

How God Created the Universe

A Testament to the Supremacy of Identity

W A Dunkley

Copyright © 2019 W A Dunkley
All rights reserved.

Distributed by Smashwords

This ebook is licensed for your personal enjoyment only. This ebook may not be re-sold or given away to other people. If you would like to share this ebook with another person, please purchase an additional copy for each person you share it with. If you're reading this book and did not purchase it, or it was not purchased for your use only, then you should return to Smashwords.com and purchase your own copy. Thank you for respecting the hard work of this author.

Ebook formatting by ebooklaunch.com

Dedicated to the supreme power that created the universe and the hope of its
acknowledgment in the mind of man

Contents

[Chapter 1: The First Principle](#)

[Chapter 2: The Monumental Denial](#)

[Chapter 3: What is the God of the Universe?](#)

[Chapter 4: Things, Time, Identity, and Change](#)

[Chapter 5: How God Created the Universe](#)

[Chapter 6: Finality and Nonlocality](#)

[Chapter 7: The God of Reason](#)

[Glossary of Terms](#)

The First Principle

Humanity seems to emerge into existence and a world, unknowing and destined to leave still to a great degree, unknowing. Much of what one encounters, from the nature of fellow humans to the structure of existence itself, serves as a cloche and barricade to ultimate reality. The smallest fraction among them will cast aside the human proclivity for fantasy and delusion, find and cling tenaciously to a single absolute. Armed with nothing but this one absolute, they assault the barriers to knowledge and understanding. They may have no academic, intellectual, or scientific status or even any allies in their quest, but it is they who are the true philosophers.

While it is said to be difficult to define, metaphysics is simply the study of existence, as such. It is a search for universal truths and a comprehensive and fundamental understanding of existence. The principle of noncontradiction, for example, is a principle of being as such. It is germane to the study of economics, but it is not a principle of economics per se; it is relevant to the study of physics, but it is not a law of physics per se. The law of noncontradiction, which states the law of identity in reverse, is a law of metaphysics, of existence as such, and is pertinent to everything.

Metaphysical study should begin with an examination of the axiom and ask the question: "What may one hold to be true of reality, by virtue of the fact that one knows that all A is A?" Obviously, metaphysical investigation should not require special knowledge, limited to a certain field and, in fact, should not constitute specialized knowledge, as it is general and applicable to all study. Today, unfortunately, metaphysical examination and pondering is most certainly an exceptional effort. Metaphysical investigation itself has become heterodox. It is entirely out of fashion.

Instead of rational metaphysical inquiry, there is metaphysical deconstructionism serving only the purposes of making meaningful philosophical thought impossible. While it deceives the practitioner into believing they are winning a debate over reason itself, it is only their own minds that they are negating. Philosophy has degenerated into the art of obscurantism. It has become a discipline worthy only of the attention of confidence men, shyster lawyers, politicians, and other professional liars. This does not refute the meaningfulness and importance of a true metaphysical inquiry and discipline.

True metaphysical investigation must begin with the axiom. It is the fountainhead of all human knowledge. It cannot be replaced with empirical science. Nor can it be replaced with religion, which is just primitive, arbitrary, and rationally unjustified metaphysics. The sad state of this noble and monumentally important pursuit of truth is exemplified by the fact that the very word "metaphysical" is now often seen as synonymous with a belief in magic. Metaphysical questions are associated with mental illness. Perhaps seen as a threat to religious fantasy, abstinence from serious metaphysical inquiry is practiced with religious devotion.

While it may be primarily used as an alternative term for metaphysics, the two fundamental branches of philosophy, metaphysics, and epistemology, the study of the means by which we acquire knowledge, may be combined and referred to as first philosophy. Metaphysical matters are inescapable. The attempt to separate epistemology

from metaphysics is foolish with a predictable nihilist result because, in the end, it divorces epistemology, and therefore the very pursuit of knowledge, from reality. It is also significant to note that when the metaphysical philosopher embraces the axiom as the supreme law of existence, this constitutes a fundamental epistemological claim to knowledge. The absolute ground of existence and knowledge are discovered together, and the fact that one is discovering both must be recognized. It is not enough for the axiom to be regarded as a principle of reason. It must be recognized as metaphysical truth; it must be acknowledged as ontological or it is not meaningful as a principle of reason.

