



LOGOS
COSMOTHEISM
 A RATIONAL RELIGION
 by Wayne Macleod

I

With most aspects of our lives, when we wish to know whether a particular idea, belief or manner of thinking is correct, we generally take the trouble to search out factual support. If the belief cannot be verified directly by our senses, for example the atomic structure of matter, people have not been content to merely wallow in speculation and have undertaken ingenious methods to test their hypotheses. The rational method has been exceptionally beneficial, although we could still claim that sickness is caused by evil spirits because no one has ever *seen* germs make a person sick, and the evidence of their doing so is largely circumstantial.

Given the vast benefits of the reasoning mind, which everyone acknowledges from daily experience, the wonder is that any other manner of thought could explain the more fundamental nature of our being, yet traditionally metaphysical explanations of Creation, good and evil, morality and natural phenomena continue to hold sway over large portions of civilization. Among people who have lost traditional faith, ethics and morality have become relative, based on the needs of human beings in varying circumstances. Where the old metaphysical reasons for behavior are discredited, the humanization of ethics is most natural, for is not correct behavior instituted for the benefit of people in the first place? We may heartily agree that it is, except when human behavior is justified by 'happiness' we must first decide if the causes of 'happiness' are always moral. That people can live both happy and immoral lives appears evident, and the act of the martyr suffering for humanity challenges the modern philosophy: "If it is right for you, do it."

The purpose of this writing is to present a rational religion derived from nature. In the process we shall demonstrate that in matters which have fallen within the field of traditional religion there is no need to extend beyond this universe we know; show that the relativistic, liberal and humanistic outlook, which has largely supplanted traditional religion, can not only be false, it can be destructive; and present a rational basis for ethical behavior derived from simple observation and deduction. By no means is meant to convey that the supernatural is impossible. As revealed by modern science, we live on the surface of reality, with so little known of our actual existence that dogmatic proclamations of any sort are foolish. All that is asked of the reader is recognition that our only means of *proving* anything is through reason based on observation, or by extrapolations of the probable, thereby suspecting imagined experiences impressed on the emotions as revelations of 'truth'. We live in a natural universe, with natural causes either for good or evil that require no supernatural explanation, and as inhabitants of this universe our common sense should tell us we are duty bound to believe only what is within our realm of experience. The tragedy of traditional belief is that by a process of selection over millennia it has established the absolutes required for human society, while continuing to implement those absolutes on a supernatural causality. When this supernatural causality is undermined in an enlightened era, the absolutes are unpinned. Here we shall attempt to solve the problem of absolutes without traditional religion.

II

If we take a glass of clear, still water and slowly insert a droplet of ink into the centre with an eyedropper, the ink initially hangs as a globule of color with a few streaks of tint slowly spreading outward. The initial stage is one of concentration that needs for its appearance an outside agent, namely the person who deposits the ink. In time the globule will disappear because the ink will disperse evenly throughout the water, leaving a completed mixture in the glass. This end state needs no outside agent; it is the result of random action between the molecules of ink and water and can be predicted. The resulting mixture requires no intelligent direction, being an unavoidable and natural action happening on its own in time. This is an illustration of what we see occurring repeatedly in nature: the inevitable and natural trend toward dispersion, dissipation and randomization in time. Other examples are equally evident: a house becomes untidy because that is its more probable state without a diligent housekeeper, and when a porcelain plate breaks, its pieces are testimony that nothing we see or touch today will perpetually be as we know it, given sufficient time. A fence left to the random forces of wind and rain will eventually weather, and a machine without care will inevitably break down. Encompassed under one postulate, “Murphy’s Law” has best given this natural trend expression: “If something can go wrong, it will.” We shall give it a more rigorous definition in the *Law of Regression*: When change is inevitable without force or forces to impel or maintain, all order tends toward disorder. This is purely a law of probability since with inevitable change in time there are an infinite number of states to enter, where the number of higher states is limited and therefore less likely entered unless directed.

Closely associated with material randomization is energy disutility, known as entropy, which again is always expected in time. Nothing is more fundamental in nature than the inexorable tendency of a high energy state to change to a state of lower energy. The most common experience we have of this is a hot object cooling. The controlled flow of energy to lower states is how we make use of energy, for example, the steam in a boiler to move a machine, or the discharge of a battery. Even on the atomic scale, an excited electron will not remain in that state if it can fall to a lower quantum level and emit the energy difference as light. There is nothing mysterious about energy dissipation; it is just another manifestation of the logic in nature for everything to take the path of least resistance, and to continue until equilibrium is reached.

We can think of the amount of order in a physical state as being representative of the energy in that state, so a higher ordered state represents more energy than a lower ordered state. Obviously, if we wanted any particular sequence of numbers drawn from, say, 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9, there would have to be an input of energy to obtain it, which is not true of any sequence drawn at random. A higher ordered state therefore represents less randomness, i.e., one with less probability of occurrence purely by random forces, and since it requires energy to obtain its material realization is representative of an energy status. The higher the order the more energy is in its structure.

How should we understand the term “Creator” when applied to a mortal Universe that is inevitably running down? Should we discard it as having no meaning? Absolutely not, because regression *can* be reversed, only in very localized regions of space and time, although eventually all regions must succumb to their inevitable fate. The Earth is such a localized region. When all the conditions for life are considered their combined appearance seems improbable, except that the Universe is so vast all those conditions are bound to exist somewhere sometime. Then natural forces can operate to ratchet up complexity. This is the Creator: the Universe itself providing large numbers within which anything is possible. Inevitably somewhere sometime conditions will exist to produce life no matter how improbable. Such is the LOGOS: the understanding of a rational Universe.

Although the inexorable tendency of existence is the decline into less ordered states, as everyone knows high states of order do exist, usually constructed while their systems are *en route* to equilibrium. The ink blob does not immediately disperse evenly throughout the water but is moved by minute currents to form entertaining patterns, more complex than the initial ink blob. Chaotic clouds of dust and gas spread throughout the universe contract into stars and solar systems where life can appear. One of the first discoveries of spontaneous order was by Henri Benard in 1900, when a liquid heated in a dish portrayed a multitude of hexagonal patterns. Such instances of spontaneous order fascinate mathematicians researching Chaos Theory. Although when considering such examples material order is increased, they are open systems depending on an input of energy. We should remember this when considering human examples.

What we know as creation is the existence of ordered states, which means the expenditure of energy by nonrandom forces for its appearance, where nonrandom force means any force occurring in one direction more often than by chance occurrence. Although on the scale of the Universe all forces are chaotic, taken on a local scale forces can be directional. An analogy would be a weather pattern, which over all is circular and the direction of its winds is therefore in all directions, but at a particular, localized time and place the wind is felt coming from only one direction.

