

More Laughter

*Further Writings of
John Roland Stahl*

(Author of The Laughter of God)

© MMXI
THE EVANESCENT PRESS

www.tree.org
tree@tree.org

ISBN: 978-0-945303-19-0

CONTENTS

An Open Letter to Barack Obama	page 4
Further Advice to Barack Obama	page 9
Another Letter to Barack Obama	page 10
Letter to Richard Dawkins	page 12
Reality Economics	page 28
A New World	page 33
Secret Societies	page 36
The Stone that the Builders Refused.....	page 41
Knotweed	page 44
Einstein's Fundamental Error.....	page 51
One World Government	page 55
Yet Another Letter to Barack Obama	page 62
Is God Almighty?.....	page 66
Free Market Capitalism	page 70
A Review of Zeitgeist, Moving Forward.....	page 76
Seven Ways to Retire the U.S. National Debt.....	page 83
The Kabbalah and The Tree of Life	page 89
Good-bye.....	page 91

An Open Letter to Barack Obama

10 November, 2008

President-Elect Barack Obama:

I hope that it will not matter at all that you are unlikely to read this message. From everything I have seen, it seems likely that you are part of the spirit of energy that will bring a new spiritual consciousness to the world, and you already know all of the ideas which I mention here. In contrast with the abysmal level of the Bush Administration, there is already a huge groundswell of momentum for a massive change of direction, an undercurrent of growing spiritual consciousness world-wide that will provide the catalyst for a major change in the evolution of life on earth.

I am very pleased with your proposals for green development to provide renewable alternatives to the burning up of our dwindling supply of fossil fuels (which, incidentally, are worth far more for their industrial products potential than they are as simply fuel to burn up for their energy).

Your tax proposals are also long overdue. Deficit spending must be immediately curtailed, and the U.S. Debt must be repaid as quickly as possible. It is obvious that Age of Military Power is passing, and the dominance of countries on the world stage will be

determined henceforth almost exclusively by economic strength, not military strength.

The American Nation is on the verge of bankruptcy, and everyone is terrified to think of what might happen if the United States government were physically unable to meet its obligations. Forays into military excursions at this juncture are not a positive sign!

For the United States government to pull back from the brink of insolvency, as from the brink of war, those individuals holding most of the wealth of the country must be taxed. This, of course, runs counter to the natural and almost universal tendency of the wealthy and powerful in every country: to retain as much of the wealth and the power as possible in their own hands. For the wealthy and powerful of this nation merrily to increase their wealth while effectively tossing the cost of their winnings onto the backs of the American taxpayer in the form of debt, is a grotesque folly which could lead to the collapse of the American government. Haven't they ever heard of the story of the goose that laid golden eggs? They should take very good care of that goose, not slaughter it in an attempt to get all the gold at once.

If the United States is able to run a tighter ship and manages to survive economically, even paying down some of that debt, then the international reaction will be very favorable, and confidence will be restored to the markets. But if the United States just goes on running up trillion dollar annual deficits to add to the existing

mountain of debt, then they are out of touch with reality and are in for a very rude awakening, which a great many people around the world will welcome with considerable satisfaction.

Of course it is the whole world which you must consider; never think of yourself as just the Champion for the United States and its Interests; you must be in tune with the entire field of life energy on the planet, and help us progress to the next level of being, because if life survives on earth it will be because that stream of life energy comes into a harmonious state of clarity and balance, instead of spinning out of control from confusion to chaos.

Problems are as circular as the Solutions to those problems. The more you grind away on a politically problematic footing, the more your problems will continue to increase. But when you have a clear, positive, and forward moving energy going on, you should find errant energies finding their way back to the main central stream of flowing energy, and things begin to get better at an increasing pace.

Let your administration mark the passing of the Ugly American from the stage of the world. All of the problems for which the Ugly American has felt the need to use force have only consolidated themselves and become very much worse. Just look at the way the jihad is shaping up. Of course Muslims are being groomed as the heirs to the Communists, Blacks, Jews, Gays, and the Infidel. They are the ones to fear and hate; they are responsible for all of the problems we face. But what continuations are

suggested by these attitudes? Of course, it only gets worse. The more troops George Bush sends to Iraq, the more the embers of anti-American hatred are fanned, and the more that attitude becomes cemented into place.

I recently heard a political commentator, announcing his forthcoming show, say “. . . above all, should we be afraid of the Russians?” – Oh, no, we do not have to be afraid of the Russians. What we have to do is to convince the Russians that they no longer have to be afraid of the Americans! (This may not be an easy sell.) Nor do we have to fear the Iranians or the North Koreans – we simply have to convince them that they do not have to fear the Americans any more, an idea which may take generations to sink in, so we had better start with the program now.

Everyone, all over the world, wants to be allowed to live their life in peace, in harmony with their neighbors. Yet everyone lives in fear all the time, like wild animals. All of this can be turned around – it is simply a matter of the direction of the energy. If the energy can make it past the Turning Point of Change, then it will get easier all the time as the errant energies all over the world will gradually be restored to a harmonious flowing within the main line of life energy. The other direction leads to increasing complexity, leading outward towards increasing levels of confusion and belligerence, and reaching ultimately into chaos.

