

COSMOS THEOLOGY

(CONDENSED)

Janus

What is the meaning of life? At our individual level, due to our trivial existence, it all seems so mysterious. Philosophers and religions have attempted answers to this question for millennia. The theist religions of Christianity, Islam and Judaism tell us that people find meaning by following God's commandments. In Hinduism the meaning of life is the achievement of Nirvana through virtuous living, found by continual rebirth. Buddhism admonishes one's attachments to the material world, that invariably produce sorrowful living. Confucianism's goal is the attainment of virtue through strong relationships and reasoning, thus emphasizing discipline and education. To be noted is how moral living became the purpose of life in advanced religions. Modern philosophies include Utilitarianism, which teaches that "the greatest good for the greatest number" is the basis for determining 'good' in the world; Kantian philosophy bases good and bad on the universalist principle: if everyone behaved in a particular way, would the world be a better or worse place? Secular Humanism believes that the development of the individual human being, leading to the good of humanity, is the purpose of life, and atheism is the absence of belief that gods exist, whose members generally are Humanists. Then we should not forget Nihilism with its assertion that life has no meaning; and Satanism which accepts man's nature as: ". . . that of a carnal beast, living in a cosmos that is indifferent to our existence."

Most, if not all of these doctrines, and more that could be included, have some element of truth derived from intuition, and assuming that they have taught us something about moral behaviour, can we distill from them the essence of that teach-

ing? Let us take, for instance, the Golden Rule: *Do unto others as you would have them do unto you*, taught in Christianity, Buddhism and Confucianism. Obviously this has to do with our treatment of each other, as do prohibitions on murder, stealing, cheating, lying and lust for another's sex partner, while teaching charity, mercy and kindness. Distilled to their essence, they teach the need for empathy and proper behaviour for civilized society, which in turn essentially means cooperative society. A cooperative society means a more complex life arrangement than individual existence, and therefore we might expect societies requiring empathy and cooperative behaviour to have some relevancy in the advancement of Life.

With the knowledge now available from modern studies we can explore this possible connection to moral teaching, but first we must put aside all myth and mysticism, which historically have been the means of spiritual 'enlightenment'. Ironically, it is only when we reject all mysticism that the full meaning of Life becomes manifest. Not meant to be implied is that people who have had 'near-death experiences' are delusional, or have not had 'spiritual' occurrences that were meaningful in their lives. Even with the science of today we still only claim to have the dimmest understanding of underlying reality. The quantum world is totally bizarre by the standards of our macro existence, and no one can claim absolute certainty on human existence beyond death. The only absolute truth about 'life after death' is that we do not *know*.

To the theist this rejection of mystical cause is most difficult, for how else can we explain Creation except by Intelligence? People make things using forethought and therefore forethought must be needed for all things created, they assert, which is not at all true. Even a lot of human creati-

vity comes from trial-and-error and discovery by accident. Theists are prone to mock the notion that the world and Universe could be created "by chance," without acknowledging that the chance required is the same chance people consider to win a lottery. The chance of winning a lottery is astronomically against winning by any one particular player, yet people *do* win. They win because of the vast number of players and combinations played. Someone, somewhere, sometime is bound to win. Nature plays the same numbers game, whether with stars or mutations giving new species.

But can we use a natural understanding of the Universe to explain the reason for our existence? We can, and from it derive the meaning of virtue and morality long taught by religions and philosophies. Beginning in ancient seas we know from fossils left by ancient life that Nature has followed a progression from simple forms to the more complex, from chemical molecules to one-celled organisms, then multi-celled organisms, jellies, fish, amphibians, reptiles, mammals and humans, each stage in evolution displaying higher complexity. We have no reason to suppose that the same progression will not continue in the future, perhaps for as long as the Universe exists. Very natural, then, to extrapolate the past history of life into the future and contemplate that Life must eventually reach a stage of *Ultimate Consciousness*. We can be so certain about this eventuality that we can give it a name: the *Cosmic Imperative*. What greater purpose could our lives have than participating in this Path of Life? Regardless of the particular belief, our moral systems have intuitively sought to direct humanity toward that fulfilment. Certainly without them we are left to the decay of time and regression back to the animal. So if the intuitive purpose of religion, as found in the major and most developed religions, is in line with a fundamental principle found in Nature by rational science, i.e., a trend

giving complexity, we have a tie-in between religion and science and therefore the possibility of a rational religion of the Universe unladen with the mysticism always thought by rational thinkers to be unavoidable with religion.

We are told in mythical literature that the Universe was created at a specific time. This notion is far from true. The Universe is in *constant* creation. Through our telescopes we see stars continuing to be born, and die. Species of living forms come and go, and planet Earth changes over millions of years. Eons of time are required for these changes, making their present forms seem immutable - an illusion that only indicates the fleeting moment of our individual human existence. But irrespective of the trivial span of our individual lives, the life of our species lives on. Homo sapiens have been on Earth two hundred thousand years, and our evolutionary existence dates back millions of years. Today humanity has the ability to change our planet Earth in significant ways, and is on the verge of spreading to other planets and moons of our Solar System. As a species humanity has an importance, even on the scale of the Cosmos. In future millennia this importance will grow as our descendants spread throughout the galaxy. Thus, Earthy life is intimately connected to the evolution of the Cosmos, as is Life everywhere.

For three billion years life on Earth consisted of little more than single cells living separately in Earth's oceans, when because of random mutation some began to live in colonies. These thrived, their symbiotic relationship becoming ever more integrated, to evolve into the plants and animals we know, including human beings. We still have an echo of that primeval past in slime mold, that as a single slug can dissolve into individual amoeba-like organisms, but otherwise lives as a single form of life. The phenomenon is well known and studied, and given the name *emergence*: the display of superior

properties in systems that were not evident on the scale of the systems' individual constituents. *Emergence* is the process that has given superior life over the micro organisms once living in primeval seas.