Since energy is absorbed in the procurement of higher ordered states, force is required for their realization, force being energy given direction. Thus, wherever we find an existing order we can be assured of nonrandom force or forces making it possible, even giving its origin. The occurrence of the initial glob of ink, for instance, could not be predicted without knowledge of the depositor's intention. The occurrence of a droplet of ink in a glass of water is highly improbable without some nonrandom force involved. Consequently, we could never expect the resulting mixture to reverse itself and separate into pure water and a condensed globule. If that should happen we would immediately suspect a nonrandom force acting, one perhaps dealing with ionization and an attracting electrode.

It is argued that chaos is equally the cause of creation. The complexity of a snowflake is created by multiple, unpredictable combinations of temperature, humidity and impurities that a droplet of water encounters when falling through the atmosphere. A jungle with its chaos of life is a less ordered place than a sterile desert, which changes little. Evolution is largely caused by changes in the environment, sometimes catastrophic ones, that are unpredictable and chaotic. Mutations, that give new characteristics, are completely random. All of this is correct, but we should note that in addition to the chaotic forces forming a snowflake there is surface tension on the droplet attempting to form it into a sphere. Nothing is more orderly than a sphere. Let us not confuse life with life's activities, as in the exuberance of a jungle, which are indeed entropic. The balance of an ecosystem is exquisitely higher than that of a sterile desert. To evolve, life must experience natural selection, which is a force tending toward stable adaptation. Examples where energy added to a system produces chaos, not order, would include water as compared to the highly structured order of ice. Compared to ice and crystals, liquid water is chaotic, but its energy is random. Molecular vibrations, that we know as heat, are in all directions. Extracting random energy indeed gives higher order. Disorganized energy gives disorganized results. There are two ways that energy can be applied to existing order, let us say in the form of a house: by setting the house on fire or by adding a porch. The first is a case of random energy added; the other is one of more creative use. It is in the latter sense that the Law of Regression is denied. On the social plane the same principle is found. Crime requires energy, that is selfishly motivated and means disruption of the "public order". Another human analogy would be dancers on a floor. Without music the couples simply stand. If a foxtrot is played, without knowledge of ballroom dancing the couples bump each other in a state of chaos. But if a rule is given, that they all should dance counterclockwise around the floor, then a state of order is achieved and one higher than when they were merely standing. For an understanding of creation in nature it is more correct to see creation resulting from the interplay between order and chaos, not of ordering forces alone. But we have no control over the forces of chaos, only our response to them, so in human terms of our daily lives to emphasize the chaos side of creation, although intellectually satisfying, is of little practical concern. Therefore in the remainder of this essay it is the ordering side of creation that will be emphasized.

Examples of ordering forces in nature are legion. Atoms, molecules and crystals are held together by the interaction of repulsive and attractive electrical and nuclear forces. The solar system is an ordered arrangement between gravitation and inertia, as are the galaxies. The evolution of life into higher forms is torturous, made possible by natural selection where only the fittest survive and all else is exterminated. To bring common elements together and form a new organic cell would be an impossibility ranging in the billions to one if there were no guiding forces involved. The birth of a baby requires discomfort and effort on the part of the mother, and its proper rearing as a child requires much care. It is evident that in fields of human endeavor, whether manufacture, social progress, thought or art,¹ anything man-made is always accomplished only after a struggle, by people who were willing to accept the respective challenges. All of these are examples of ordered states and their energy requirements.

¹ This notion of effort in artistic creation considers the time spent by the master in perfecting his/her talent, and the forces in nature that gave it being.

III

□

From our understanding of material nature we can glean an insight by analogy into human nature. □ What is felt by people to be good behavior is behavior that acts as an agent in maintaining or constructing a higher ordered humanity. □ A good person is obviously one whose activities are helpful in fostering the well being of his/her family, friends, community and society, all necessarily being creative pursuits working against the Law of Regression in the human condition. □ The giants in this category are popular leaders when social corruption and tyranny are defeated, inventors and discoverers who give a better material existence to mankind, thinkers who elevate our understanding, and moral philosophers who admonish our animal natures. □ And since behavior that is *good* is an agent in the promotion of higher order, manifested in an improved humanity, the process is only possible through effort, that is, by the expenditure of energy.

An analysis of *morality* now becomes clear. □ The human being has inherited much of the instinct and passion of the animal, that was indispensable for survival of the animal but in people can be the cause of waste, destruction and neurosis. □ Evolution means the development of life away from the position where survival is a matter of chance with a high degree of dependency on the environment. □ It is the process whereby animals gain a measure of freedom from the arbitrariness of nature, and modern people have gained or are gaining complete mastery of their environment. □ The question, then, can be raised whether the evolutionary process has at last ended, with the present day human its final product. □ Control over external nature has simply signaled the end of animal evolution; what remains is *human* evolution, meaning control over *internal* nature. □ Moral behavior means nothing more than this inner control over the emotional, animal part of one's nature, requiring energy as in the effort needed for self control when one's anger has been provoked. □ Humanity cannot raise itself further on the evolutionary scale by devising ever more sophisticated gadgetry; that can only be done by the force of internal *will*, which signifies cerebral control over the passions that are dictatorial in the animal, and thereby gain a freedom unknown to the animal kingdom. □ Greed, lust and egoism are not rational drives; they belong strictly to the emotional, and hence animal, sphere. □ The purely carnal person is one with little cerebral control over feelings and desires, similar to an animal. □ Being closer to the animal, the immoral person has a lower order of character than the virtuous.

Not to be understood is that morality means the elimination of emotion, that would robotize the sensitive human experience. □ To make an understanding of this point concise, we may take the example of hunger. □ Man's need for food is physical, and to deny that need with lengthy fasting is destructive of the body. □ Although destructive, fasting is not considered immoral, some sects even practicing it in their religious excesses. □ Obesity, on the other hand, is also destructive of the body, but in addition carries the suggestion of moral weakness. □ Why this difference if both are destructive? □ Whereas the ascetic practices cerebral control over his/her body, the obese has surrendered to animal craving. □ But this is only to say that obesity is immoral, not that the ascetic is acting morally when practicing restraint beyond the limits of practical judgment. □ In the same sense, to deny or subvert the emotional side of life is also destructive. □ Just as modern people cause destruction to their external world when they exercise control without respect for nature or environment, causing dire consequences for themselves, so do they with regard to internal nature. □ Discipline over the emotional self means *channeling* rather than denying the instincts inherited from our evolutionary past, and in this manner creative pursuits can receive immense impetus derived from emotional involvement. □ In the same way that we can bring greater beauty to external nature with parks and gardens, by controlling our inner nature we can also beautify, and express those cultivated feelings creatively. □ Thus there is a great similarity between the broadest interpretation of morality and *culture striving*. □ Both are expressions of inner mastery unknown to the animal world.

