white. However, not all statements that are falsifiable in principle are falsifiable in practice. For example, ‘it will be raining here in one million years’ is theoretically falsifiable, but not practically so. The concept was made popular by Karl Popper, who, in his philosophical criticism of the popular positivist view of the scientific method, concluded that a hypothesis, proposition, or theory talks about the observable only if it is falsifiable.” -- Wikipedia

Note that Nietzsche had introduced the concept of a “refutable” theory long before Popper. Interestingly, Nietzsche considered the theory of ‘free will’ refuted. Like scientific materialists, he couldn’t grasp free will, while, like scientific materialists, he assumed its existence all the time. If there’s no free will, Nietzsche had no choice but to write his philosophy, hence it’s not actually his philosophy at all: he’s merely a human typewriter. No one who reads his philosophy has any choice in the matter, and no one has any choice about whether to act on it. It’s utterly pointless. Why is it that so many brilliant minds have succumbed to the absurdity that there’s no such thing as free will?

Make no mistake, free will is the supreme test of any theory and any theory that cannot accommodate it is ipso facto refuted.

Is “There is thinking” a superior formulation to “I think therefore I am.”? Nietzsche was one of those who determinedly gnawed away at Descartes’ logic, but did he succeed? He, like Hume, questioned the whole concept of “I” and “Self”.

But why would “thinking” that didn’t belong to a specific thinking agent (an “I”) create the self-delusion that such an agent *did* exist? If there are no “I’s” in reality, how did we come to think that there are “I’s”? How can you make a simulacrum of something without the original? Postmodernists like to talk of the “authentic fake” and the “copy without an original”, but these concepts nevertheless acknowledge that there was a time when authenticity and fakery, copies and originals, were once all real. How can the simulacrum of “I” be based on anything but an authentic “I”? But if there is an authentic “I”, what need is there for a simulacrum? Occam’s razor supports the simpler explanation – that we talk of an “I” because there *is* an “I”. It would be absurd to invoke a “non-I” that thinks it’s an “I”. How could such a thing ever happen? It’s much easier to accept an “I” that thinks it’s an “I” than a “non-I” that thinks it’s an “I”.

A “thinking substance” that had no concept of itself as an “I” would never invent an “I” – after all, what possible reason or precedent would it have for doing so? Something that thinks it’s an “I” does so for the simple reason that it *is* an “I”. An “I” is a conscious life force at the centre of all sorts of feelings, willing, desire and thinking which it – *and it alone* – is experiencing. It is not experiencing anyone else’s feeling, willing, desire or thinking.

To be sure, each monad starts off as “it”, but when it becomes conscious (or at least achieves “narratised sentience”), it becomes “I”.

“It thinks therefore it is” is converted by evolution into “I think therefore I am.”

The Theory of Everything

We will literally answer EVERYTHING, at least in terms of the big picture if not all the fine detail, by adopting the most reductionist approach ever seen, and then showing how this ultimate reduction is the flip side of ultimate holism, integration and synthesis (all handled mathematically, of course).

For the first time ever in the public domain, we will, in this series of books, be identifying and explaining the God Equation that provides the basis of the whole of physical reality. If you are a scientist or a mathematician, you will almost certainly have encountered the God Equation

already, but not recognised it for what it is. We are immersed in a vast ocean of knowledge in which the supreme answers are already visible for those with the eyes to “see”. Most people stagger around in the corridors of knowledge as if they were blind, unable to see the answers right in front of their faces. Recognising the true significance of existing knowledge is the launch pad for discovering new knowledge. If we can’t recognise the truth as things stand, why would the accumulation of more and more “knowledge” help us?

Scientific materialism has acquired an immense amount of “knowledge” regarding M-theory, its own provisional theory of everything, but after several decades, it is still nowhere near a final answer. It will NEVER find an answer if it continues to prefer empiricist materialist dogmatism over rationalist mathematical truth.

The God series presents our TOE – theory of everything – which will stand as the most deadly rival science has ever faced since we are championing its own greatest tool: mathematics.

This particular book – *The God Game* – has invited you to ponder what actually constitutes “the answer to everything”. If you encountered a burning bush in the desert and a voice in your head announced that the burning bush was “I am that I am”, would you regard that as the answer to everything, or would you go and see a psychiatrist? If an angel appeared to you in a cave and started dictating a rather dubious text to you, would that constitute the answer for you? If you saw “Christ” rising from the dead, would that be the answer to everything? Is “resurrection” indicative of the final answer? (Anyway, how would you know “Christ” wasn’t the “Antichrist” – don’t the evil rise too?)

When do you know that you have actually encountered the legitimate answer to everything? Can someone like Edgar Cayce provide the answer to everything? Is the answer to everything hidden in a paw of the Sphinx on the Giza Plateau? Is Allah the answer? Did aliens visit us thousands of years ago? If so, are they answer?

What you are willing to accept as the answer says a huge amount about you. Is the final answer invested in a supernatural being, an ancient document, an extraordinary fact that defies conventional understanding, an alien species...?