If humanity is an extension of this life process do we see any sign of emergence in present human life? Indeed we do. But to have it there has to be total integration of people into a community. They therefore have to respect each other. They cannot steal or covet the possessions of others. Rather, they must be charitable, even empathic to others suffering misfortune in the community. They cannot be violent or lustful after others' sex partners. They must not display arrogance or pride in the face of others, nor be liars or gossipers. In other words, people most on the Path of emergence toward superior human life are *moral* people, and this is the behaviour sought by the major religions. We now have a rational understanding of moral behaviour. It is superior behaviour leading to the emergence of human beings into a *collectivity* of Higher Life, emphasized by such metaphors as Christians considering their congregations "the *body* of Christ"- a single form of life. This understanding of moral behaviour as *superior* human behaviour also derives from our insight that immoral people who give vent to anger, lust, gluttony and all manner of base emotion act little better than *animals*.

If morality is a superior trait, can we say that moral people are more intelligent people? Not necessarily, because the superior intelligence derived from moral behaviour is an emergent quality of the *community*. Studies have shown that the collective intelligence of groups extends beyond the cognitive abilities of individual members of the groups. Having a group of smart people does not necessarily make the group smart, but rather it is a strong empathic connection between members of a group that produces better results. A

large proportion of women in a group gives higher performance. Future individual intelligence will undoubtedly increase, and might even be enhanced by genetic intervention, but we can also be assured that emergence will be manifested in our human *collectivity*, and that collectivity will be *religious*. As a physical embodiment that collectivity will be recognized as a *civilization*. The first recognition of civilization as a living, biological entity was by the historian-philosopher, Oswald Spengler (The Decline of the West), who noticed that the major civilizations of history (Sumerian, Egyptian, Classical, Mycenaean, Levantine, Chinese, Hindu, Mexican, Andean, Western, Russian, Cambodian) are born, live and die like biological organisms, and go through similar stages of development.

Not surprisingly, therefore, the meaning of life is to advance Life, not only one's individual life but also the Life of the Cosmos. We do that by integrating ourselves into a collectivity that survives well beyond our limited individual existence, by respecting the lives of others within that collectivity, even submitting our individual needs and wants to their needs and wants. The ultimate realization of that convergence will be a total human collectivity unified by a religion of the Universe. In place of individual obsession we can then expect there to be no suffering, hunger, poverty or injustice caused by disparities between human beings. Crime will be extirpated in a world devoted to emergence. By the powers of science and the reasoning mind genetic maladies will become unknown, and the human mind and body will be enhanced. War will be impossible because there will be no national militaries. Just as the organs of the human body, although different, exist in a cooperative, benevolent state with each other, in that future world, envisioned for thousands and even millions of years hence, we can expect the same with

nations within a world civilization. In that future world we can expect environmental problems to be solved because heavy industry will be moved into space where energy from the Sun is free and an abundance of raw material, including water, is available from asteroids. The Earth will become a garden planet. Robots will do unwanted work and human toil will become unknown. A Golden Age of humanity will exist, when art, learning and all aspects of personal development will become the role of human life. This is our human destiny, brought by superior human resolve and reasoning integrated into a world civilization of love and harmony beyond imagining. This is the promise of *Cosmos Theology*.

Contrary to this promise, however, we know from daily living that the Universe does not always, or even often, tend toward order and complexity. More evident is the tendency toward chaos, disorder and dissolution. We can see this most notably by inserting a droplet of ink into a glass of still water. The droplet slowly disperses, first giving intriguing patterns, until there is a completed mixture in the glass. A homogenous mixture is the end result, requiring only *time* with no effort or planning, a process which we see occurring repeatedly in Nature: the trend toward dispersion, dissipation and randomization in time. Examples are legion: a house becomes untidy, a plate breaks, a fence rots, a machine fails to work, Murphy's Law, etc. All are due to the law of probability because there are more disordered states than ordered ones, and therefore with inevitable change in time a disordered state is more likely entered unless directed. The same happens when heat is lost to a cold environment, giving a loss of availability for work, a loss known in science as *entropy*, and we can think of all ageing as *entropic regression* that requires nothing more than time. Throughout the Universe entropy is always increasing; stars continuously pour out their energy into

the cold of space, so that at the end of time even the Universe will be dead.

Not only natural change is the cause of entropic regression. Human beings can also be the cause. As vandals they might destroy a house. By doing so they become *agents* of entropic regression. It is the same with any crime. It is the same with any accident although these are not intentional, and that difference gives us an understanding of *evil*, which is just entropic regression given intention. Whereas ‘good’ behaviour advances the Cosmic Imperative, ‘evil’ behaviour retards it. Evil people are agents of decay acting in time. *The effects of error and accident in human life are the same as the effects of evil.* The meaning is not that entropic regression is the *cause* of evil, but rather that evil is our interpretation of human activity conducive to disorder in the world. The mind interprets such behaviour with feelings, not analysis. Once we have this natural understanding, spiritual notions of good and evil become superfluous.

A subjective understanding of ‘good’ and ‘evil’ arises because people do not always have an understanding of behaviour that is destructive or degrading of humanity. Without it human approval is very plastic, which we can see by a short list: Tolerance towards drugs can be reversed in different societies. Foods eaten in some countries are considered disgusting in others. Sex has been equated with immorality in monotheistic cultures, which is quite different from the relaxed attitude toward sex among nonChristian and nonMoslem peoples. In ancient Chaldea the temple was a place of prostitution and business. There are twenty nations in Africa where parents insist on clitorrectomy of their young daughters. Vikings and Mongols glorified war and violence. Pre-Columbian Mexicans practiced human sacrifice by the thousands. Suicide has long been honourable in Japan, as it

was in the ancient world. Regardless of the high caliber of philosophical thought in the Greco-Roman world, the Roman Empire was a slave empire and again we see the inconsistency of moral standards in the public conscience, which can vary from acceptance in one society to outrage in another. Can the atheist’s judgment of subjective right and wrong therefore be correct? The humanist tradition runs deep within the atheist movement, so without belief in an all-powerful Lawgiver atheists have no trouble accepting a subjective version of good and evil. It is when we attempt to find the place of human behaviour in Nature that we gain superior insight. In the long evolution of human life the beliefs of people must have tapped into the realities of the world, or they would never have survived. All of the above examples can be judged according to their benefit or injury to humanity, that is, on whether they are conducive to human advancement or not, so we are still left with an absolute standard - the Cosmic Imperative.