But if the tangle of life energy on our planet can come together in clarity and order, then the energy will become simple, sleek, and efficient, and positive change will evolve at a dizzying pace, leading to a whole new world which must be totally unimaginable to everyone who is on the “ante” side of the change (the *Omega Point*, as suggested by Teilhard de Chardin).

All of the political problems in the world are expressions of mutual fear, out of which comes hostility, aggression, and violence. Once the Fear is addressed directly, and can be transcended, then the other manifestations will gradually subside until peace is achieved.

Economic problems are simply the inevitable consequence of political problems. The world is experiencing an economic crisis because the world is bursting with political problems all over the planet. As those politically volatile situations are ameliorated, then the wheels of commerce will begin to turn again, soldiers can return to their farms and their families, and life can begin to get better and better for everyone.

So it is really very simple – turn around the energy of the planet from flinging itself apart from confusion and chaos back towards clarity, balance, and peace, and all of the problems of the world will solve themselves, and the Kingdom of God will come on earth.

Further Advice to Barack Obama

16 February, 2009

The first step is to understand the way the world works, and how things happen, which is all about the Sequence of the Process of Change.

The second step is to participate, by discovering the most important things you can do to influence the path of the process of change. I have attempted to address all of the most important problems facing the survival of life on earth (not limiting it to human life), and here are my findings: Plant More Trees!! Trees are the most important expression of Life on this planet, and the earth is greatly suffering because of the loss of its Trees. From the watersheds, to soil erosion, from the loss of its role converting carbon dioxide into oxygen, to climate change, the population of Trees on the planet is essential for the survival of life itself.

Send every out-of-work American to plant trees; the earth will thank you for it, and will repay with bounteous abundance.

Another Letter to Barack Obama

24 March, 2009

Like a great many people all over the world, I have been enormously encouraged by your successful campaign to the Presidency. I had been predicting a bad end to this country, but now I see some glimmer of hope. Perhaps it may not yet be too late to make the immediate and radical changes needed to halt the slide of this country into poverty and oblivion.

I even felt that I understood your position with respect to Afghanistan! Of course, it is not easy being President, even a very popular one. It is still necessary to proceed very carefully. You not only have to do the right thing, but you have to manage so that your agenda will be allowed to proceed across political minefields.

Accordingly, I thought I understood the political reasons for your bellicose stance with regard to Afghanistan. It was necessary to pound the war drums proudly in order to cover the retreat from Iraq. By talking tough over the Afghanistan question, you would be able to accomplish the difficult task of withdrawing from the morass of Iraq without arousing too much opposition.

“But,” I said to myself, “once the Iraq withdrawal were accepted politically, once you had entered upon your Presidency

and were enjoying the increased stature and approval that would come from your new administration, then,” I speculated, “you might evolve the political process to enter upon some period of diplomacy. While standing ready to unleash a whole new military offensive in Afghanistan, you might temporize, and gradually the diplomatic process would proceed while the military option would be ‘temporarily’ withheld. Finally, to everyone’s surprise, you might find grounds for an exit strategy from Afghanistan on vastly better terms than could ever have been obtained from military activities (just ask the Russians what they think about fighting a war in Afghanistan . . .). Best of all, such a diplomatic solution would save untold billions of dollars that the country just cannot afford to spend, frankly.”

I sincerely hope that I have correctly guessed your intentions. It is a very clever plan; in fact, it is brilliant. No one has to know that it was your intention all along to extricate this country from a totally unwinnable conflict in Afghanistan (a conflict that would make Vietnam look like the Falkland Islands) by diplomatic evolutions rather than by military actions.

Letter to Richard Dawkins,
author of *The God Delusion*, ISBN 978-0-552-77331-7

March, 2009

I was very glad to come across your book, *The God Delusion*, as I have studied philosophy all of my life. My quest to understand the world began with a theological crisis at the age of six. My father was a professor of philosophy and a Methodist minister, so, naturally, being an intelligent child, I was immediately an atheist, as soon as I understood the views propounded by my father.

“Who does he think is listening to his prayers?” I would ask myself, along with the obvious question, “Well, then, who made God?” However, even at that tender age I understood that it is not sufficient to reject an idea until and unless you are able to propose a reasonable alternative. And so I began my search to understand the world without resorting to any theological postulates.

I studied everything from Christian theology to the Kabbalah, the I Ching, Hermetic alchemy, magic, and witchcraft, and many other sources, not omitting the likes of Swedenborg, Aleister Crowley, and Madame Blavatsky. Eventually, I began to piece together a world view that featured a principle by which I was able to understand the patterns of order in the cosmos. I first referred

to this as “the Philosophers’ Stone,” but later, thinking I were precocious and witty, I called it “God.”

However, as my understanding of these mysteries became more and more clear, I began to realize that my labeling of this principle as “God” was not really so clever or even very original; I had just rediscovered what intelligent people had understood as God all along. If anyone had ever suggested to me in my youth that I would eventually come around to a belief in God, I would have dismissed such a notion as so far beyond wildly improbable as to be entirely negligible.