Evil behavior, conversely, denotes behavior that acts in accord with the Law of Regression, i.e., behavior that is selfishly motivated with no social benefit, that is parasitical and associated with the lack of personal achievement. □ It connotes no effort in creative pursuit; a thief produces nothing except misery for those whose labor has gone into provision. □ Evil people by definition inevitably cause harm and destruction, and since without creative effort the fate of the world is regression, they are agents of decay acting in time. □ This understanding of evil is not a discovery of *Cosmotheism*, being intuitively felt since the dawn of humanity. □ The Egyptian god of evil, Set, was also the god of *chaos*. □ The meaning is not that the Law of Regression is the *cause* of evil, but rather that evil is our interpretation of human activity conducive to disorder in the world. □ The mind is constructed to respond to such behavior with feelings, not analysis. □ Good and evil are concepts of the mind, as is beauty. □ Just as we interpret a high degree of spatial order as beauty, we interpret agents in the Law of Regression as evil.

Thus is explained the nonexistent need for personalized good and evil that people have come to believe derive from a spirit world. □ Good' behavior is simply behavior that contravenes the Law of Regression in human affairs, that acts in harmony with universal creation, is order constructing and must by necessity require energy in the form of effort and struggle. □ Evil' behavior is that which takes the easy path toward disintegration probable in time. □ There is nothing spiritual or metaphysical in this understanding, there is no need to invoke 'higher' powers from an unseen world; the understanding is an act of simple, everyday intelligence, not of profound and unfathomable faith. □ Of course, we could still assume mysterious powers behind good and evil, but once explained rationally such views become superfluous.

IV

Having dispelled the spiritual interpretation of 'good' and 'evil' that traditional religion teaches is the essence of our being, we might ask: What is the meaning of life? Every human has asked this question at some time. The ability to ponder such mysteries is one of our human gifts that place us above the animal. We need wonder no more. Here the question will be answered.

First we must define the Creator. Myth religions have viewed the Universe as a static, once and for all time creation. The Earth, Sun, Moon, the stars, the fish in the sea, birds and mammals, and Man² were born in acts of creation, and left to remain as they are for eternity. Separate and above them, an anthropomorphic divinity creator is viewed distinct from Nature, so that a direct act of the divinity is seen to be supernatural, meaning above the natural. Now will be revealed the Reality, and it is this: Man, the Universe and the Creator are not separate. They are all parts of the Whole, and the Whole was Self-created. We live in a Self-realizing Universe where creation is on-going; it has never stopped. Creation is not static; it is fluid and dynamic, like a living being. Therefore we should not think of the Universe as a creation, but itself, the Whole, as being the Creator. The tangible Universe includes the blazing suns of the firmament, the interstellar gas from which stars are born, all of Earth's creatures, Man, etc., all are the material manifestation of the Creator. We all belong to the Whole, and the Whole is the Creator. The Universe is on going and Self-created.

(Note: In presenting the following, commonplace words such as "Urge," "Path" and "Purpose" are taken from Dr. Pierce's original *Cosmotheism* in reference to the Creator, although these are human terms not normally used in reference to the Universe. Such practice is necessary for a popular religion because to describe the intended concepts more accurately would require scientific language and probably mathematics not used by average people. We should not put a human meaning behind such words, however. The various manifestations of self-creation evident over great expanses of space and time are nothing more than the consequences of natural forces working on large numbers.)

In the development of any living being there is the purpose of fulfillment. So is there with the Creator. In the Universe there is the internal Urge toward the One Purpose. From the tenuous gasses of the void have come suns and planets, and from the Earth have come plants and animals. In Man the Urge is manifest also, for from Man will come Higher Man. All are on the Path of Life leading to the One Purpose: the Self-realization of the Creator. This is the meaning of Man's being. Man is on the Path of Life to the Self-realization of the ever evolving and dynamic Whole.

Before Man each part of the Whole was blind: the gasses of the void could not foresee the suns that they were to become. The Urge carried the Whole along the Path, and each part of the Whole, though blind, has served the Creator's Purpose. Man has served the Creator's Purpose in this blind way through instinct, but also in another way, in an enlightened and conscious way.

In the Path of the Universe to Self-realization blind experimentation is performed. Multiple types of suns are spread throughout the galaxies, from brown dwarfs to black holes. In the development of life on Earth over ninety percent of all species that ever existed are extinct. There have been multiple forms of fish, insect, bird, reptile and mammal, with an evolutionary progression seen in time from fish to amphibian to reptile to mammal. Amongst the entire array of species there were some who were not mere branches on this tree of life; they were on the main trunk of that tree and led the way to higher life. Through them the Universe took steps toward Self-consciousness and Self-Realization.

² The term *Man* is generic. *Woman* means 'man with a womb'. Changes in the English language, such as from "chairman" to "chairperson," are linguistically pointless and do nothing to promote gender equality.

Man is on the threshold between unawareness of the One Purpose and a state of all-seeing Consciousness. Not everyone will cross this threshold. Those who attain Divine Consciousness will ascend the Path of Life to Higher Man. Reason will illuminate the Path for them and give them foresight; it will be an aid to the Creator's Urge within them. Those who do not attain Divine Consciousness will be diverted from the Path by false reason. The difference between true reason and false reason is this: true reason seeks to guide Man's actions in accord with the consciousness of the Whole, while false reason does not.

Men and women of true reason seek order in all things, and shun chaos. They are pleased by harmonious relationships, by progress on the Path of Life, by truth, beauty and nobility, and hate all that is contrary to these pursuits. They have within them the Creator's Urge, which burns brightly in some but less brightly in others, for although the Urge is within all things the state of consciousness of the Whole is not equal in all. It is more highly evolved in living beings than in the non-living, in Man more than other animals, and in some individuals more than in others.

Regardless of the Urge within all, truth, reason and beauty do not always prevail in the life of Man. Then come forth the self-seekers, the liars and those of base motives when falsehood is held in place of truth, ugliness is preferred over beauty, when disharmony rules and lies are heard everywhere, and evil deeds are seen yet no one can act against them. In those times the thoughts of men and women are only of themselves, and through amusements, eating and drinking, games and parties, stupefying intoxicants and every form of self-indulgence they divert their thoughts away from the meaninglessness of their lives. Some attempt to give direction to their lives by accumulating wealth, by wielding power, by becoming skilled in some art or craft. But unless these purposes are related to the Creator's Purpose they are without merit and the lives of those who pursue them are without meaning, and may as well never have been.