Although societies have different moral perceptions, if mistaken and moral philosophers do not address those mistakes, the societies will learn by experience. In Western societies we consider monogamy to be the moral standard for marriage, which the moral relativist would say is dependant on our cultural bias because Arab societies practice polygamy with no moral qualms whatever. One study, however, found that polygamy causes a more violent society due to male competition for brides. If a wealthy man can have four wives at the same time, that leaves three men without any wife. The result is that polygamy is slowly dying throughout the world. Evidently Nature decides the morality of a custom, not people, and we have to know what the rules are. If we do not we find out the hard way.

A querulous atheist will still complain that placing the evolution of humanity as the centrepiece of morality does

not answer why this should be judged ‘good,’ as humanity could be judged evil from the viewpoint of another species, so relative morality still applies. If microbial life is found on Mars, this reasoning goes, would humans have the right to replace that life by colonizing the planet? If so, would a superior alien species have the right to colonize Earth and replace humans? Here we could again have the argument that what is right or wrong depends on one’s point-of-view. From the Cosmic Imperative, however, we need to first realize that any Martian life found is going nowhere evolutionarily. Conditions on Mars do not allow for further evolution than microbial. Human life on Mars would be an advancement, and may even be a requirement for long term survival of our species from its dispersal, since we know from the past history of our planet that near extinction of life on Earth is possible. Human colonization of an Earth-like exoplanet in another solar system, nonetheless, would be an outrage if that planet were found to be in the early stages of Life as was Earth two billion years ago. To destroy or impede that life’s development would be contrary to the Cosmic Imperative, and in this light so would be any alien colonization of Earth. For an appreciation of *Cosmos Theology* we must judge morality from a genuine *Cosmic* perspective, not with a limited human and therefore subjective vision.

This is not to say that humanity cannot be evil. Indeed, we see during our present time humanity responsible for the extinction of many species in our world, estimated to be between 0.01% and 0.1% of all species per year, for which geologists have named this Age of Man the “Anthropocene”. Forests are cut down, habitats are lost, ecosystems are ruined, entire fish stocks are depleted with pollution now causing vast dead zones in the world’s oceans, and climate change caused by human economic activity threatens to turn Earth’s atmos-

phere into another Venusian one. The end of it all can only mean that humanity itself will suffer. Surely a species like this from the Cosmic perspective cannot be considered ‘good’. If we do not learn to act more wisely with our home planet we can be assured that catastrophe is in the making, but we should not think that the end of humanity would invalidate the Cosmic Imperative. It would only be a failure in our small corner of the galaxy. In the far reaches of space and time the Cosmic Imperative would still operate among more morally responsible species.

The question of relative morality is answered by *emergence*. To destroy sickness-bearing microbes, insects and animals, although living beings, is not judged immoral because Man is closer to the ultimate attainment of Life than they, and in their threat to human life act as an impediment to the Cosmic Imperative. Similarly in the case of war - should we condemn the empire building of nations throughout history, in view of the toll on human life extracted for their construction? To answer we must judge whether the many empires that extended their dominance over large regions retarded humanity. When examined the case can be made that civilization today would be less advanced without having had those past empires, with a few exceptions. Therefore they served a purpose in the grand scheme of Life, and this judgment would be made regardless of humanitarian considerations

Equipped with our understanding we can apply it in judgment of moral beliefs and practices, and modern schools of conduct. What, for example, can we make of the Biblical charge: . . . *do not eat from the tree of knowing good and evil* . . . (Genesis 2: 17)? Surely *Cosmos Theology* must proclaim: Let us eat from that tree, and eat heartily! We also read that God cursed Adam: *In the sweat of your brow you must make a*

living . . . (Genesis 3: 19). *Cosmos Theology* shows that Man until the modern age had no recourse but to toil if he/she were to be a moral and responsible creature, since what is ‘good,’ being creative acts, can only be achieved through effort and struggle. To ally ourselves with the Cosmic Imperative we *must* adopt ethical behaviour unavoidably associated with work and struggle that are necessary for the highly ordered state of Life and its promotion. We *must* concern ourselves with our daily living, work to improve our material existence and not be frivolous with disposing wealth, act forcefully against corruption, do our best to ensure both personal and social survival and raise healthy generations for the future, if we are to act as moral beings.

As a moral doctrine, Christianity is lacking. Nowhere in the *Four Gospels* of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John does Christ teach the virtue of work, of caring for one’s self or responsibility for one’s family. On the contrary, he tells us: *Do not lay up for yourselves treasures on earth . . .* (Matt. 6: 19); *Do not worry therefore, in view of tomorrow . . .* (Matt. 6: 34). The analogy Christ draws is with . . . *the birds of the air, how they neither sow nor reap nor gather into barns, but your heavenly Father feeds them . . .* (Matt. 6: 26). This passage demonstrates Christ’s ignorance of Nature, for every animal is engaged in a struggle for survival, to feed itself, raise its young and ward off predators. His preaching against the family is most questionable: *Whoever comes to Me without hating his father and mother and wife and children and brothers and sisters, yes, even his own life, cannot be My disciple. . .* (Luke 14: 26) Christ’s rejection of sexual relations goes to the point of absurdity: . . . *and some have made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. He that is able to accept it, let him accept it. . .* (Matt. 19: 12). Christian doctrine has rationalized these verses, but knowing the celibate

Essene background of Christianity and the fact that Christ himself was celibate, the most assured interpretation can be taken as they literally read. That Christ rejected all sexual relations is supported by Revelation 14: 4, where we are told that the 144,000 redeemed from the Earth are: . . . *those who have not defiled themselves with women, for they are celibates*. The whole doctrine of the Four Gospels adds up to an unliveable imposition on the individual and society, so by the second century when the two Timothies were written, conventional morality regarding the family, child begetting and managing a household was reasserted.

