

COSMOS THEOLOGY
(Condensed from the same title, by Janus)
Science-Derived Morality from Nature

C. Wayne Macleod

Part I - the Philosophy

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 they have taught us something about moral behaviour, can we distill from them the essence of that teaching? 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 evolutionary advancement of human 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'. This rejection comes from our knowledge of Nature, even at the atomic level, for if any divine, omnipotent and omniscient Creator were the cause of everything, surely when we look into the heart of matter we would see evidence of certainty. Instead, we see only probability. On the quantum level, at the very heart of matter, all is probability. But neither does *Cosmos Theology* affirm atheism, for the evolution of Life suggests possible destiny, as though the human species had meaning even on the scale of the Universe. 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 creativity 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 fortuitous biological mutations.

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 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 Life 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 had a Beginning but it 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. Aeons 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. The destiny of Man is to seed the galaxy. Thus, Earthy Life is intimately connected to the evolution of the Cosmos, as is Life everywhere.

For almost three billion years Life on Earth consisted of nothing 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. By *emergence* has evolved 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 materials, 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 the *Cosmic Imperative*.

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 in Nature there are many more disordered, random 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* or *random 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 random regression. Human beings can also be the cause. As vandals they might destroy a house. By doing so they become *agents* of random 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 random regression given intention. Whereas 'good' behaviour advances the Cosmic Imperative, 'evil' behaviour retards it. Evil people are agents of chaos 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 random 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 clitorectomy 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 using the evolution of humanity as the mode for determining morality does not answer why human evolution should be the measure of '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 atmosphere 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 possible 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 random 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.

Mystical doctrine, of course, is not the only source of error in moral understanding. That can also derive by placing human want ahead of Nature's requirements. Environmental destruction to fulfill human need is an example, and this is so even when the motive is humanitarian. A feature of natural Life is its *diversity*. Species diversity makes an ecosystem and ecosystems make a world. Destroy our world's ecosystems and we destroy our world. Most people, if not everyone, would agree that this would be an act of the greatest *evil*. A most cursory glance at humanity also reveals its diversity. Many different cultures, nations, races, etc. make up human diversity the same as we see in Nature. To destroy that diversity would equally constitute evil, but ironically we have today the political narrative that liberal "multiculturalism" *gives* diversity! What this narrative fails to recognize is that when races and cultures *mix*, street to street and door to door, diversity is *destroyed*, because history shows that under such circumstances races *interbreed*. The way to destroy racial diversity is to have races mix, as we have with liberal "multiculturalism". If our liberal leaders truly wanted racial diversity the one policy they would *not* promote is liberal "multiculturalism". Instead, a world of racial-cultural diversity is a world of racial-cultural *nations*.

People who migrate are people who perceive opportunities elsewhere from their home territory and have the abilities and preparation to work in jobs requiring the needed skills. The result is "selective migration," leading to ability disparities between internal donor and recipient areas of industrial countries. If a country is racially homogeneous the skewing is not racially noticeable because all areas are racially the same, but in these days of globalization migration is international. The result is places like Silicon Valley where the search for talent is world-wide. Consequently, we see people in high-paying jobs in industry, academia and government who are obviously not nationals and performing well in those positions. Science and technical journals are filled with names that are difficult to pronounce in the native tongue, and a time of globalization is also a time of industrial "outsourcing," resulting in millions of national workers facing unemployment and dependancy. Racial problems arise, the national population declines and replaced with immigration, "multiculturalism" becomes the mantra of politicians and policy-setters while nationals are saddled with historical and racial guilt for "discrimination". We are left with the question of how justified is nationalism and should there be national laws and programs based purely on human considerations that ignore the national existence. We then have the question: are job requirements the only ethical requirements for nation building, sufficient to put nationalist racial considerations aside?