Our assertion is that mathematics is the only possible logical, coherent, rational, definitive answer to everything. The God Equation is so powerful and conclusive that you will be left in no conceivable doubt about the veracity of what we are saying. The final truth belongs to pure logic and to the necessary, immutable, eternal, analytic truths of mathematics. The answer to everything is ultimate mathematical rationality. Imagine how grotesque that is to people of faith who want the answer to everything to reside in the person of a mysterious super being. They don’t want a rational answer that they themselves could understand if they were sufficiently rational. No, they want a being who is enormously more powerful than they are. In other words, it’s not an answer they’re seeking, it’s somebody to worship.

So what will YOU accept as the final answer, and what will you definitely not accept as the final answer? People ought to be clear about what they’re seeking before they seek it. People of faith are seeking a being of supreme power; people of reason are seeking an answer that they can understand 100%. For rational people, the answer is a system of inevitable logic, lacking any capriciousness, randomness or contrivedness. It has nothing to do with any powerful being. For believers, the being they worship is all that matters. Once again, we see that believers and rationalists are more or less two different species, looking for completely different answers.

As for the God Equation, it is exactly what it ought to be: the most beautiful, elegant, economic and mind-boggling equation of mathematics ever discovered. Have you guessed what it is yet?

Several people have mentioned Leibniz's Monadology. This is of course a key text, but it should be pointed out that the published version was designed for a Christian audience that believed in a Creator with 100% foreknowledge.

Leibniz's true Monadology – intended for a non-Christian audience – is radically different and precludes a Creator. Monads are non-created and eternal. Moreover, they are fully interactive, hence are evolving in tandem with each other. There is no sure foreknowledge at all.

You would reach many completely false conclusions about Leibniz's true thinking if you were to rely on his "Christian Monadology". His alternative Monadology is the one upon which Illuminism is based and it is, ultimately, entirely mathematical. It can't be stressed enough that mathematics is the ONLY subject that offers eternal, immutable, necessary, analytic truths. If you want definitive answers to existence, you have nowhere else to go. If, on the other hand, you want bullshit, well the choices are endless – as all the religions and philosophies of our world prove.

July 4, 2012 – the publication date of *The God Game*, hence World Independence Day.
The liberation of humanity begins.

Many of the most important books in history fall "stillborn from the press", as David Hume put it. Ours will certainly suffer the same fate, but, even so, once these ideas are in the public domain they will start to build an unstoppable momentum. It may take decades – just as it did for Christianity and Islam – but the liberation of humanity is on its way. Reason – mathematics – will set us free.

The Age of faith and Mythos is coming to an end. We are entering the Logos Age, the launchpad to human divinity. New Humanity is here – HyperHumanity.

The Glass Bead Game

We ought to offer some advice on how to read this book and the others in the series. They are actually constructed in such a way as to provide a homage to Hermann Hesse's *The Glass Bead Game*, which was itself a homage to the Illuminati.

The Glass Bead Game is an extraordinary game whereby underlying patterns in existence are discerned in apparently disparate things. It's a kind of hyper sophisticated musical chess using, as the chess pieces, strands of information from all sorts of different topics and subjects. The game is to link the pieces in the most elegant, unexpected, beautiful and harmonious ways, revealing their deep connections and having them accompanied by the most exquisite music.

So, these books are written in a "hyperlink" style where they leap from one thing to another and eschew linear, formal discursive techniques. The books are supposed to reflect the Glass Bead Game itself, played at the ultimate existential level of revealing absolute truth.

The books are also designed for maximum reading effectiveness. By keeping the reader's mind always slightly off balance by jumping back and forth between all manner of subjects, including high-level mathematics, ultra-advanced philosophy, cutting-edge physics, *The Simpsons*, *South Park*, horror movies, and so on, we hope to detonate an immense creative explosion in the mind of the reader.

Putting it another way, you have no chance of understanding these books on a book-by-book basis, so don't get bogged down in the detail. The books are intended to be grasped across the whole series, approaching one million words in extent. Things that might make no sense in one book will become crystal clear in another where the same topic is addressed from a radically different angle.

We recommend that you read the whole series without paying too much attention to detail

initially, and let the whole thing wash over you like the ocean. If we have done our job right, you should start to reach an excellent intuitive understanding of the material. Afterwards, you can start the series again from whatever point most interests you and study the material in depth.

Our aim is to present the most complex material of all time in as palatable a way as we can contrive. If we presented this material as pure philosophy, pure mathematics and pure science it would make sense only to academics, and even most of them would scratch their heads. So, we've come out with a new style of presenting challenging material. Whether we have succeeded with our experiment will be for you to decide – but please suspend your judgment until all of the material is presented, especially since it was originally conceived as a single book and single project.

Good luck to every player of the God Game, the ultimate Glass Bead Game.

Summary

This is the introductory text of the series of books called “the God Series” in which the most ancient secret society in the world – the Pythagorean Illuminati – reveal, for the first time in the public domain, the “answer to everything”.