Mystical doctrines that preach renunciation and pacifism are divorced from the real world we experience. If one believes in an ‘other world’ that is higher than the present and is committed to attaining a purely spiritual existence, it is that spiritual world that has more meaning. Consequently, not to care for one’s body, family and society, not to put full exertion into practical achievement, automatically follows. We therefore have the implication that the very underlying principle of spiritual belief is iniquitous. Fortunately for society renunciation and pacifism have been the preserve only of saints and eccentrics, not of the more responsible elements of a population, because from our understanding of entropic regression we can be certain that if the tenets of Christianity had been followed when the masses of faithful faced cut-throats and con-artists, the world would long ago have been overrun by evil.

A most divisive issue in modern Western societies is that of abortion: is it moral, immoral or amoral? The policy of some church denominations is blanket condemnation, based on human life judged sacred. The humanist believes the issue revolves around human rights and freedoms, in particular the right of women to having control over their own bodies. The

sacredness of human life and the rights and freedoms of people both seem to be reasonable grounds for ethical proclamations. But something is wrong, or our understanding of ethics is incomplete if both are correct. We would think that two paths to ethical understanding would not conflict. With our enlightenment we can seek a resolution:

It is evident that life manifests a natural complexity that should be respected, with the exception of parasites that are themselves detrimental to life in obvious accord with entropic regression. When a fetus threatens the life of the mother, or is infirm in some manner that its support after birth would mean a constant and non repaid sacrifice on the part of its parents or society, its growth is no longer a social investment but is purely parasitical and means a weaker social whole with its fulfillment. The support of a weak baby in a family of limited resources may mean that the family foregoes a strong baby. Poverty means a lessening of life, and families that are too large, nations that are unable to support their masses, behave neither rationally nor ethically when they increase their numbers still further. Thus, abortion and all measures of birth control can be ethically justified when numbers prey upon themselves, or when any form of life preys upon the strength of the whole.

But in the same category can we place abortion for convenience, i.e., abortion or birth control simply because children would impinge upon the lifestyle of their not-to-be parents? Clearly in this case there is lack of recognition for the basic struggle that is unavoidable in all order creation, and it is in this renunciation to maintain the struggle of life where lies the unethical premise of induced sterility, of purposeful childless marriages and convenient celibacy. It is in this light that a pregnancy brought to an artificial termination is the result of a selfish decision. Clearly a woman has the right to control over her body, but it could be argued as well that a

man's freedom is equally limited when he has a family to support, yet no one would argue that he stifle or abandon his children for this reason. The family reduces the freedom of both, which demonstrates how freedom and the whole issue of individual and democratic rights cannot be the criterion for judging ethical behaviour. Just as the Universe gave us life we have a duty to return life to it. Deliberate sterility, the denial of worthy human life to the Universe, is hardly conducive to the *Cosmic Imperative*.

Another issue that impinges upon the rights and happiness of individuals involves race. In the modern era racial-cultural nationalism no longer exists in Western countries, these being open to immigration irrespective of racial origins. The main justification for multiculturalism is its diversity, which must include racial diversity since this is what brings the diversity in culture. Races around the world have blended together in various proportions to produce more variety than had there been no such mixture, the analogy being a painting with its mixture of colours. The difference, of course, is that by throwing nations open to the world and having no barriers to race migration, the end of diversity must eventually result. When people live without national barriers, history shows they blend. Like a painting where colours are continuously mixed, producing a toned down greying effect, the end of nationhood will not give a world of variety but one of racial-cultural sameness: the end of diversity. Proponents of multiculturalism are therefore caught in a logical dilemma.

At one time our total collectivity was our family, clan, tribe, nation, race, church or nation. All of these remain important, but today we are coming to see that our collectivity extends to all humanity and Planet Earth, with the question of a world order automatically arising from this larger consideration. The *Cosmic Imperative* logically demands an Emergent World Order (EWO) that goes beyond our current disparate

nation-states. We are on the Path of Life to the eventual goal of all Life, so we realize the evil that would be involved in the arrest of humanity from that eventuality.

Such would be the imposition of the global state, or 'new world order' that inevitably develops with the maturation of history. World government is nothing new in history. The Roman Empire was exactly that for the Classical world, as would be an American or Chinese Empire for the entire globe, with its decadence. Another definite future for humanity other than an Emergent World Order is therefore possible, at least in the short run (meaning centuries) and that is the corruption, oppression, poverty, exploitation and ignorance of a global world empire in social decline while maintaining its lethal, military supremacy. Since enlightened belief requires an enlightened society educated in the empirical sciences, advancement in religious outlook would suffer an immense retardation. Surely this is not the picture of an evolving humanity on the Path of Life, so the end of war should not be our only concern for the establishment of the inevitable world government. Of more concern must be the *state of civilization*, and that is a product of *religion*. It follows that the envisioned Emergent World Order must be a *religious* development. Being an unavoidable conclusion, we must wonder what function and form an EWO would take.

The Western world today is thoroughly indoctrinated in the need of separation between Church and State, but all civilizations have begun and grown in eras when the temple was virtually inseparable from rule. The caution today is due to the autocratic character of traditional religion, which in turn is due to its mystical quality, because in an age of learning when belief cannot be substantiated with fact, religion's only recourse has been coercion. An agency determining 'truth' is therefore required - a philosophical council established on rational knowledge rather than mythical fantasies. But deter-

mining rational belief cannot be done democratically by popular voting because as a species we are still persuaded by our animal past and easily deflected from the Path of Life. As a rule, people are persuaded more by emotion than intellect. Perception of the Cosmic Imperative must be the directive, and that is found by learning that is not always in the public domain.