Death comes to the man or woman without Divine Consciousness, living matter becomes non-living matter, meaningless life become meaningless death and even the personality is annihilated. Eternal nothingness is the destiny of those who are spiritually empty. But those who have attained the state of Divine Consciousness partake in the immortality of the Whole, because their consciousness resides with the Community, and just as the Community lives to serve the One Purpose, so do they, for all eternity.

The Community of Divine Consciousness is the Community of the Awakened Ones, of the Climbers on the Path of Life, of the Ordained. People who would become members of this Community are called *Cosmotheists*. These are the people of the Rune. They are known for their knowledge, consciousness, discipline and service. By consciousness is meant the state of mind of the Awakened Ones, of those who have gone beyond knowledge and are aware of their being part of the Whole. Like knowledge, consciousness requires receptiveness, diligence and purity of motive.

Discipline comes from the Community and from within. Without it there is no mastery, but with it the People of Divine Consciousness may fully serve the Creator's Purpose. Service is in the new way of Divine Consciousness, not in the blind way of sub-man and of inanimate matter. The new way is the way of Higher Man, of the Awakened Ones; it is the way of true reason. The People of the Rune are fully *conscious* agents of the Creator's Purpose.

These, the People of Divine Consciousness, are the beginning; they are the first crossers of the threshold between ignorance and awakening; between sub-man and Higher Man. They are ordained to overcome false reason and to put to an end all that would contravene the Creator's Purpose. And this is our summons: put your life into the service of the Cosmos. Abandon folly and the corruption of self-seeking nothingness. Enter into the Awakened Ones' Cosmotheist Community to partake of our joyful certainty that the Creator's Purpose will be fulfilled, and lay with us the foundations of a new world. Cross with us the threshold of Divine Consciousness.

V

For rational understanding of the Universe we need not interpret "Creator" in a metaphysical sense, for when existence can be explained by natural causes there is no need for mystical speculation. To presume otherwise leads to the difficulty of the monotheistic religions regarding evil, shown in the case of life because if life is the ultimate destiny of the Universe and this destiny is directed by a Spirit in any way, we could ask why such a Spirit would bring forth inferior life dangerous to higher life, such as disease. At this time of writing virologists are worried that the current Bird Flu presently killing birds the world over will mutate into a human-to-human transmissible disease, as did the 1918 "Spanish" Flu. If that should happen researchers will look at the virus through microscopes and admire its molecular structure. It will appear to

be wonderfully “designed” for its nasty work. And, of course, it will be. But to presume a designer behind it would be ridiculous. We know the “design” would be the result of random mutation occurring among a large number, a mutation that got lucky by chance. If we presumed an intelligence behind that occurrence we would have to presume the same behind throwing dice. Modern physics has found probability to be at the very heart of Nature. Mass and energy are two sides of the same coin so at the subatomic level they can both be treated as particle and wave. We do not think of mass as a wave but when very small, such as of the electron, position can only be known in terms of probability, unlike on our macro scale where position and motion can be calculated very accurately using Newton’s equations. This is how Nature is built: mass gives certainty. It is difficult to see how any Spirit could determine such a Universe.

The problem with crediting a Spirit with Creation is that any spirit by definition does not obey natural laws, and therefore must be apart from the natural Universe. But the Universe, by definition, includes everything existing in space and time. Nothing can reside outside the Universe, because if it did it would be included in the Universe. We can resolve this conundrum by assuming the Universe itself to be endowed with the ability of Creation, in which case natural laws can never be circumvented. We could still think of a Spirit inhabiting the Universe, but not metaphysically, a view that does not deny the possibility of spiritual existence. Present astronomy, for instance, postulates the presence of dark matter and dark energy, termed “dark” because it cannot be known from the usual methods of detection. In usual parlance it would seem to fit the definition of a spirit world, but even it does not interact with the realm of normal matter, except through its gravitational effect, and therefore cannot be credited with Creation. So we cannot assume that a spirit world, or what we would interpret as a spirit world, cannot exist, but only that a metaphysical explanation is most unlikely for our natural Universe. To illustrate: if we were convinced that we were in the presence of a ghost at a time when our teacup rattled, we might presume that the ghost caused the rattling. We might even use the rattling as proof that the ghost existed. But if at that same time a locomotive went by our apartment we would more rationally associate that event with the rattling, and have reason to doubt the presence of the ghost although that presence could still be claimed. Absence of proof is not proof of absence. In a case like the teacup the likelihood of a natural cause is so overpowering of a mystical cause that it can be easily accepted, but where natural causes are not so evident, and even counter-intuitive, their acceptance is more difficult. The duty of science is to make them evident, which it has done with great success in many cases and is continuing to do, most notably today with Chaos Theory. The point to be made is that science still cannot rule out the existence of a spirit world. It can only suggest the unlikelihood of that realm influencing our natural realm. As humanity gains more control over its physical existence this point of view will become more accepted. To presume the loss of moral responsibility with that acceptance, however, would be a mistake, as this essay is intent on showing.

Since it is on the fallacy of spiritual causes that myth religions are based we can apply our understanding to judge them, and while we are at it we may as well judge nonreligious moral beliefs and practices too, and modern schools of conduct. What, for example, can we make of the Biblical charge: “But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it.” (Genesis 2: 17). Surely *Cosmotheism* must proclaim: Let us eat from that tree, and eat heartily! Again we read that God cursed Adam: “In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread.” (Genesis 3: 19). *Cosmotheism* shows that Man has no recourse but to toil if he/she is to be a moral and responsible creature, since what is good can only be achieved through effort and struggle. A moral code that denigrates work as a curse is hardly engendering of a prosperous mankind.

If we take Christianity as it literally reads, a full acceptance of that doctrine is most questionable. Its whole inference, its pacifism and renunciation of the cares of this world as preached in the *Four Gospels*, amounts to an abandonment of the struggle of life. What other meaning can we give Christ’s teachings to not worry about our living (Matt. 6:25, 26), to give away whatever wealth we possess (Matt. 19:21), to not resist injuries (Matt. 5:39, 40), to love our enemies (Matt. 5:44) and his admonishment of the family and marriage (Luke 14:26; 20:34, 35), including all sexual relations (Matt. 19:12)? *Cosmotheism* teaches that ethical behavior is inseparable from struggle, especially that struggle necessary for the highly ordered state of life and its promotion. Hence we *must* concern ourselves with our daily living, work to improve our material existence and not be frivolous with disposing wealth, 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. And with each of these duties is associated effort; that is unavoidable with the construction of order.

Christianity is no different from other mystical doctrines in preaching renunciation and pacifism because as mystical doctrines they 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. Fortunately for society renunciation and pacifism have been the preserves only of saints and eccentrics, not of the more responsible elements of a population, because from the *Law of Regression* we can be certain that if these tenets of myth doctrines had been followed when the masses of faithful faced cut-throats and con-artists, the world would long ago have been overrun by evil.