Apparently not. Robert Putnam is a political scientist who in 2007 published the results of a study on 30,000 people in the United States, which he found so disturbing that he delayed publishing them until six years after the time of his study in 2001. What Putnam discovered is

that societies with a high degree of liberal multiculturalism display lower confidence in local government, local leaders and local news media, lower confidence in one's own influence, lower frequency of registering to vote, less expectation of solving dilemmas requiring public action, less likelihood of giving to charity or volunteering, and have in general problems arising from lack of public trust. The most pertinent conclusion we can draw is that racially based nationhood is the most stable and harmonious collectivity for human existence. The conclusion is not surprising when we look at the reason from Nature for diversity in the first place.

Racial diversity is the beginning evolutionary stage of species diversity. If two separate populations of the same species remain separate over tens of thousands of years, each will evolve different characteristics to identify them as separate races, and if they remain separate sufficient differences will accumulate to prevent interbreeding. They will then have become different species. To destroy species diversity, then, all we need to do is destroy racial diversity, which can be done simply by having racial intermixture when the differentiating populations can still interbreed. Fortunately in the animal world pheromones are readily sensed, that prevent racial mixture, and animals have less problem with racial amalgamation than humans, although mixture happens (as with coyotes and wolves). The human species lacks the prohibitions of animals who are better endowed by a superior olfactory sense, and hence the relative human proneness to elimination of its racial diversity. We can easily verify this destruction by viewing the abundance of interracial couples strolling our streets today, although it is questionable if our human lack of pheromone sensitivity extends to our *subconscious*, as it is likely the underlying hidden source of racial discrimination and conflict in all countries housing the racial residue of imperialism.

The issue is far from being a subjective one, based on what we like or dislike. Variation depletion in Nature limits the paths that evolution can take. The *Cosmic Imperative* is impeded. Nature does not 'know' what variations lead to higher manifestations of Life, requiring many chance mutations and probabilities for selection. Variation is also important for survival of Life in the event of world catastrophe, such as the asteroid impact that wiped out the dinosaurs. Without the diversity of Life at that time, *all* Life would have been destroyed. Obviously diversity is important in Nature for reasons that go beyond the service of insects in pollinating plants. It has a *moral* imperative, which we see when its end would result in that nadir of all 'evil' - the end of Life on our world.

Human beings have a marvellous capacity for emotion suppression. It is the origin of moral behaviour when controlling our animal natures. But like any control we exercise over our instinctual selves, it must be done with remembrance that our instincts given by Nature are for our *survival*. To ignore them or deplore them because they are not intellectualized must be of the most profound foolishness. The end of human diversity would not destroy our world, but the principle from Nature indicates the moral implications, and *that* has consequences. As Robert Putnam has shown, public *trust* is diminished by liberal "multiculturalism". *Civilization is affected*. There is nothing new about liberal "multiculturalism," known in the Roman world as *cosmopolitanism*. It was an accompanying development and possible cause in the decline of that great world.

This liberal penchant for "multiculturalism" is an example of acquiescence to the decay of time when there is weak racial-cultural identity. In general, liberals support the natural course of events, and consider their reforms "progressive" when they comply with the predictive natural wants of human beings, hence the term "progressive". This compliance includes to a decadent culture with its visceral random changes in *time*. In mass racial mixture we have an example as it would be applied to all humanity, contrary to the resident diversification found in Nature that

has given the world its variety of species. After three thousand years of existence 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 civilizations when different races live together. Such diminishment would be the result in the West of the liberal mind-set, and demonstrates how creative norms in society require philosophical direction.

The issue of homosexuality is another where the mores of society can impinge upon the rights, freedom and happiness of individuals. Here we must distinguish between the homosexual as an individual and homosexuality as a condition. An individual who stutters, for example, cannot be condemned, which is not to say we must look favourably on the condition of stuttering. Society cannot condemn aberrant behaviour of any type when that behaviour is non-threatening and is victimless. That behaviour need not be approved but neither can it be punished, especially when the individuals concerned have no choice in being what they are. There are several diverse factors that go into making homosexuals, but what is coming more to light is the role played by heredity, since it is found that male homosexuality runs in families, inherited from the side of the mother. Placental changes caused by the number of previous brothers may also be a cause. If womb influenced, the homosexual as an individual is blameless, and to ostracize him or her for the sexuality given by Nature is morally dubious.