Pythagoras provided a glimpse of the answer 2,500 years ago when he declared, “All things are numbers”. However, this statement baffled everyone outwith the Illuminati. The God series fully reveals what Pythagoras meant. Mathematics – built from numbers – is not an abstraction but is ontological: it actually exists. Numbers are real things. Specifically, they are the frequencies of energy waves. (Moreover, energy waves are simply sinusoidal waves: sines and cosines, meaning that the study of energy is the study of sinusoids). There are infinity energy waves, hence infinite numbers. No numbers are privileged over any others, so negative and imaginary numbers are as ontologically important as real numbers (upon which scientific materialism is exclusively based).

Real numbers correspond to space and imaginary numbers to time. Negative numbers are “antimatter”: a mirror image universe.

The two most powerful numbers of all – and the ultimate basis of Illuminist thinking – are zero and infinity, which are harnessed together ontologically (opposite sides of the same coin, so to speak). The existence of zero and infinity is vehemently denied by the ideology of scientific materialism. In Illuminism, these two numbers not only exist, they are the “God” numbers: the origin of all other numbers (which are latent within them; balanced so as to cancel to zero overall). Zero and infinity comprise the Big Bang Singularity itself from which an infinitely large universe emerged: “everything” literally came from “nothing”.

Moreover, zero is also the “monad” of Leibniz (one of the greatest Illuminati Grand Masters). It is therefore the number of THE SOUL, and it has INFINITE capacity. Being dimensionless – a mathematical point – the soul is outside the dimensional, material domain of space and time, hence the soul is indestructible, immortal and cannot be detected by any conventional scientific experiment.

What we are describing are the necessary, analytic, eternal truths of mathematics – they have no connection with Abrahamic religious faith. There is NO Creator God but, astoundingly, each soul is capable of being promoted to God status, just as the pawn in chess can become the most important chess piece, the Queen, if it reaches the other side of the battlefield (the board). In Illuminism, if you reach gnosis – enlightenment – you become God.

Mathematics is literally everything. Unlike science, mathematics offers certainty: 100% true and incontestable knowledge. Mathematics unifies science, religion and metaphysics. Mathematics is the true Grand Unified Theory of Everything that science pursues so futilely. Science can never deliver truth and certainty because it is inherently a succession of provisional theories, any of which can be overturned at any time by new experimental data. Science is based on ideas of validation and falsification. Mathematics is based on absolute analytic and unarguable certainty. No experiment can ever contradict a mathematical truth.

Mathematics is the ONLY answer to everything. Mathematics is the ONLY subject inherently about eternal, Platonic truth. As soon as existence is understood to be nothing but ontological mathematics, all questions are ipso facto answered.

The God series, starting with this book *The God Game*, reveals the astonishing power of ontological mathematics to account for everything, including things such as free will, irrationalism, emotion, consciousness and qualia, which seem to have no connection with

mathematics.

Read the God series and you will become a convert to the world's only rational religion – Illuminism, the Pythagorean religion of mathematics that infallibly explains all things and guarantees everyone a soul that is not only eternal but also has the capacity to make each of us a true God.

Isn't it time to become Illuminated?

Conclusion

“Mathematics, rightly viewed, possesses not only truth, but supreme beauty, a beauty cold and austere, like that of sculpture, without appeal to any part of our weaker nature, without the gorgeous trappings of painting or music, yet sublimely pure, and capable of a stern perfection such as only the greatest art can show. The true spirit of delight, the exaltation, the sense of being more than Man, which is the touchstone of the highest excellence, is to be found in mathematics as surely as in poetry.” – Bertrand Russell, *Study of Mathematics*

If we have done our job properly, this book should have raised many more questions than answers. After all, it is simply the introduction to the “God series”.

In the remainder of the series, we will address the key issues in far more detail, invoking far more mathematics.

You have taken the first steps to mental liberation. The door to enlightenment has swung open. Beyond lies the most impressive structure in all the universe, one that embodies the language of God and the code of existence itself. It is no Pharaoh's pyramid, it is mathematics – the arche, the source of all, the eternal “One”.

Mathematics alone explains reality. Mathematics is the True God. Mathematics – living, ontological mathematics – is the principle of life and mind. Life and mind are defined by one number – ZERO, the MONAD, the SOUL. Zero is the number of *subjectivity*, and no scientific experiment will *ever* reveal its secrets.

Unless you have understood subjectivity versus objectivity, you have understood nothing. Self-reference, mind, life, consciousness, free will, religion, psychology and metaphysics all revolve around subjectivity.

Scientific empiricist materialism has no conception of subjectivity. It doesn't know how to study it, so simply denies its existence.

The great truth of existence is that ultimately, there is *only* subjectivity. The objective world is the creation of subjective minds.

Mathematics is the most mysterious subject of all. The properties of numbers deliver endless miracles. Who needs God when mathematics gives us so much more? Mathematics is the God factory: it does nothing but generate Gods ... an *infinity* of them.

THE END