So, these branches of philosophy, metaphysics, and epistemology, in fact, must be approached together, as they are intimately related, and it would be impossible successfully to address one separate from the other. They are, in fact, founded on the same first principle. The first principle of reason is also the supreme law of existence. It could not serve as the first, without being acknowledged as the latter and the axiom could not be known as the supreme law of existence without being acknowledged as fundamental knowledge. The law of identity, standing and regarded as just a principle of reason has had a calamitous effect on philosophy and the human mind. Knowledge is grounded in a metaphysical principle, and it must be regarded as such. The absence and rejection of metaphysics make knowledge impossible.

It is an incontrovertible truth that all A is A. Things are what they are. Everything else that exists must possess self-sameness. This, the law of identity is the most basic axiom. An axiom is a self-evident truth; it proves itself. Axioms are also sometimes referred to as necessary truths because it is rationally inconceivable that they could be false.

There is an incalculable number of necessary truths, but there is only one basic axiom, the law of identity. Many commonsense assumptions are thought to be necessary truths but may, in fact, not be true at all. The failure to distinguish between self-evident truth and commonsense assumptions has contributed to the erosion of man's intellectual confidence while conversely, his worldview has become more sophisticated. The axiom is not an assumption, but when widely held commonsense assumptions turn out to be false, as they often have, the axiom is seen to have fallen.

Self-evidence declares identity. Any axiom, if indeed it is a true axiom, is such because it asserts self-sameness. This is the monistic view of axioms. The law of non-contradiction simply states the law of identity in the negative. It states there can be no non-identity. The most basic example of a contradiction may be expressed as A is not A. It is by no means trivial to point out that this is also the most basic example of a lie.

Such a blatant lie seldom stands naked, but it is the vulgar fraud that steals beneath the glorified loose-mouthed insinuation of mysticism. It is, therefore, poetic irony when the critics of non-contradiction fall back on a childish puzzle fittingly called the liar's paradox. If one wishes to understand the absolute corruption of the mysticism that grips humanity, it is found in the recognition that the embracing of contradiction is not only a lie, but that it is the fundamental falsehood that all lies mirror.

It was with profound irony when the British philosopher Bertrand Russel lamented "one of the painful things about our time is that those who feel certainty are stupid, and those with any imagination and understanding are filled with doubt and indecision." This same

philosopher once referred to philosophy as “on the whole a rather hopeless business.” Knowledge, justifiable certainty, is undoubtedly not discovered as easily as the false confidence of the fool. Humanity, nonetheless, need not be doomed to observe mindless fools follow mindless fanatics as the more intellectually talented among them stand idle and endlessly confused. This is the result of the failure of philosophy as Bertrand Russell and others seem to be implying, but never explicitly accepting blame. It is philosophy, nonetheless, that has brought this condition to humankind, and philosophers such as Russell have done little to change this. It is the failure of the philosophers, the result and perhaps the purpose of such philosophy that has turned any claim of certainty into the delusion of the feeble minded.

Once comprehended and understood, nonetheless, the real claim to, and ground of knowledge is an idea that could be grasped even by the less intellectually gifted. The self-imposed thoughtlessness and entrenched stupidity that has dominated humankind has been the result of self-deception, much more than a lack of intelligence.

It is the function of philosophy to formally and explicitly formulate the axiom and recognize its significance and meaning. Historically, philosophy has failed, and humanity is offered mindless indulgence and mystic fantasy as the only alternatives to unfulfilled, intellectual effectiveness and potency. This has constituted the most appalling and catastrophic failure in human history and experience.

At least, nonetheless, a latent, implicit acknowledgment is and must be present for humans to think. Necessary truth is implicit in any rational assessment of perceptual information. This implicit common sense has never been completely transformed into knowledge. Unable to achieve its proper status, this common sense, loathed and attacked, can only depreciate and decline. This can be seen in the horrendous intellectual environment, especially in a social or political atmosphere or controversy.

Even among those who present well-reasoned ideas and arguments, when viewed and scrutinized in the broader context of the philosophy or religiosity they embrace, would make such reason groundless and unprovable. Reason is embraced and employed in some matters while other subjects are left to fantasy and mysticism, seemingly unaware that one negates the other. For one who understands this, the abject absurdity of this compartmentalization is truly disheartening. It is not a matter of embracing the right beliefs, for it is not right to just believe. Humanity must rise above belief and discover knowledge.

Objectivity is rooted in the fact that the axiom is the most supreme law of existence. The first principle can provide us with a simple, provable concept of objective reality. The objectivity of reality simply means that things, primarily, are what they are. The objectivity of reality is grounded in the fact of identity. It is significant to note in this context that calls to accept objective reality in hard to accept circumstances, are often expressed with an axiom such as “well it is what it is.”