Contrary to Genesis 2:22, the basic plan for the human body is female, not male, a fact that should be evident from the beard, musculature and deeper voice of the adult male compared to the young boy. Testosterone is a sex hormone common to both genders, only the male has twenty times more of it than the female. The male receives two major doses of this hormone in his development, the first in the fetus stage that changes the genitals from female to male, and also the brain into being heterosexual. Interruption of this flow to the brain at this stage is the most probable origin of male homosexuality, which in addition to the causes mentioned can also happen if the mother is under stress at the time, and something similar in reverse with a female fetus to cause lesbianism. Attempts to change homosexuality in the adult, with punishment and “conversion therapy,” are therefore foolishly doomed to failure and cause an unjust imposition on the individual. A second dose of testosterone occurs at puberty, which completes the transition into the adult male.

The effects of a manner of conduct may be unknown until observed on a large scale, and to make a judgment on homosexuality as a condition all we need to do is exaggerate its occurrence in society. The condition at the individual level can then be judged a matter of degree. Any community composed entirely of pure homosexuals would last only one generation. If all humanity were so composed the same fate would befall it. Pure homosexuality on a mass scale would therefore make humanity less viable as a species. Like all conditions that weaken humanity, its morality as a condition becomes less certain and proclamations on its normality must be questioned.

Although blame cannot be placed on the individual, approval at the conditional level is another matter, yet we see in modern Western society officialdom’s embrace of rainbow flag, public displays and parades in macabre celebration of developmental error. Nature places a great deal of importance on survival of its species, as we see from the sex drive in all species and its strength in the young. Procreation and Life’s renewal is all-important, so we know when renewal is impeded that the denial of Life is in error. Such is homosexuality, which can be said to be “natural,” but it is a naturalness in the sense of mishap. Nature makes mistakes too.

Our last example judging existing moral beliefs considers a most divisive issue in modern Western societies, 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 random 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, so that families that are too large and 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*.

Part II - the Religion

At one time our total collectivity was our family, clan, tribe, nation, race or church. 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 corruption that always occurs with empires. 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 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*. It follows that 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 determining 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 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 the slavery of their time? 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 labour, that made slavery a less efficient means of production. Human advancement would therefore have been retarded by the continuance of slavery, and hence the moral recognition admitted against it, but we can be assured that without automatic machines slavery would still be prevalent in world economies 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.

From the above examples 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 rule, of democracy and learned authority, 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 that education system. 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 system.

‘World’ empires like the Roman, Persian, Ottoman, etc., and now the putative 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 continued expanding over Asia and we see today its continual expansion due to the remarkable growth of its economy.

The Confucian ethic of order and obedience has fuelled Chinese history since the beginning of the Han dynasty, 206 BC - 220 AD. Other religions had influence in China too, notably Buddhism that dealt with the afterlife, and Taoism that dealt with one’s well being, but Confucianism guided the social realm that included government, relationships among levels of society, ethical guidelines for maintaining social order, education and family Life. Central to Confucianism is the importance of the family, emphasizing respect children show to their parents, the high regard given elders that transfers to lawful authority figures, and an appreciation for learning, protocol and ceremony. Confucian practice became the characteristic world view of the Chinese and with it, by extension, the sense of belonging to a society and state, hence giving cohesion and collectivism to Chinese society. The authority of the Chinese state derives from it being regarded as the protector and embodiment of Chinese Civilization. China is a civilization state more than a nation state. Whereas in the West people see the state as a necessary evil, to be challenged by civil authority, media or church, in China the state has been seen as an integral part of Life, whose directors derived their right to govern from the ethical principles of Confucianism, with those directors tested for centuries in an imperial examination system.

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 in the form of empire.

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?

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 essentially 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 eventually 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.

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. It can also be *secular*. A modern 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 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 ideological cohesion, 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. The oldest existing civilization in the world today is the result.

The fundamental, enduring answer for Europe and the West is to give Western 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 mathematicians versed in Complexity Theory, 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 become hedonistic. A science-based “Imperative Council” would give a lasting moral infrastructure for a new worldview, the same as the Christian Church gave to pagan Europe. If provided, a new hope would be born and with it a new religion.