On a mundane level, the connection between the Law of Regression and ethical behavior is evident. A chair is an ordered material arrangement, that like all ordered arrangements subject to random forces in time will deteriorate. Given a hundred, two hundred or a thousand years the chair will eventually become dust. When we are children we are taught (or should be taught) to have respect for someone's property, so if a child deliberately breaks a chair he/she is scolded. If a child attempts to repair a broken chair he/she is commended. Thus arises our understanding of proper and improper behavior. Clearly breaking the chair is in flow with time and for that reason is easy, even tempting for a mischievous child. Repairing the chair is an 'upstream' action against order regression and for that reason requires effort. But in examples like the chair someone's life is affected and from such experiences it is easy to derive that good and evil are subjective and depend on one's point-of-view. Perhaps the broken pieces of chair could be used for kindling to heat someone else's pot of water. Such arguments are always from restricted vision or from not considering the greater order to be achieved. If the subjective viewpoint is insisted upon, then let us look from the Cosmic viewpoint. We gain superior moral insight by having a more Cosmic perspective than emotional subjectivity. The demolition of a house may be against the wishes of its owner, and if its destruction were due to vandalism we can sympathize with the owner's judgment that the act was evil, a judgment entirely different if it were for public renewal. A thief may very well consider stealing to be good, indeed, this author met a youth who was so convinced, but his subjective understanding is void of any understanding on the needs of society and what would happen if everyone were a thief.

To understand the relationship of evil to the Law of Regression it is first easier to remind ourselves that error is an agent of regression. Obviously mistakes do not improve matters. But *the effects of error are the same as the effects of evil*. If the chair were broken by accident rather than by mischievousness the end result would be the same. In examples like this the connection between the Law of Regression and evil is nothing more than trivial. In our more general being concerning our relation to society, an understanding of the connection is more enlightening.

Why has sexual relationship required religious consecration in all societies the world over? Why has marriage been deemed moral? More pointedly, why has unlimited sex been condoned within the marriage bond yet condemned outside of it? If condemned in one instance and condoned in the other it cannot be the act itself that has religious concern. One obvious function sex has is procreation. The choice of a marriage partner is made with more discrimination than of someone for a 'one night stand,' with many factors entering the decision. If marriage were not a social institution and the renewal of generations were entirely open, this element of selection would be removed and population renewal would be more randomized. Marriage pairs people according to abilities, interests and socioeconomic status, the best marrying the best, and when children must be supported by the family with no support by the state, selection in marriage tends to prevent dilution of the most viable offspring. Apart from men abandoning their function and responsibility, which is to support woman, marriage is a force acting against the Law of Regression in the eugenic caliber of a population. Acting thus against time, marriage has become a *moral* custom.

A poignant moral decision facing modern society will bring our standpoint into further focus: the issue 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 understanding of the Law of Regression we can seek a resolution using this enlightenment:

It is evident that life manifests an ordering process and should generally be viewed sacred, with the exception of parasites that are themselves detrimental to life in obvious accord with the Law of 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 unrepaid 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 behavior. Just as the Universe gave us life we have a duty to return life to it.

The function of traditional religion has been to give people a place in the cosmos and to direct behavior in accordance with laws conceived to be universal and natural. With the end of traditional belief this point of reference is lost; people then become their own point of reference, and ethical behavior depends on what promotes the rights and happiness of individuals. Like traditional religion, a rational religion need have no basis in humanism, and may reach conclusions contrary to the requirements of individual happiness. Competition in sport, politics and business, for instance, places stress and strain on individuals, but we cannot condemn competition because of such undesirable effects; these are to be expected in the human struggle.

Normally, in our everyday lives, judgment on behavior depends on the effects of that behavior. If an act causes harm to more people than it helps, it is considered unethical. If the level of harm caused to a few is higher than the amount of good bestowed upon many, the act may still be considered unethical although a qualitative assessment becomes necessary. Religion is not exempt from this 'common sense' view of ethics, as in the Buddhist/Confucian/Christian Golden Rule: "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." It would seem that 'common sense' is the perfect guide, except that we must wonder if 'common sense' is a universal guide for all cases. To find out, we'll analyze three issues perplexing modern society, each hinging on our treatment of people: the abolishment of capital punishment, homosexuality and multiethnicism, to see if their acceptance possesses internal, logical difficulties. If they do, the Golden Rule breaks down, and it will not be surprising if we find they are in accord with the Law of Regression. Instead of immediately analyzing each in the light of that law, however, we'll pull them together under one label and then see how that general category is or is not a product of time.

Capital punishment is an issue certainly directed against the personal interests and happiness of criminals. A case can be made against it when there is the least doubt of guilt because the punishment is irreversible, but with increasing sophistication of forensic techniques such doubt is becoming less problematic. What of capital punishment in cases where there is absolute certainty of guilt? Should the known guilty have their lives respected at public expense? Opposition to capital punishment in such instances is based on the notion that human life is sacred, and since criminal life is also human life, criminal life is included sacred. Presumably human life is considered sacred because it is intelligent life, a position that does not explain why intelligent life should be sacred when that intelligence is used for evil purposes. If an individual's value system does not permit control over greed, egoism and passions of all description, might we not question whether the life of that individual is on an animal plane rather than a human one?

From a different perspective we might say that what is sacred is humanity. Criminal life is part of humanity, but a part is not the same as the whole. In varying degrees criminal life threatens humanity. But something sacred cannot threaten something else that is sacred, because that would mean it is evil, which is impossible. Therefore criminal life cannot be sacred. What the humanist fails to understand is that destroying evil can never be evil, irrespective of that evil taking human form.

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 instance, cannot be condemned, which is not to say we must look favorably on the condition of stuttering. Society cannot condemn aberrant behavior of any type when that behavior is non-threatening and is victimless. That behavior need not be sanctioned 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.

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.

Yet another issue that impinges upon the rights and happiness of individuals involves race. In the modern era cultural nationalism no longer exists in Western countries, these being open to immigration irrespective of racial origins. One justification for multiculturalism is its diversity. Races around the world have blended together in various proportions to produce more variety than had there been no such mixture, the same as a painting with its mixture of colors. What is true internationally multiculturalists would promote nationally. 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 colors are continuously mixed, producing a toned down graying 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.