Even if one assumed that one is in a world such as what was portrayed in the fantasy film, *The Matrix*, a world where all perception is somehow manipulated would not obliterate our basic metaphysical concepts. It would still be a rational world. Identity and causality would still exist. Even the concept of material objects in such a world would still have a reference to something that exists, though something very different than what

we thought. Existence nevertheless, would still be objective. If one lived in such a world, then one lives there, and that would be an objective truth. As mystics have stated with contempt, identity and the law that asserts it is immutable. This is what objective reality means within the context of the philosophy of Identism, the philosophy presented in this work, and it is the only conception of it that it embraces. Things do not exist independent of thought and feeling. Thought and feeling exist; they exist as factors.

Even the existence of subjectivity is objective. One's thoughts, hopes, or prejudices, while they may not represent the exercise of objective reasoning, are part of reality and possess identity. Whatever its causes, and effects they may have, the existence of subjectivity can only be so because its existence concurs with the fact of identity.

The formulation of the axiom is the simplest but most profound product of human creativity. That simple act of creativity provides the most basic premise of reason. It is this modest unassuming but certain truth that elevates man's notions about the world to the lofty status of knowledge (i.e., truth held with justifiable certainty.) All knowledge, even firsthand perception, is ultimately validated by this first principle and the existence of identity.

Logic and perception are both founded on the same first principle of metaphysics. Logic might be characterized as applied metaphysics, but much to the discontent of empiricist, so too, could science and the scientific method. Axioms are basic, straight on, assertions of identity, while logical truths are more complex assertions of identity. If a notion, thought to be a logical truth, cannot be reduced to an assertion of identity, then it is not a logical truth.

Identity exists, but the axiom is a human creation. It exceeds even the innovation of money, something used as a medium of exchange and store of value, as the greatest invention in human history. Without a medium of exchange, advanced civilization would be impossible, but without at least an implicit embrace of the axiom, of logical truth, no human reason is possible. Any evaluation of perceptual information involves the employment of logical truth. Interestingly, historically, necessary truth is perhaps the only thing that has been despised, scorned, and ridiculed more than money.

Criminals and mystics have managed to take both of these greatest of human values and twist, pervert, and manipulate them into weapons of control and plunder. Nonetheless, the concept of identity has been embattled by the mistakes of the well intending. Such is the case with those who have held identity to be synonymous with existence.

Defining identity as existence obliterates a critically important concept. The Identist concept of identity, the view that the axiom is ontological; that is; describes, asserts, and proves the existence of self-sameness; differs from this tragically erroneous classic conception. This view holds that A is the identity of A, that identity is another word for existence.

It has been maintained that to hold identity as a part of reality is much like seeing identity as a coat of paint applied over a house. This is not a good analogy at all for the existence of self-sameness. Identity is not an afterthought. The notion that the Identist concept of identity is Platonic, implying some sort of abstract world, is false. The concept of identity is abstract only in the same respect that all parts of existence are abstract. They are parts

mentally abstracted of the totality of existence. The Platonic notion of some domain of a ghostly abstract outline of reality is particularly inapplicable to identity. There is nothing that can be abstracted from identity. Identity is irreducible. Identity exists in the only reality, the reality that it creates.

Identity is not a product of the things that possess it. The things that possess identity, everything else that exists, is ultimately a product of identity. A much better analogy than a coat of paint would be to compare identity to the atoms that comprise the house. One can strip away the paint; yet, one would still have a house. On the other hand, you could remove paint, doors, or windows, whatever parts you remove, the house would still contain atoms and so too, would the parts that you remove. Self-sameness is even more fundamental than atoms; its removal is rationally inconceivable.

The law of identity does not grant us omniscience, but it does tell us something that is true of everything. If we fail to acknowledge this, then we know nothing. Consider such a phony esoteric statement as “the law of identity breaks down at the quantum level” or “the subject transcends the naive of human reason.” One could use lost socks in the washing machine as evidence of an unknowable world of contradiction, and it would be less sophisticated, but no more idiotic. This is arriving at a contradiction in one’s thinking, and then blaming reality. This is the ultimate intellectual dishonesty and corruption hiding behind academic status. This is baseless arrogance more like a spoiled child than a scientist or intellectual.