We can imagine that the future of humanity is one of prosperity and freedom, which is not to say that such a prospect is on our immediate horizon. Our more immediate future might well be one of world empire, with its dictatorship, injustice and all the poverty and oppression that implies. Can we look at the United States or China today and think with certainty that anything different is in the making? It does not have to be. A modified European federation of free nations is more in line with the future we prefer.

After the fall of Rome Western Europe consisted of independent kingdoms, free to develop concepts in national sovereignty. Individual freedom became enthroned with the French Revolution and English Parliament, in Magna Carta, Laissez Faire and the Rule of Law. This development was quite different in Russia where Vikings originally imported Byzantine autocracy, and this was followed by Mongol rule. The Tsars (Caesars) continued autocracy, to be replaced with Communist dictatorship that meant little difference. Unlike Western Europe there was never a time in Russian history until the present when the people experienced political freedom. Even present Russia shows the difficulty a free democracy has to arise, and similarly throughout much of the East, including China.

When political freedom does arise, however, it dies hard. That spirit still exists in Western Europe, exhibited in present populist movements and Brexit. Yet even in Europe it must struggle against the ancient shadow of empire now spreading across the globe, from China to America, and represented in the European Union by the ambitions of moneyed elites. Here is the revolutionary setting for a secular ideology to germinate the civilization required for an evolving humanity, which cannot be subjected to the dictates of authoritarian rule. Nor can human progress be fettered with bureaucratic directives, or by the selfish interests of elites. These are the temptations of a European Union, which must be resisted for a union of free nations, not an empire. If accomplished, Europe will become an inspiration to humanity, and enter a period of world leadership greater than its past. Additionally, the ideological vacuum left in Europe with the demise of Christianity has left its society open to acceptance of a secular ideology. Europe is therefore fertile ground to be the prototype for an Emergent World Order. An enduring world order requires secular belief, and a secular belief requires political authority. With an EWO the circle is closed: hope is established that is a realizable hope born from learning, and that enlightenment assures political validity. It is the hope of free nations in a world without empires or war or weapons of mass destruction. It is a world of racial and cultural diversity. An example for the globe, this will be the Emergent World Order required for an evolving humanity. Cosmos Theology will then become Cosmostheism, and 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 could very well come that embryonic beginning.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. Q: What is the Cosmic Imperative?

A: In the case of the Universe we cannot say that any obligation is manifest, but by considering the vastness of space filled with stars, billions of years of time and the fact of Life on Earth, we know that the laws and forces of the natural Universe combine to give Life and ever Higher Life. No spiritualism is implied. In the way we think of an object in the air as having a natural imperative to fall, we interpret the term to mean that the Universe has a natural imperative to evolve complexity.

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 combined 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, even of the brain composed of neurons.

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 whole populations have the same deep belief.

6. Q: The premise of your “religion” is wrong. Religion requires faith, not reason.

A: Yes, faith has been required for the great religions, like Christianity that grew from a “Dark Age” of extreme violence and deprivation. When people live in grinding poverty and ignorance, their hope of salvation must be established in the unreal because reality offers no hope. Personal circumstances can produce the same need, and people believe what they want to believe even against real evidence. This historical motivation changes as society improves. The need for blind faith vanishes, and if religion is not solidly founded its importance generally diminishes because people must then have real motives to believe. Only secular religion in the form of political movements can then survive as ideologies. If not provided, civilization declines. This did not happen in China because of Confucianism, a secular ideology.

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. 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. Atheists fool themselves in thinking they have no god. They do. Generally, their god is humanity in which lies their hope. But humanity is as subject to random regression as everything else, shown by the decadence of great civilizations when Cosmic creed is lost. Humanity is a false god. For the same reason the Universe cannot be a god either, but it has one saving grace: large numbers.

10 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.

11. 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, a world language, standardized weights and measures, 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.

12. 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.

13. 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.

14. 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, like gold. 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 democratic Council of Nations. World peace would be secured along with national identities.

15. 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.

16. 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 random 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.