Examples of how our human (and emotional) understanding is not always in accord with the Cosmic Imperative abound. One is the imposition of slavery, already mentioned, that was indispensable in the ancient world but considered intolerable for the modern. Were the ancient philosophers absolutely immoral for not condemning it? If before the invention of automatic machines society could have advanced equally well without it, then slavery was absolutely immoral. Can we say the same if society could not have advanced equally well without it? Slavery released talented people from the toil of mundane life, to perform the art, science and philosophy for which the Classical world is noted. Would it have been 'good' to deprive humanity of that progress, even in part? That would not have been in accord with the Cosmic Imperative, so we do not see the philosophers of the Classical world condemning the slavery of their time. Black slavery of the American South, however, occurred at a time when automatic machines were taking over human labor, and made slavery a less efficient means of production. Human advancement would therefore have been retarded by the continuance of slavery, and hence the moral repugnance against it, but we can be assured that without automatic machines slavery would still be prevalent in the Western world today, and moral arguments would be given from pulpits to justify it, as they were in the Old South.

We can empathize with the plight of human beings, but surely our understanding must extend beyond, to a deeper

understanding of the world we live in. This is where religion enters, which if mistaken about Nature, as mythical and mystical teachings are likely to be, can be evil even if in the guise of holiness. Vows of poverty, for example, from the point-of-view of humanity and life's imperative, are sacrifices that lead nowhere. Individuals can believe they are doing 'good,' yet seen holistically their practice lessens the strength and viability of humanity, especially if proclaimed ideologically *en masse* with potential to beget nations of beggars. From the viewpoint of the Cosmic Imperative people can be sadly mistaken. It is by their effect *on the scale of humanity*, on whether they promote or retard human advancement irrespective of human tragedy, that notions of good and evil must be judged, and that measure is absolute, not relative.

An example from our day of how popular sentiment can lead us astray from the Cosmic Imperative is the stream of destitute people from impoverished parts of the world seeking refuge in developed nations. Scenes of fleeing families tug on the heart strings of well meaning people who implore their governments to lower national entrance barriers. Should they do so? If they should, then the same should follow for all nations, leading to a mixed race world. How would that fit with the *Cosmic Imperative*? We can judge by looking at the world as it is, and how Life has evolved after a billion years. The first striking feature of that long process is the *diversity* of Life. Without diversity the evolution of Life would be impeded, because it is by branching that Nature experiments, some branches succeeding and evolving further; other branches failing. The human species is subject to the same differentiation. Its branches are the *races* of humanity, and as with all forms of life, racial differentiation is the beginning evolutionary stage of species differentiation. Contrary to the

meaning of liberal multiculturalism, "diversity" is not promoted by racially diverse people living in the same neighbourhoods, as assumed by the political narrative in Western countries today, for under that condition history shows *in time* races *mix*, just as surely as a drop of ink in a glass of water, *destroying* diversity. In this we see an example of *entropic regression* that would affect all humanity. A world of racial-cultural diversity is a world of racial-cultural *nations*.

The liberal penchant for "multiculturalism" is an example of acquiescence to the decay of time, in this case to inevitable race mixing when there is little ethnic-national identity. In general, liberals support the natural course of events, and consider their reforms "progressive" when they comply with the wants of human beings in a decadent culture, but in reality are nothing more than resignation to time. In mass racial mixture we have an example of the same applied to all humanity, contrary to the resident diversification found in Nature that has given the world its variety of species. Nothing obliterated pharaonic Egypt more than its change in race and culture, and the same becomes true in time with *all* established nations and entire civilization when races live together. Such destruction would be the result in the West of the liberal mind-set, and demonstrates how truly *creative* norms in society require philosophical direction.

From examples like this we see how determination of the Cosmic Imperative cannot be left to popular sentiment. There must be an authoritative voice presenting the reason given by learning and experience. Yet we know from the wisdom of crowds that there is an intelligence that comes from collective behaviour, imploring the need for democracy. How to implement these two conflicting requirements, of democracy and authoritarianism, is answered by realizing the dual nature of rule: it can be *imperative* as well as *regulative*.

Regulative authority is the usual authority governments have in determining taxes and various laws for a functioning society, that should be under democratic control. All physical elements of control, such as police, should be nested in democratic councils. Not so evident are the subconscious *moral* and *ideological* beliefs we all carry, that determine our lives in an even more fundamental way. This is the realm of *imperative* authority, that for a humanity on the Path of Life would be wisely left for moral philosophers to determine in an education system headed by a council selected up through the world's education systems. Not being an elected body, the only authority of this council would be moral suasion - a velvet method of rule but nonetheless a very powerful means of governance. An example of the regulative/imperative duality was given during the Middle Ages when kings and queens collected taxes and made laws governing the everyday lives of their people, yet even they were subject to the Church which by the power of mythical belief could exercise much influence, especially when resorting to the threat of eternal damnation. In the same manner, but with authority based on scientific data, universities influence political policies today, showing how both regulative and imperative laws can be housed within the same government. We can think of an *Imperative Council* playing the all-embracing and socially solidifying function of the Medieval Church, but a "church" whose teachings are supported by the rational learning of its education systems.

'World' empires like the Roman, Persian, Ottoman, etc., and now the American, are not the only examples of 'world' orders embracing the civilizations of their times and places. The same occurred in China, only its 'world' empire never ended like the Roman and all others. It continued expanding over Asia, and we see today its continual expansion over the globe due to the remarkable growth of its economy.

Neither of these present empires, the American or Chinese, presents the picture of an evolving humanity on the Path of Life; both are examples more of the oppression and materialistic decadence of social decline. Opponents of world government fear the loss of freedom and national identity that such an establishment threatens, without realizing that without their personal compliance to the Cosmic Path they will eventually have exactly what they fear most from the natural course of history.