The critical importance of the axiom’s relationship to knowledge is stated in metaphoric eloquence with the expression “the buck stops here.” However impeccable or imperfect, it does not matter if the information we acquire about reality and our world comes from the daily newspaper, the internet, firsthand perception or a little voice in one’s head coming from little green men from outer space. All our knowledge and even the very concept of truth itself ultimately rest on the axiom. It is not necessary to know everything about the means by which we acquire knowledge to prove this. All that is necessary is the recognition of the immutability of the axiom and the existence of self-sameness.

To constitute an unwavering foundation for knowledge or even justified opinion, however, the axiom must be uncompromisingly acknowledged as an all-inclusive immutable absolute. The ultimate implication of just one adulterous fling with absurdity is the abdication of any claim to knowledge. Even the concept of truth itself is obliterated when the identity principle is betrayed. If one imagined a fantasy domain of non-identity, logic and mathematics would be nothing but mind games with completely arbitrary rules but also seeing would by no means justify believing. When embracing the delusion of embellished contradiction, often peddled as a limitless possibility, one possibility that must be surrendered is knowledge.

Knowledge begins when the axiom is formulated, acknowledged as incontrovertible, but also, it must be recognized that it asserts the existence of identity. If one does not acknowledge that all A is A, then one has relinquished the claim of any knowledge. Even firsthand perception becomes ambiguous when the axiom is not embraced with absolute certainty. Furthermore, it is not just knowledge in the absolute sense that will fall. Any claim of likelihood will also sink into this bog of uncertainty.

The best of Western culture brought to the world the ideals of reason, individualism, and intellectual and economic freedom, but they were never fully realized and correctly defended. Because of this failure and the natural hatred of these values among the corrupt and because these ideals stand in opposition to the ambitions of the criminality of the state, there are devious and powerful criminals working to eradicate what remains of Western culture from the planet. This could be the price of Western philosophy's failure.

Regardless of the fact that the influence of reason has been relatively brief and latent weighed against the domination of mysticism, the embracing of contradiction, its effects have been profound. While the understanding was flawed, the foundation of man's greatest achievements and the accomplishments of Western culture is the first principle and identity philosophy, philosophy that acknowledges the axiom as absolute truth and profoundly important. It is no coincidence that one preceded the other in history. This causative relation was demonstrated twice, first in ancient Greece and then in Europe, fostering the age of reason. Islam also had a brief enlightenment as it was influenced by Aristotle and other Greek philosophers. Apparently, explicit identity philosophy emerged from implicit common sense that was temporarily liberated from religious superstitions.

Humanity, however, has never really discovered knowledge, for the validity of one's claim to any knowledge or even justified opinion is ultimately lost when the axiom is betrayed. All opinions become equally arbitrary and baseless. If one decides the identity principle is not true in some mystical domain, then one loses the justification for assuming self-sameness exists anywhere. This is not a hypothetical implication of failing to acknowledge that all A is A. It is a precise description of the collective state of the human mind. The originality of this writing is evidence that knowledge and comprehension of identity are not inborn. To the contrary, humanity has struggled to understand necessary truth, its meaning, and implications.

All A is A. Only a corrupt mind that is divorced from reason will fail to acknowledge that the law of identity must be universally true and all-embracing. This fact is not a meaningless truth. Philosophy's greatest historical tragedy is the failure to recognize that meaningless truth, truth with no reference to reality, is a monumental contradiction. This was the failure to recognize that the axiom is ontological.

Assertions are true in the respect that they agree with the part of reality to which they refer. Meaning, reference to reality is a prerequisite for truth. The notion that the assertion "A is A" does not state anything about "A" is shallow and false. It does not assert anything about "A" that distinguishes it from anything else because what it declares of "A" is true of all things. The identity principle asserts identity; self-sameness is the existing thing to which the axiom refers.

It is incontrovertibly true that a dragon is a dragon, but yet, there are no dragons. What then is the truth of the statement? The statement "dragon is dragon" does not assert and prove the existence of dragon; it asserts and proves the existence of self-sameness. Logical truths are complex assertions of identity. The mathematical statement "2 and 2 are 4" may be reduced to "1 and 1 and 1 and 1 are 1 and 1 and 1 and 1," and this asserts a truth even if you are counting dragons. The truth that it asserts is the truth of the existence of identity. Logic asserts identity. The statements 2 and 2 are 4, A is A, all logical truths and all axioms reference the same fact, the existence of identity. Their application is

diverse and universal because the thing to which they refer is the essence of everything. All logical truths are complex assertions of self-sameness. It is the fact of the existence of identity that grounds logic to reality.