The issue of race mixing, however, is more than one just of logical difficulty; it is one affecting our lives and society and therefore of worldly importance. To understand why, we must first understand that any race is a unique blend of particular characteristics, and that there exists the possibility of favorable and unfavorable combinations of characteristics depending on their incidence in a racial population. To take one example, musical ability has a relationship with mathematical aptitude, but a renowned performer needs also an artistic temperament, so the appearance of such performers in a population depends on those incidences of aptitude and temperament. This applies not only to musical ability, of course; *all* ability and genius on which social progress depends is the result of individuals born who are manifestations of traits found in their populations, and their birth depends on the incidences of those traits. Technical invention, therefore, is not likely a matter of intelligence alone, and neither is the progress it brings. Multiple factors are involved, carried by the race, and this inheritance can be disrupted. If those incidences are high in one racial population, for reason of climate, migration or any factor with a selective effect, and that population mixes racially with another not having those same incidences, there will be a diminishing of ability and genius in the resulting mixed population. We would have a racial example of the Law of Regression. This has nothing to do with the acceptance of individuals: on how “nice” they are or on beauty and the usual factors influencing mating. It is purely a matter of population genetics – of numerical ratios.

An obvious method of discovering whether such talented populations exist is simply to look at past accomplishment over six thousand years of history, which reveals Europe to be the birth place of the world’s greatest civilizations, of the Western centered around the north Atlantic and the Classical centered around the north Mediterranean. We are accustomed to thinking of ancient Europe as a place of barbarism, but that is not entirely true. Western Europe was the scene of monumental megalithic sites contemporary with ancient Egypt, of which Stonehenge is the most famous, and Cro-Magnon cave paintings are among the first stirrings of artistic expression anywhere, showing that Europe from the earliest time has been a focus of human achievement. Our modern world is the product of almost exclusively European genius with some contribution from China, the latter always being an area with a much greater population. The Classical World gave us geometry (Euclid, Apollonius), trigonometry (Hipparchus), the beginning of calculus (Archimedes, but lost), the study of anatomy, botany and zoology by scientific observation (Aristotle), the use of concrete and the jurisprudence of Roman law, yet the knowledge passed to us from that civilization constitutes a pittance of all that was, the rest being lost in the fires that destroyed the Museum of Alexandria. Before the birth of democracy in Greece, nations were ruled by supreme despots, sometimes very cruel ones, and outside areas of Western influence today they still are. Since then Western Man has gone from a Dark Age to leaving his footprints on the moon. Only a few centuries ago the world was unexplored, we knew nothing about our celestial universe, nor about the cause of sickness. Before the emergence of the West there were no symphonies nor even orchestras, there was no free press, no free citizenry, no state with a written constitution, no concept of the rule of law, not to mention no automobiles, airplanes

nor any knowledge of electricity and its many appliances. The world's greatest art, whether in painting, sculpture or music, is European. Western academic achievement has ranged from astounding developments in physics, mathematics, engineering, chemistry, biology, medicine, geology, archaeology, economics, etc. to knowledge on the formation of bubbles and snowflakes. The very concept of *rationality* in science is European.

None of this is to say that individuals of other races cannot be creative in the rational sciences. That is the mistake in logic of the racist: what he/she sees of a group is applied to a component of that group, so if the Black race has not been notable in scientific accomplishment, for example, he/she assumes no Black individual can be a scientist – a false conclusion. Equally we must acknowledge the fallacy of the liberal who thinks of an individual as representative of a group, such as indicating a Black scientist as proof that the Black race is equally endowed as any other with the ability to produce scientists. A conclusion about the group is drawn from what is seen of a component. This too is not logically correct.

There are reasons for the prominence of Europe and its racial offshoots on the world stage, mostly stemming from the harsh conditions in prehistory when Europe experienced an Ice Age. The people who survived those conditions were not the mentally and physically feeble. The descendants of those hardy Neolithic hunters are today's Nordic and Germanic peoples, who have migrated all over the world to establish prosperous nations, including the ancient Dorians and Latins who were originally migrants from central Europe into Greece and Italy. When the ice sheets began to melt, farmers from the Near East spread agriculture up Europe's river valleys that was adopted by the former hunter-gathers, and on this prehistoric population fell Aryan invaders from southern Russia who imposed on their subjects their language, paternalism and form of religion, as conquerors everywhere do. The result has been a very dynamic region of the world, and to lose such a heritage through race mixing would indeed be an example of the Law of Regression. In today's multicultural West that threat exists. This is the stock from which the Community is to be drawn.

The many examples of racism around the world in diverse cultures seem to support the view of universal racial consciousness, contrary to the notion that racism is purely a White phenomenon resulting from colonialism. It is therefore the individuals who step out of the norm and seek sexual partners from races not their own who must be viewed as having been socialized, who at some time in their lives have learned preference for the alien, rather than the racially inclined having learned preference for their own. Again this view would seem to be supported by the facts, since the known statistical fact is that people marry partners with characteristics close to their own, including looks. If intolerance is learned it seems to be learned very easily, suggesting that it is the multiculturalist who must overcome an innate tendency, a development that is not only possible but probable in caring people when feelings of racial guilt are taught. So, from a moral point of view we might ask: which is more moral if morality is the exercise of control over our animal selves: yielding to racial instinct or restraint of racial instinct? At first glance it may seem that the anti-racist has the moral high ground, and indeed he/she makes this claim, loud and clear. But again we must remember the fine line between control and suppression, how control can be exaggerated into suppression and how suppression can result in our destruction. The control of sexual passion is generally considered moral, for example, but to suppress it to the point of not breeding is foolish. Analogously, to desire the preservation of one's biological as well as cultural heritage seems a proper exercise of instinct, well in accord with the creative variation of nature, whereas the denial of that desire, that leads to the passing of a great heritage, must also be seen foolish. We should never forget that the instincts given us by Nature are for our survival. The mistake of the multiculturalist is seen from it being the sense of oneness with one's partner and children that leads to genuine feelings of *love*, whereas the more carnal appetite is satisfied with the titillation of difference, making racially mixed relationships suspect of being on a more animal level.

Along this same line we might ask about the "new world order" espoused by modern politicians, and the whole issue of world government premised on the ideal of "multiethnic nations". There can be little doubt that with developments in transportation and communications, the evolution of economic blocs and the danger to the world posed by nuclear weapons, that the globe is approaching some form of supranational government, but does this government necessarily need the ideal of "multiethnic nations"? Could not world government be a development among ethnic nations as well as "multiethnic nations"? World government, should it ever arise, need not be an imposition on nationhood, but the type of world order we are marching toward under the United Nations with plutocratic sponsorship surely will be. The tragedy it poses is that it will be a realization of a declining civilization, not unlike the Roman Empire that similarly melted together the nations of the ancient world. The current push toward the same nationless form is

viewed the most obvious and natural undertaking once the requirement of a supranational structure is recognized, but that it will also be a degenerate manifestation of a dying world we know from the fate of the Roman Empire.