Western Civilization today is showing signs of the decline that civilizations in the past have experienced. These signs include: monopolization and concentrating economic power, growing economic disparity, loss of manufacturing, externalization of elites (globalization), inflation, increasing debt, concentrating political power with diminishing freedoms, rule of money, materialism, emboldenment of external enemies (radical Islamic movements), huge military expenditure, mass pacifism yet endemic wars, cosmopolitanism (multiculturalism), irreligion, growing irrationality, growing foreign beliefs, increasing mysticism, male effeteness, shrinking middle class, search for sterility, low birthrate, giant cities with shrinkage of the countryside population, hedonism, crass art, etc. Do any of these sound familiar?

A rarely appreciated factor in the growth of civilization is the role of *social ideology*, historically in the form of mystical religion but the ideology need not be mystical. An example of how a *secular* ideology influenced society is Soviet Communism. Regardless of what we think of Communism, under it Russia industrialized and became a significant threat to the West militarily and in space accomplishment. When that ideology was found false, the Soviet Union fell apart to become the domain of oligarchs. German National Socialism was another secular ideology that emotionally impacted the German people so forcefully

that it took a world war to destroy. Purely mythological ideologies have also given the same motivation, resulting in temples, cathedrals and pyramids with their great art. We always find these *religious* achievements with the birth of civilizations, and the reason is the sense of mission and togetherness people always feel when they belong to a single, unifying ideology. Civilization is the *emergent* result of religion, when everyone believes the same. When that ideological conviction is undermined in an age of learning, the people of a civilization become individualized and motivated solely from personal needs and desires. This spells the end of the civilization, and this is the state of our present Western Civilization today.

Religion can be defined as a *belief system characterized by the hope of salvation through fidelity to the belief*. There must be hope of salvation, but what “salvation” can there be in any secular belief? In myth religion the answer is immediate: that comes from belief in heaven, Nirvana or any of the blessings bestowed by mythical deities. Secular religion by its intellectual nature must disregard such mythical belief, leaving the power of political authority its source of hope, and in fact wherever we see secular religion established it is always by means of political authority. Confucius died thinking that his life was a failure because he could not convince the rulers of his day to his philosophy, Confucianism being a secular belief in religious guise. His teachings were rescued under the Han dynasty to become the credo of the Chinese for centuries until Communism, a credo that even included state examinations. The oldest existing civilization in the world today is the result.

Now the West needs the same ideological strength, but Cosmic belief, like Confucianism, will not be established without first having political authority. Incumbent on Cosmos believers, therefore, is their involvement in the political affairs

of the world, to bring into being the Emergent World Order. Contrary to New Testament teachings of disengaging with the world, Cosmos believers *must* participate fully in its advancement, knowing the pervasiveness of entropic regression, which requires them to be active agents of the Cosmic Imperative. Towards this objective surely one aim must be to dismantle the large imperial states into their racial-cultural components for true diversity, rather than to have a world of racial homogeneity that will follow in time with the continued existence of those states. An Emergent World Order will be one of nations in the true sense of the word, giving a world of racial-cultural diversity.

Europe today offers a chance for this development, since Europe is composed of diverse nations reflective of the world, well acquainted with the devastation of war. Europe also has an educated population existing within a spiritual vacuum since the death of its Christianity. An EWO thus begun would be a replacement of its present European Union and its elitist world order that naturally occurs eventually with the maturation of history.

Civilizations are born in periods when pyramids, temples, ziggurats and cathedrals are built, and decline in periods of irreligion. Skyscrapers and huge government projects are not the hallmarks of civilization, these are more the signs of an ageing society; instead, pyramids, cathedrals and temples are. But who today can believe that the Earth was created in six thousand years, in personalized angels and demons, that woman came from man’s rib, that the Sun stood still in the sky, that evil came from a talking snake, and the entire plethora of myth and fable that is Christianity?

The gift of religion to civilization is not its teaching of morality; some religions have had no moral teaching whatever yet inspired great accomplishment. Its value is in the cohesion given to people when they all believe the same. We

are a social species; our strength is when we all act together. Only then can we resist incursions from abroad or build a Medieval cathedral, but to have that strength the belief must be believed. The question is then : why do civilizations become irreligious? The answer is obvious: with increased learning people can no longer adhere to the myths and fables of their forbearers. When progress undermines that ideology, cohesion is gone and people are thrown upon their individual selves. Without common belief due to the enlightenment that civilization brings, people become individualized. Money is then the major motivator leading to all manner of social malignancy. People become spiritually differentiated, and when there is no longer an ideological vision society is atomized, making it vulnerable to disorder, decline and erasure. This is the state of modern Europe, which cannot react to the incursion of Islam, a religion that by suppressing the enlightenment of modern knowledge can maintain its mythology and therefore continue to give collective and aggressive life to its still believing people.

All civilizations have had profound influence upon intellectual development, evidenced from calendars, mathematics, writing, invention and scientific inquiry. Not only are education and expanding knowledge the reasons, the city itself is a mental stimulus as it brings personal confidence and more chance of easy transference of ideas than a rural community. This growing intellectual refinement and affluence of civilized people inevitably places them in conflict with the irrational beliefs of their ancestors, and this conflict was no less evident in ancient societies once Nature's phenomena were understood to be natural events that could be predicted. In Classical Greece the gods seemed banished from the sky by Thales predicting a solar eclipse and proclaiming that heavenly bodies moved in accordance with fixed laws. The Sophists openly took up the challenge of science and directly opposed belief in

the gods, for which they often were driven from cities and had their books burned. We can expect much the same to have happened in the earliest civilizations, particularly when the reality of the stars and planets touched the priestly class whose members were the first astronomers.

The fundamental, enduring answer for Europe and the West, therefore, is to give our peoples a replacement for Christianity, a new religion, but not one in the usual sense of supernatural gods and spirits. It has to be based on real world knowledge to be enduring, and in an educated world that is only possible with *secular* belief. A rationally enlightened, science-based belief system can motivate a new West. With an Emergent World Order a Golden Age of achievement would result in place of the exploitation characteristic of imperial rule. This is the hope of Cosmos belief, that will be assured from its enlightenment given political authority.