The law of identity is the supreme law of existence, but it does not govern the universe. It is the existent thing to which that law refers, identity, which rules the universe. Contrary to assertions such as “laws govern the universe,” laws govern nothing. The apple doesn't fall from the tree because of the law of gravitation; it falls because of the existence of gravitation. Newton's law of universal gravitation is a description of something that exists; it describes gravitation. Whether it is warped space, gravitons, or something else, his law, nonetheless, refers to something that exists and so too does the law of identity. But while Newton's theory may be a flawed description of something that is complex and conditional, the law of identity is a perfect description of something that is absolutely simple and unconditional.

Once the contradiction of meaningless truth is exposed and dispensed with, it becomes clear that the identity principle proves the existence of identity. The fact of identity's existence is the fact that hinges reason to reality. The result of not acknowledging this fact is the detachment of logical truth from reality and rendering reason mute without ever having to deny its “truth.”

Truth itself follows the axiom into irrelevance. This is mysticism's most devious, insidious and corrupt achievement. The failure to acknowledge that the axiom is ontological, not just a principle of reason, is catastrophic because its acknowledgment is indispensable in its role as the foundation of human knowledge. All axioms, all logical truths, ultimately reference the same monistic fact, the fact of the existence of identity.

The denial of the existence of self-sameness leaves humanity hopelessly uncertain. The postmodernist nihilist mystic seems to be fully aware of this when reason is described as “the weighing of notions against imaginary ideas.” This is an attack on human knowledge of deadly sophistication, aimed at the very heart of reason. Most certainly, nonetheless, reason is not the weighing of notions against imaginary ideas. It is the weighing of ideas against the incontrovertible and universal fact that the mystic dreads, the existence of identity. The existence of self-sameness and the ultimate reality it implies is what these delusions and fantasies seek to escape.

It is the axiom itself that proves the existence of identity. This is the essential recognition that has been lacking. It is this fundamental absence that has detached the human mind from reality. It is this wanting fundamental knowledge that could unify metaphysics and epistemology and thus, reality, to the mind. The axiom provides the most basic knowledge of existence, the existence of identity. No true knowledge is possible without this foundation.

One may know nothing else about what is on the other side of the universe, but one can know with absolute certainty that whatever is out there, that is what is out there. It must possess self-sameness. In this respect knowledge is primarily *a priori*. Yes, even empirical science in this fundamental regard is *a priori*. Empirically derived knowledge must be founded on that which can be known, and only be known *a priori*, the existence of self-sameness.

The validity of perception and the fundamental truth of reason are both founded on the first principle and what it asserts, the existence of identity. Only identity can serve as the foundation of knowledge. Any other claim of an underpinning is a fraud and any notion that knowledge does not require such a foundation is equally false. When the axiom is betrayed fundamentally, choosing consistency over inconsistency becomes an arbitrary choice. Without the underpinning of the existence of identity, logic itself will often be seen as an arbitrary choice that is inconvenient and imposing.

Empiricism cannot save the human mind from the failures of rationalism. Science and humankind cannot run from the imposing metaphysical questions, with all their social, ethical, and political implications. Such issues cannot be successfully addressed if a basic understanding of existence and the essential basis of knowledge is not comprehended. Empirical science, rational metaphysics, human freedom, and civilization with live or die together.

What social, ethical, and political system is possible and appropriate for the mindless, the blind, and the deluded? Such a humanity is just sheep for the control and slaughter of whatever criminal gang can prevail. Common sense cannot escape the creeping mysticism that demolishes and devours sensibility, scientific objectivity, and advanced views of the world and the universe.

The law of identity is the simplest of human principles, but its true and profound meaning remains latent and undiscovered. Within this vacuum, it is the claim to human knowledge that remains concealed with this undiscovered absolute. For this absolute is the fountainhead of all else.

The Monumental Denial

Proof is that which supports the truth of what one is asserting. Proof in the absolute sense is that which proves absolutely, that what one is asserting must be true because any alternative is impossible. There may be relatively little one can know with this level of certainty, but the existence of identity most certainly can be held as immutable and, as it happens, must be. Without this recognition, there is only the prospect of intellectual chaos and confusion. This is simple, basic, and incontrovertible. Notwithstanding humanity's accomplishments, the grim state of humankind, human culture, and humanity's tenuous and ultimately fraudulent claim to knowledge is a powerful and disturbing demonstration of the ultimate meaning and implication of this failure.