The issues of abolishing capital punishment, of acceptance of homosexuality and multiethnicism show how some trends in the modern world possess internal difficulties when placed under examination, with little reference made to the Law of Regression, but there is a common thread through them all: they are *liberal* issues. The essential premise of each is human happiness with emphasis on the individual, on his/her rights and privileges, but as was shown, a rational ethic need have no basis in a purely humanistic consideration. We may deplore the sacrifice of life in war, which says nothing about the morality of allowing a nation to be overrun by tyranny. Individual welfare cannot be the highest good when the collective welfare must take precedence. From the philosophical principle of utilitarianism (the greatest good for the greatest number), to expect the individual to sacrifice in service of a greater and more enduring collective cannot be improper, irrespective of his/her rights and happiness. But the sanctity of the individual is the unstated premise of modern liberalism, an emphasis suggesting diminution of collective interest without which no society can survive. The actual meaning is randomization of the forces propelling society and direct connection to the Law of Regression. In the modern world, liberalism has become the *philosophy of decadence*.

The trend to disorder, as a universal tendency when there is no contravening force, is evident in people's *psychological* disposition with the march of time just as much as in the physical aspects of nature we have considered. As with fruit, with too much ripening it becomes rotten, liberalism has been a valuable historical movement in the Western world in the promotion of liberty, where it was realized that true freedom is only achieved with self discipline, but with emphasis on the individual, where his/her 'happiness' is paramount, it is not difficult to see how this same liberalism could degenerate into a libertine outlook with its eventual manifestation in hedonism. And just as in physical nature, whether considering the sophisticated idea of entropy or our lowly ink experiment, the end result of time's randomness is equalization, so is there an analogy with liberalism. Where social equality is attempted in the striving of the disadvantaged we see a creative performance, equality to the liberal is a state that he/she is willing to promote with the reduction of the higher to meet the lower. The real achievements of liberals, whether in leveling government programs or those from a live-and-let-live attitude, result in an exhausted plane for all; their emphasis on individual rights and issues makes them catalysts of destruction actually prejudicial to the humanity they so favor. Apart from crusading humanitarians, liberals simply acquiesce to the easiest solutions. They support the natural course, and consider the natural trend 'progressive' because it seems inevitable, lending their weight to the corrosive action of time.

VI

The lessons of the Path lead to an understanding and value of all living things: of the variety of animals, of the races of Man, and the varying qualities of individuals. Through the Urge came the ordering of the non-living, the highest ordered becoming living, and the Urge continued the ordering of the living to the higher levels of consciousness. The ordering continues. All matter, living and non-living, is ordered in a hierarchy: animate above inanimate, conscious above unconscious. The Urge is toward higher consciousness; the purpose of all material things is the implementation of the Urge in service of the One Purpose; and the value of each is its potential for serving the One Purpose.

Our understanding will serve as a guide in evaluating all things. Some have taught falsely that all things, being of the Whole, are sacred and inviolable. They may be of good will but their understanding is limited, and their teaching is contrary to the Creator's Purpose. For Man is not a spectator but a participant, and every part of the Whole lives by violating other parts; every animal consumes other forms of life. It is only the Whole that is inviolable, only the One Purpose that is sacred. The parts of the Whole come and go; they are subject to the eternal process of Creation, which annihilates some, preserves some and transforms some.

Others have taught falsely that it is Man that is sacred and inviolable, and of one kind, who stands aside and above the process of Creation. On the contrary, without serving the One Purpose Man's life is without value and can even be an abomination, a defilement of all life. Thus people are ranked in value: First are those with Divine Consciousness who walk the Path of Life with sure foresight, who have crossed

the threshold from Man to Higher Man and knowingly serve the Creator's Purpose. They are the Awakened Ones. Next in value are those of goodwill and awakening consciousness. They are of the *Cosmotheist* Community. Next is the stock of them from which the Awakened arise, those of the same race-soul, for they collectively are the reservoir of Higher Man from which the Awakened are drawn. But members of this reservoir are also ranked in value. Those who are uncorrupted by false reason, who are of goodwill, who have mastered themselves, who have great capacity for knowledge, who are of strong constitution, are of higher value than those who are corrupted, indifferent, self-seeking, servants of alien masters, weak and ill formed. All of the latter who, even though of the stock from which the Awakened arise, cannot claim value by reason of the stock alone. For they may threaten through evil action the One Purpose if they are corrupted by false reason and of ill will, and also through weakening of the stock if they lack capability for discipline or knowledge or are of poor constitution.

The process of Creation is the process of developing the Self-consciousness of the Whole. Its way has progressed from blindness to foresight, from unguided groping to the threshold of directed progress. Because its way has been groping the Creator has followed many channels, the Urge has taken many directions. In some channels the current of progress has been slow, in some rapid. Some channels have ended in stagnant ponds; some ponds have dried up altogether. In other channels that current has been rapid but has gone askew; reason has developed without consciousness, strength without discipline and action without service for the One Purpose. Thus we are to understand the diversity of the forms of life.

The world is full of species that have branched from the main evolutionary tree to fill their niches; some continue to evolve along their branches, some have ceased to evolve and some have become extinct. Only Man is on the main trunk of life, not merely a branch. Similarly, the races of Man are due to the Creator's blind groping; only one, the stock of the Awakened, is on the Path of Divine Consciousness. But other currents also run and the danger still exists of being swept into a false channel, of emptying into a stagnant pond. And so measures must be taken against all that would weaken the stock of the Awakened, against the disease organisms that plague sustenance, and especially against lesser stocks that threaten corruption by mixture.

The stock of the Awakened Ones has reached the threshold separating the unconscious way of progress from the conscious way, the threshold that when crossed has all our values changed. In an age of imminent consciousness hostility to the stock of the Awakened Ones has mostly served to advance it, like the wolf strengthens its prey by pruning away the weak. In an age of the Awakened Ones' consciousness their stock will prune itself, to better serve the One Purpose because it will be done with foresight. But at this threshold the greatest care must be used; its crossing is a time of danger, because the old way no longer serves and the new way still awaits implementation.

And these are the qualities that Man shall value: First, conviction of the One Purpose. Second, strength of reason, for with its possession the more effectively can the Creator's Urge be implemented. Third, strength of character, which is the ability to act with the nature of Higher Man. Fourth, physical constitution to serve well the One Purpose. These are the ways in which Man shall consciously serve the One Purpose: Our stock shall be preserved, without mixing with the blood of other stocks, for each stock follows a different course along the Path of Life. We shall increase the number of our stock and make every land where it dwells free from the danger of mixing. Laws and institutions shall be arranged so that in each generation numbers of offspring will be born to men and women in proportion to their own value: the best shall engender the most and the worst none. We shall act as the wolf and winter, to prune and select, and do all the above as conscious agents of the Creator's Purpose.