The answer for the West, and ultimately all humanity, is to have science-based religion taught in high schools and universities. This need not restrict any existing creed - *all* can be taught in the same venue, and judged freely by people during their formative years. With free competition between religions presented, the most appealing will become the more popular, which in an informed society will be the most knowledge-based. By this means society will become persuaded by a secular theology of the natural Universe, and eventually have that as a *common* belief. Being a moral belief it will also be a *unifying* belief, with its beneficial emergent consequences for society.

Knowledge needed for future human evolution will require extensive research, pursued by the most dedicated social scientists, philosophers and even mathematicians, and these appointed to an authoritative council forming the apex of the civilization. Being appointed, this council would not be democratic and therefore should have no agency power, like

police. Its power would be in *persuasion* and extension of its thought throughout the education systems. The trend to disorder is evident in people's *psychological* disposition with the march of time the same as in the physical aspects of Nature we have considered, making democratic determination of Imperative law unwise. Due to entropic regression without rationally determined imperative law the liberal achievements of people eventually become hedonistic. An "Imperative Council" would give a lasting moral infrastructure for a new world-view, the same as the Christian Church gave to Medieval Europe. If provided, a new hope would be born and with it a new religion. With a new religion comes a new civilization, just as Christian Europe formed a new civilization from the pagan Classical world. From today's Europe would come that embryonic beginning.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. Q: What is the Cosmic Imperative?

A: "Imperative" is defined as an obligatory act or duty. In the case of the Universe we cannot say that any obligation is manifest, but by considering the vast number of stars in just our galaxy, billions of years of time and the fact of life on Earth, we know that intelligent life exists and can evolve into more complex forms. We can be so certain that human life will continue to evolve, as will other intelligent life in the Universe, that we can consider it virtual certainty. In the way we think that an object in the air has a natural imperative to fall, we interpret that certainty to mean that the Universe has a natural imperative to develop life and evolve ever Higher Life.

2. Q: Why is knowledge about the Cosmic Imperative important for a Cosmos religion?

A: It gives reason for doing 'good' in the world. The practices of honesty, not stealing, not coveting, etc. when followed improve life. We then act as agents of the Cosmic Imperative.

3. Q: How does morality relate to the Cosmic Imperative?

A: The Cosmic Imperative gives understanding for the rational exercise of morality. To vent anger, be lustful, avaricious, prideful, etc. means exhibiting the emotional behaviour of our 'inner ape', which is a step back from the Cosmic Imperative.

4. Q: What is emergence?

A: Emergence means the appearance of novel properties with self-organization of simple agents into complex systems. A bees' nest is composed of hexagonal cells placed together in a mathematical pattern. A single bee has no idea of mathematics; it simply follows individual instructions dictated by its

DNA, but merged with the instructions of all other bees of the nest they together produce a masterpiece of construction. The hive has superior intelligence to that of a single bee. Its intelligence is an emergent quality, as is probably all intelligence everywhere.

5. Q: Why is emergence important in Cosmos Theology?

A: Knowing that emergence happened in the past to give higher forms of life, we cannot ignore the probability that the Cosmic Imperative will operate the same with human beings in the future. Moral insights teach co-operative behaviour and empathy exactly as needed in an emergent society, and group intelligence appears to be an emergent phenomenon. The Wisdom of Crowds gives superior results than individual human cognition. Civilization becomes the emergent result of deep belief when everyone has the same deep belief.

6. Q: You speak of Nature as a “god”. Why bother with gods at all when we know the natural causes for the world?

A: That is a misunderstanding of Cosmos Theology. Nature is not a god, but can be a metaphor for “Creator”. Consider the evolution of life. It arose on our primitive Earth about four billion years ago, and eukaryote cells, that is the type of cell that comprises all higher life from algae to humans, appeared about two billion years later. From the trillions of floating cells on Earth at that time, after two billion years, one microbe swallowed another without digesting it, and both became symbiotic. The eukaryote cell was born, and it happened only once. That shows how difficult and unlikely that event was. Obviously this was not by intelligent design. It happened as a fortunate occurrence in a stew of large numbers. But the *result* was the same as if done by intelligence. Whether it took a day from divine intelligence or two billion years by natural process, the difference in the end was only one of time. By

ignoring the time scale the Universe can be spoken of metaphorically *as if* Nature were a “Creator” in the usual sense. It helps us realize that there is a Cosmic Imperative, and that this Universe has meaning in which Life and human beings are an integral and inevitable part.

7. Q: Have not religions given division and the bloodiest wars of history, not civilization and the unification of people?

A: Indeed they have, but that has been due to there being many religions, some hostile to each other. It is due more to the breakdown of religion than religion itself, such as the religious wars in Europe after the Protestant Reformation. With a single religion there cannot be religious war and bloodshed, and when that religion is premised on empirical knowledge, differences of opinion will need empirical proofs. Lasting schisms will therefore be more difficult, and as in science, erroneous views will eventually die due to not being founded on provable facts.

8. Q: Why worry about religion at all? Would not the world be better off without it?

A: Religion has been a part of humanity since our species began, and probably played a part in our evolution. That is why it is found all over the world, in every climate and environmental circumstance. Religion may not be in our genes but social cohesion is, we are a social species, and common belief, that is, a single belief, with its rituals, prayers, singing, symbols, etc., enhances that cohesion. For that reason it was a factor in our survival, and still is. Religion is the inspirational drive of civilizations, seen in the Gothic cathedrals of the Middle Ages but also in the great temples, pyramids and ziggurats of all other civilizations. Large cities, business enterprises and utilitarian works are actually the prelude to decline.

For continued human progress, future government cannot ignore the fundamental connection of religion to civilization.

9. Q: Are you serious about religion being essential for world government? In a world of the future religion will not even exist.