As this failure demonstrates, this rationally indisputable knowledge is not innate. It comes from the axiom and a recognition of its meaning, the existence of identity. Once confronted with the fact of the existence of identity, it is only by virtue of the human mind's capacity for self-deception that identity could ever be denied, and usually, this denial is implicit, not unambiguous. "Denier" has become a demonized term, but surely the failure to recognize and acknowledge the immutability of the identity principle and what it asserts is the ultimate irrational denial.

In contradistinction to the historical mistake of rationalism, however, this knowledge is not the product of some inner light or intrinsic knowledge. It is the knowledge gained from the axiom itself; it is the axiom that asserts and proves the existence of identity. No set of empirical facts can ever extrinsically prove that which is proclaimed by the axiom.

Without the fact of identity, nonetheless, there will never be confidence and justification for calling anything a fact. Contrary to the claim that the axiom is somehow supported by extrinsic facts, that we know that A is A, because we observe the structure of reality, the proof of the axiom is intrinsic. Trying to prove the axiom extrinsically puts the cart hopelessly in front of the horse. If it is not acknowledged as self-proving, then the identity principle can never be extrinsically proven. Such is the state of the human mind.

Even the truth of that which is self-evident, the very truth of self-evidence, is grounded in the axiom. Without the axiom, even self-evident perceptual evidence of all else would not constitute knowledge. Hypothetically speaking, not even empirical omniscience could extrinsically prove the axiom. If one had empirical evidence of everything, save identity, the recognition and ascendance of this information to the status of knowledge would still require the fundamental awareness of the immutability of the axiom and the existence of identity.

Perception is not the thing perceived. When dealing with the mystic's claim of some alternate form of knowledge or truth, it is important to make this distinction. If a tree falls when there is no one around, then there should be the presence of sound waves. Sound, however, as an element of consciousness would not be present if there is no one to hear. This is not negated by mind, physics indifferentism, the view that what we subjectively know as consciousness is the sum of the physics that constitutes it. The physics that constitute sound waves would be there but the physics that constitute hearing would not.

However we may obtain information, no information we may acquire about reality is exempt from the first principle. To reveal a fallacy or misconception as such, it is often necessary to examine it in a broader context. To do this, however, one must first acknowledge that existence does not contradict itself, that it possesses self-sameness. Mysticism is an attempt to escape this scrutiny.

Mysticism is a revolt against the law and concept of identity, a revolt against reality. Mysticism is the antithesis of identity philosophy and, as such, is driven to destroy its opposite. Sinking to the bottom of their sewer, beneath the embellished variations, mysticism is the embracing of contradiction, of non-identity. In an epistemological context, it refers to the notion that knowledge can be founded on something other than identity. Mysticism is a belief in non-identity. Nihilism is a kind of mysticism, for to reject the self-evident fact of perception, or at least sensation, constitutes a rejection of identity and the embracing of non-identity.

Whatever diverging, and often violently competing, fantasies embraced, the metaphysics of mysticism is the notion that existence is contradictory and irrational, that it does not correspond with the first principle. Abdicating any claim to true knowledge, mysticism must choose between nihilism or a pretentious, conjured alternative to knowledge. This fabricated claim of higher intuition feeds upon the limitations of human understanding and self-awareness.

Exemplifying the often-latent workings of the human mind, once a man was resting in bed by his wife watching television. There was an attractive young woman on the television show they were watching. She seemed familiar to him, but he couldn't place her. He could not remember whom she reminded him. His wife, also watching, made the remark that for some reason she did not like this young lady, but she did not know why. She said she was certain it was not jealousy, but there was something about her she just didn't like. Well, about that time the man realized who it was this young lady reminded him of. It was his mother-in-law. She didn't look like her; she just had a manner about her that was similar. The man, having some measure of commonsense and wisdom, never told his wife of whom this young lady reminded him.

As illustrated by this true story, the workings of the human mind are often concealed and not completely understood. One may have hunches or insights while not being explicitly aware of the reasons. In this context, it is important to note mystics do not hold a legitimate monopoly on this intuitive mode. This kind of insight is not proof or even genuine evidence of some mystic awareness outside the realm of reason or perception. If one has a feeling or intuition, it is imperative to acknowledge it as such. A rightful seeker of truth must always strive for the intellectual rigor necessary to uncover the hidden reasons behind such insight. It is by this means that one may discover whether a hunch or insight has any claim to legitimacy or rightfulness. Without such rigor, all one really has is unsubstantiated prejudice.