With the demise of Christianity Western people have turned upon themselves for motivation in life, upon purely human needs and desires that allow them to identify with all others who have the same motivation. The result is a culture common to humanity, leading to a new morality and an age exhibiting the irreversible *Zeitgeist* of decline. Already the prediction is that by mid century America will no longer be a White country, nor Western Europe by century's end. Often forgotten in Western society when showing respect for foreign races and cultures is that we should also show respect for our own. That is not done with the policy of multiculturalism, since by definition that policy means the end of White nationhood. Western Civilization is passing into history as did ancient Rome, but just as Christianity grew from the wreckage of Rome so in this milieu will come the Community – as a *remnant* from the West composed of men and women who swim against the decay of time. The purpose of the *Logos* Community church is to extract from the Western World a nation of people who understand its concepts and are willing to adhere to them in service of the Cosmos. From the ruins of the West will be built a new civilization with a new ethic based on rational perception. Since rationality implies a higher degree of cerebral finesse than the

exercise of mythical and mystical belief, its people will be self-selected for this quality. The act of acceptance will sift from the general mass those who can rationally contemplate the greater implications of their existence. Where, when and how the new nation will be founded must be a matter for speculation at present. With developments in space technology it may not even be on planet Earth. For now we must content ourselves with advancement of the Community amongst the decaying remains of the West.

VII

Human institutions are of the Whole and cannot be perfect while the Self-realization of the Whole is incomplete. They can only serve the One Purpose imperfectly. While Man lacks consciousness society must reflect that blindness, and may even become an instrument of regression contravening the Creator's Purpose. But with the Awakened Ones society should reflect their consciousness and their true reason; it should manifest in its institutions the Urge toward the One Purpose.

Survival, right striving, order and progress are the proper determinants of human institutions. Accordingly, the Community must protect itself from greed, malice, negligence and ignorance. It must practice vigilance against famine and disease and against all who would harm it either physically or spiritually. If someone teaches that the mixing of stocks is permissible, or that everyone is of equal value, or that human life has no purpose, then the Community shall outlaw and expel that individual. If someone's behavior or lifestyle leads others astray or weakens the Community, then that person cannot remain in the Community, for the Community must protect itself against indiscipline as much as against falsehood.

The Community must preserve the knowledge gained in each generation and impart it to future generations, and facilitate the gain of new knowledge with libraries, schools and laboratories. Knowledge must also be imparted outside of institutions through customs, celebrations and festivals. Above all, the Community must direct knowledge, for it is not any knowledge for which its members strive; it is knowledge that leads to understanding of the One Purpose. Festivals and rituals must likewise raise consciousness with demonstration of grace, skill and strength. The Community must glory in the self-mastery of its members, and value their achievements so that all will strive to match or surpass them.

The Community itself is an instrument of service, and every institution must manifest that reason for being. It is not merely the sum of its members, institutions and material assets; it is an organization requiring coordination of its components. It must judge its members in such a way that the order of the Community best serves the Creator's Purpose. In other societies people are ranked by wealth, age, popularity, skills, etc., but the *Cosmotheist* Community is different in that its members are judged according to their value to the Community in attainment of the One Purpose.

There are four Community institutions: the family, the academy, the corps of guardians and the hierarchy, to be instituted while the Community dwells amid the decaying remains of Western Civilization. By "family" is meant a man and woman united by the Community for begetting and nurturing children. In it all remnants of female bondage, such as name changing, will not exist. In the academy, youth are to receive training and scholars are to carry on their work. The corps of guardians must defend the Community from both physical and spiritual enemies. It shall be composed of members ordained to a life of service to the One Purpose, of the most disciplined, the most conscious and the most capable. The hierarchy is the institution by which the Community holds itself to the Path of Life. It is a community of priests, of individuals who may also be scholars, guardians or workers in other fields of service. By the hierarchy the Community is kept moving ever upward, toward new knowledge, higher levels of consciousness, greater strength and discipline, all for more effective service to the Creator's Purpose.

Once the Community has a world of its own it will continue striving towards Higher Man by establishing a Council occupying the pinnacle of all learning institutions, that will be a part of government to guide and direct the democratic assemblies of the nation, but will have no powers except the power of persuasion. That Council is to ensure through eugenics that children born in each generation will manifest the qualities best serving the One Purpose more strongly than the preceding generation. It will awaken more fully in each member the Consciousness of the Whole. Thus the Community will evolve, but not blindly. Its institutions will be guided by an ever-growing sense of direction, with an ever-clearer vision of the Divine that is the destiny of those who follow the Path of Life.

In ages to come this Earth and Solar System cannot avoid the eventual fate of all existence, which is death in recognition of the Law of Regression. Our Sun is destined to explode, and a billion years before

that its heat will eradicate all life on this planet. But long before then our species will have learned survival beyond Earth, and have spread its seeds among the Cosmos. Intelligent life need not succumb to regression. Similarly among many other worlds and many others species of our galaxy and Universe, so that all communities will merge in essence, like the cells of a single body, into a *Cosmic Consciousness* of the Whole. Thus, many billions of years in the future, will be actualized the Self Realization of the Creator.

Although not denying the possibility, *Logos Cosmotheism* makes no assertion about the existence of a spirit world in the sense of life after death, nor is it necessary.□This is left for the individual to decide because it belongs purely to the realm of speculation, and people will always speculate upon the unknown, even more upon the unknowable.□Whether or not there is life after death bears little infringement on rational belief, for we have reached the same conclusions taught by the major religions concerning ethical behavior.□Religion can be defined as a belief system characterized by the hope of salvation through fidelity to the belief. *Cosmotheism* is no different in that its hope is for the new world of Higher Man, and of that certainty we can have absolute rational conviction by following its teaching. But if speculation about any 'other world' should prove true and one has honestly pursued the rightful path, surely the Pearly Gates will not be closed to him/her because of improvable and subjective, usually ridiculous, points of dogma.□It is in its premise that *Logos Cosmotheism* departs from traditional religion, in essence representing a departure from the thinking of the Stone Age.□At the same time, a rational perspective which demonstrates that human freedom and 'happiness' do not serve as a basis for ethics is in direct opposition to liberal humanism.□What both the religious mystic and acquiescent liberal fail to impress on us is the resolve inherent in culture striving.□When the establishment of that striving is assured, then the paradises offered by traditional religions will become a realization, not in a world of fantasy but in the one world of importance: the world we experience.

LOGOS Cosmotheism is an adaptation of *Cosmotheism*, by the late Dr. William Pierce, combined with *Rational Ethics*, a chapter from the book, *Dynasophy*, by Wayne Macleod, which can be found on website: www.trafford.com/robots/04-1493/html. *Cosmotheism* is written in three books found on the *Cosmotheist* website: www.cosmotheism.net.