A: Knowing the connection of religion as social ideology to civilization we can say that without it humanity will have no future at all in a world of decadence and oppression. This is the result of mystical and mythical religion, which must inevitably become lost among the educated of a population who then have nothing in their lives except personal interests. The aim of *Cosmos Theology* is a world religion premised on actual knowledge, not myth and mysticism, so religion will not be lost and people will be guided by more than individual and selfish interests.

10. Q: Is Western Civilization really in decline? The world today is becoming more prosperous.

A: The Roman Empire gave Europe the longest era of peace and prosperity Europe has ever known. Roads, lighthouses, public baths, aqueducts, expanded trade, common laws, etc. were realized under that ‘world’ empire, yet its seeds of decline were already sown. Utilitarian works and human betterment are only the outer face of a civilization. Integral to its existence are its morale and social cohesion, and Western Civilization is today showing telling signs of the same malaise that afflicted past ‘high cultures’ no matter how great they were.

11. Q: Why is *Cosmos Theology* concerned about world government?

A: It concerns itself with the evolutionary future of humanity. This world cannot forever remain politically disunited. Not

only are atomic weapons the reason; if world government is only about economics and politics all humanity will experience the decline and decadence of former ‘world’ empires, like the Roman, which were in effect the ‘world’ governments of their times. A global government must give internal, psychological unification in the way that the Christian Church gave to Europe during the Middle Ages, and that means in addition to regulative duties it must be a motivational institution.

12. Q: I am a White nationalist. Why would I want to establish an EWO or any world order?

A: History is not static. Its natural course is toward Imperium, the last stage of a civilization - one of decline. The Roman Empire is an example, which was the Imperium stage of Classical Civilization. The “new world order” is the default setting of world government - that of liberal multiculturalism and big government. By rejecting the EWO you are not impeding the development of world government. You are only *rejecting your only hope against* the new Rome. That is coming naturally, in the form of an American or Chinese empire. By contrast, an enlightened form of world government is a religiously founded federation - the Emergent World Order. That is the type of world order that humanity needs, and we know from the Cosmic Imperative that it is inevitable.

8. Q: When you speak of world government, is it your wish to scrap the nation-state?

A: Not at all. The nation-state is the mainstay of racial-cultural diversity in the world, and therefore a moral requirement of *Cosmos Theology*. Under a union trade agreements would be negotiated nation-to-nation and not imposed on different economies by blanket rule. Nations could therefore maintain their own currencies and immigration politics. An international currency could still exist to facilitate trade and

travel, and serve as an international monetary standard. A Council of Nations could exist to decide on aid to nations that need it. But the federation would need unified education in the liberal arts and ideology, headed by an 'Imperative Council' selected up through the education systems. Neither would there be independent national militaries, but one united military under the Council of Nations. World peace would be secured along with national identities.

9. Q: Why is racial diversity important in Cosmos Theology?

A: The whole essence of morality in Cosmos Theology is to ally ourselves with the Cosmic Imperative. That means we must seek to improve humanity, in particular do nothing that would impede its evolutionary development. Diversity is very important for the evolution of Life, because with less diversity there are fewer avenues to evolve. There is also more chance of extinction. Diversity occurs with the bifurcation of species into sub-species, or races. The races evolve separately until eventually they cannot interbreed, and that is how different species are born. But if races interbreed, species differentiation cannot occur. Evolution is impeded. So as a general principle in Nature, racial interbreeding does not occur and that is why we see such diversity. In the human case, people also generally seek to breed with their own race, but in liberal multicultural states they have more chance to outbreed with races not their own. Diversity is destroyed. This is contrary to the Cosmic Imperative and therefore to Cosmos Theology.

10. Q: Evidently you are not a White supremacist but you are a racial nationalist. What's the difference?

A: All (most) Texans are Americans but not all Americans are Texans. It's that simple. Yes, all White supremacists are White nationalists but all White nationalists are not necessarily White

supremacists. Examples are the various nationalist movements around the world, whether of the Basques, Scots, French Canadians, Chechens, Kurds, etc., who want national separation but lay no claim to racial superiority. *Cosmos Theology* argues the same for all nationalist movements where separation and nation are the only demands. The conflation of White nationalism with supremacy is a media tactic, because the money power knows very well that the vast majority of voters are repulsed by notions of superiority by any race, which they consider "hate". White supremacists should understand the same: whether true or not their White supremacy is politically self-defeating.

11. Q: Why should I bother with Cosmos Theology?

A: Not only does Cosmos Theology enlighten us, it also implores us to apply that knowledge. We must work and struggle if we want a better world; we have no other option. Lassitude leads to decay and evil, which are natural and expected expressions of entropic regression. That struggle would include striving for a politically united world making war obsolete along with its egregious costs because nations would have no militaries, a world of racially and culturally diverse, self-governing nations where democracy is guaranteed, a world ruled by knowledge and intelligence in religion instead of dogma and intolerance, a world of unprecedented scientific advancement eliminating maladies, including the genetic, and extending the human life-span, a world without economic disparity caused by greed and corruption because these would be expunged by a secular religion devoted to emergence. The Bible mentions (Isaiah 35 and 65) a paradise on Earth as the reward for mystical belief. A paradise on Earth is indeed possible, but more realistically brought by human beings ourselves through rational belief. It will not come from heaven. We must work to produce it.



The symbol of Cosmos Theology is the Swastika, an ancient and noble symbol representing the Sun, used by Europeans and native Americans since the Neolithic Age. It is used in Buddhism to symbolize universal harmony, good fortune and eternity. We wish to convey the same, in addition to conveying nationalist aspirations of pride, distinctiveness and belonging. Such feelings are presumed to be the natural right of *all* peoples, but in Western nations have been preempted by liberal notions of multiculturalism. For that reason we will democratically replace all Western parties and leaders not in compliance with Cosmic religious principles, including in the European Parliament.

The colours of the flag are: a golden yellow Swastika to represent progress, and expanding red circles representing the victory of blood over a black background of entropy