It is critical to our claim to knowledge that we understand the axiom is ontological. The existence of self-sameness is what the axiom tells us about reality. This, however, is all the axiom, in and of itself, tells us about existence. Identity is all it asserts and all that it accounts for. Just as necessary truth is monistic, so too is *a priori* knowledge. It tells us only one thing about reality, but what it tells us is absolutely critical. Despite the monistic

nature of this knowledge, its application is enormous. It is so tremendous that it is easy to be unaware that it is ultimately just one fact that is being referenced.

Knowledge without experience, *a priori*, is monistic and has remained latent in the mind of humankind. Aside from the existence of identity, our awareness and understanding of the universe are ultimately derived from perception. Perception and the human mind are not infallible. A delusional mystic may really hear a voice in his head, but this does not mean he is really hearing from god or little green men. The presence of feeling, sight, sound, etc. is self-evident proof of their existence.

Perception is sensation acknowledged as information about reality. Sensation is, to the one who senses, self-evident proof of the existence of sensation. The existence of sensation is proof that something exists even if one assumes that sensation is all that exists. Common sense assumes this surely even in the mind of a child or an animal. However, this proof implies acknowledgment of the axiom and would vanish without the recognition of identity. This is exactly what has happened to the mind of humanity.

In an atmosphere of philosophically groundless chaos, relativism has emerged from the nihilism. Relativism accepts the nihilistic notion that true knowledge is impossible and attempts to replace it with some kind of intellectual elitism. Relativism is a sort of fiat reason only unlike fiat currency that is forced upon humanity by government and a financial elite, fiat reason is offered as a replacement for knowledge forced upon us by a bankrupt philosophy and intellectual establishment. Just as the result and design of fiat currency is manipulation and theft, so too is the result of fiat reason the manipulation and theft of intellectual potency. One establishes a false and criminal financial elite, the other a false and deceitful intellectual elite.

While relativism, which is just soft nihilism, is sold as a counter to extremism and dogmatism, the ascending of the false or unproven to the status of knowledge, it is actually the most intellectually crippling dogma of all. One may hold the notion that the world is flat, and it could be a popular and accepted view. The proponents of such an opinion may have academic status and prestige, but as long as an objective standard of proof is in place and acknowledged, such a view can be refuted.

Relativism, however, undermines any objective standard for proof and turns the battle of ideas into a popularity contest. New ideas are seldom popular and the truth even less so. Since real knowledge is regarded as impossible, only social convention controlled by elites, new ideas need not be refuted or even earnestly examined. Ideas that threaten their crippling status quo can be swept away by simply branding them as “out of the mainstream.”

Ascending from an environment of relativism and intellectual elitism, acknowledging the existence of self-sameness and the immutability of the law of identity would truly be the ultimate triumph of the rule of law in the most fundamental sense, over the rule of men, and their fiat reason. This would be a precondition for such an achievement in the political realm.

Just as fiat currency appears doomed, so too, does fiat reason, Relativism appears hopelessly condemned to fall in the catastrophe it summons. It is no contradiction that while stagnating relativism dominates the intellectual establishment, it has been

accompanied by head-cleaving religious fanatics who represent the extreme of the fastest growing religion in the world. Where will the “buck stop” when the promissory notes of fiat reason must “float” against the currencies of irrationality, the basest of human emotions, in the blood-drenched financial market of history? Relativism has left the wreckage of Western culture so intellectually bankrupted that against the most irrational ideologies and philosophies they can only fall back on slander and lies as a weapon and protection. The same degenerate philosophy that so stubbornly and stupidly rejects any possibility of rational certainty, so easily falls to the mindlessly faithful, so long as that faith comes from outside the culture that still holds a tenuous grip on the values that they most abhor.

A violent, aggressive Christianity swept through Europe replacing indigenous religions, and now a more passive, peaceful Christianity is under attack from a more aggressive, savage, brutal, inhumane Islam. There is a reason why the so-called “great religions” have such a violent history. It is why they became the “great religions.”

If one were to invent some fantasy religion, but kept these beliefs to oneself, then that religion would die with its creator. Religions live or die by the law of the jungle as it is asserted by natural selection. Religions must survive and procreate just as living organisms. If not, they are lost and forgotten. Intellectual matters can be settled with facts and reason, but history has shown that faith is best promoted with the sword. Having faith in peace, compassion, and tolerance leaves one disarmed against those who have quite a different sort of faith.

Beliefs, groundless claims to truth, are all equally arbitrary. Faith, in itself, constitutes a violation of the absolute. It involves the contradiction, “unknown is known.” If one decided to believe there is life on Mars without the justification of supporting evidence, this would remain a contradiction and, as such, an untruth even if it happened that there was actually life on Mars. Life on Mars, or not, it would be a false claim to knowledge. Guilty or innocent, a man would receive an unfair trial if he was convicted by prejudice rather than evidence. The failure to uncompromisingly acknowledge the axiom as an absolute is to lose all claim to it. This is why faith and belief sabotage all claim to any knowledge. Knowledge and faith are incompatible.

The nihilist relativist mystics of hypocrisy and disbelief have no answer for violent believers of non-identity, for this too, non-identity, is the belief of the two-faced relativist. Metaphysical issues are far more important than most would think. Humanity’s quest for its metaphysical footing may be a matter of survival. It is time to look beyond the false elite’s manufactured eclipse of the light of reason and look for answers that may decide human survival.

These so-called “terrorists,” however, are just a tiny fraction of the forces of brutality and irrationality that are arrayed against humanity. The seldom acknowledged, but scarcely deniable fact, is that most of the terror in the world is perpetrated by the gangs of criminals called government. They are the real threat to the very survival of the human race.

Behind the embellished incantations and pretentious formality, government is nothing but the most dangerous form of organized criminality and statism is little more than the most virulent form of criminal insanity. One cannot formulate a better definition of criminal

insanity that the willingness to engage in criminality while not only feeling justified but even virtuous. Underneath the varying ideological differences, this is the essence of statism. The state is nothing but the delusion of authority to commit crime. The power of this delusion is derived from the fact that most of its victims share the same delusion. It is they who must be liberated from their own delusion.

This liberation can only come about with an uncompromising commitment to reason, the first principle and the existence of identity. It must be based on that which virtually all human achievement has been grounded. Humanity must discover the shining beacon of knowledge before it can discover life and happiness giving freedom.

Neither the delusional senselessness of mysticism nor the criminal insanity of statism have really done anything positive to promote the ascent of humanity. To the contrary, they have always stood in resistance to it. As humankind has advanced, however, they have both become more dangerous, more incompatible. In the case of statism, one need only look at the trend of history to see its escalating danger, and the fantasy of mysticism can provide no protection. To the contrary, it enables it, for the state itself is nothing but a mystic hallucination.

There is one hope for the future of humanity. Mysticism and statism have risen together to dominate the mind of man, and if identity can emerge as the acknowledged absolute, they will fall together, as well. It is the periods in history in which humans came the closest to discovering knowledge that they also came the closest to liberating humanity from these monsters. If humanity does discover knowledge, with its empowering intellectual confidence, government, and religion, the two scourges of humanity should soon be thrown together on the scrapheap of history and cultural evolution.

Meanwhile, in this frighteningly paradoxical age of confusion, mysticism, statism, and nuclear weapons, a call for a gentler faith and misguided intellectual tolerance, is an attempt to evade a simple, incontrovertible truth and escape into fantasy. It is an evasion of intellectual responsibility, but there is no evading the consequences of failure. Reality and identity are most assuredly, deniable, but just as undoubtedly, can never be defied.

Fantasy cannot replace the first principle or what it asserts. It is with the reminiscence of class hatred that mystics speak of the immutable axiom and logical truth. Nevertheless, the recognition of the absolute stated by all true axioms and logical truths and its correct meaning is the true “empowerment” of the human mind. As even a latent recognition of identity degenerates, meaningful thought becomes impossible. Rational persuasion is becoming completely infeasible as subjectivity and self-deception prevail.

One need only examine the present state of culture to see that rational integrity, objectivity, and even civility are seldom to be found, especially in political and philosophical realms. In an age that knows nothing, anything can be claimed. Unfounded claims abound in an age of philosophical baselessness. Groundless, all assertions are equally arbitrary. In such a besmirched, vacuous, and intellectually confused environment, truth is the most greatly hated and most uncorroborated assertion of all. This is because knowledge and truth itself have been unsubstantiated.

Knowledge is, and must be, foundational. Knowledge cannot exist as merely relative or contextual. An idea’s concurrence within a broader, comprehensive context while

Thank You for previewing this eBook

You can read the full version of this eBook in different formats:

- HTML (Free /Available to everyone)
- PDF / TXT (Available to V.I.P. members. Free Standard members can access up to 5 PDF/TXT eBooks per month each month)
- Epub & Mobipocket (Exclusive to V.I.P. members)

To download this full book, simply select the format you desire below