Well, here I am, and I have some views which I have not found expressed anywhere else, and I have also developed ideas which I later discovered to have predated my “invention” of them by some thousands of years. I discovered, in my readings, that many very similar ideas kept popping up, so I tried to organize those ideas in a systematic way. I had already begun to do so when I discovered the idea of Pythagoras, in which he suggested that the abstract ideas of numbers themselves are the purest symbols for the “Mysteries of Nature.” For some years I had arranged representations of the first four numbers, which I arranged horizontally, each one on a separate page (*vide: Patterns of Illusion and Change*, reprinted in *The Laughter of God*). However, when I stacked those images vertically, I was astonished to discover that I had exactly reproduced the Tree of Life from the Hebrew Kabbalah. What is more, every position on my designs held the exact same significance on the Tree of Life. This not only allowed

me to acquire a new understanding and appreciation of the Tree of Life, but it also confirmed to me that my investigations were on the right track, since I had independently recreated the Tree of Life which was essentially identical to the design which has come down to us over the centuries.

All of that was simply an aside, to sketch out some of my preliminary lines of investigation. I turn now to your book, and the first thing I notice is that you decline to address any serious or sophisticated understanding of God. You decide that it is far easier, and much more fun, to confine your efforts to arguments against primitive and fundamentalist notions of God, rather than to venture out into the more rarified air of serious discussion.

Consequently, I found your book pleasantly amusing in spots (many of your analogies are quite colorful), but not really relevant to serious contemporary conceptions of God, although I agree with many of your principle points. I share your disgust, for example, with the God of Abraham. If the Old Testament God were to come around my door, I would offer him a meal and a night's lodging (out of "Christian charity" – not religiously motivated, however – I guess I would just find one evening with the old brute tolerably interesting), and then, after an early breakfast of toast and coffee, I would tell him to just shuffle on down the highway.

§

My understanding of God may be a bit confusing because I have two quite different visions of "God," each of which seem

entitled to be called “God,” for historical reasons, but it is not at all clear that the two entities are one and the same. In the first place, there is God the Creator of the Universe. I find an important role for God in the creation of the Universe, but my God is neither omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, nor even “good.” You might find my discussion interesting, and you might easily decide that nothing about it requires introducing the title of “God” to the concept. You can find this in an article published on my web site at www.tree.org/cosmology.htm.

In case you wanted to view my whole presentation of philosophy and metaphysics from the beginning, you can read my *Patterns of Illusion and Change* at www.tree.org/patterns2.htm. There you will find (in the *Postscript* to the Second Edition) my second candidate for the throne of God (“Will the real God please stand up?”). This second candidate has many important qualities long associated with God, but many other qualities are totally absent. This God, for example, is no more omnipotent or omniscient than the last one, nor did He have any role in the creation of the Universe (unless you follow a rather obscure line of logic that discovers these two manifestations of God to be one and the same after all). I don’t want to repeat the entire discussion here, but, in brief, I imagine the role of Consciousness elevated first (and foremost) to a planetary scale, and then to a cosmic scale. Following the line of thought that the higher the organism the loftier the development of consciousness, I have proposed that the Consciousness of God is even more fully conscious than human beings: a Deity with whom one might realistically be able to communicate.

To be sure, this is nothing like the God whom you so effectively ridicule, but I think it accounts for the nearly universal understanding of God that people have felt since time immemorial. It may have been natural for primitive men to assume that their “God” were omnipotent and omniscient, but I do not find any reason for such suppositions. I think God (limited in most of my speculations to “Gaia,” considered as the most important theological focus for human beings, which includes all life on earth, plants and animals as well as people) is just doing the best He can, carrying the flag of Life with its order, balance, harmony, and growth in the face of the rampaging chaos that He finds all around Him.

Given the scope of a single letter, I do not attempt to develop this idea fully here, but the analogies of human consciousness and group consciousness make the idea seem very reasonable to me. It solves the problem of evil at a stroke! “How can we believe in a God who is omnipotent and omniscient as well as good, merciful, and loving, in the face of all the manifest evil in the world?” Simple – God is not omnipotent, and we are just doing the best we can.

I have read lots of very obscure treatises on many arcane subjects, and at first I would read with my blue pencil, arrogantly marking the author’s errors as I found them. I have always known, since the days of my high school debating society, that it is far easier (and usually more fun) to take the Negative position in an argument. We learn very early on that to ridicule your opponent (or his arguments; take your pick) is usually a more effective

strategy than to rely purely upon reason. I think the English are usually much better at this than Americans. I remember reading some articles by Bertrand Russell which I found very funny; it was very amusing to watch him shred up his opponents (well, usually he would confine his attention to his opponents' arguments; I must do him that justice). But much later on in my studies I began to realize that many authors may have had some interesting idea after all, even though the language they may have used to express it might have been faulty. I underwent a major shift in my reading style – instead of simply considering the words themselves, which anyone of Russell's experience and talent could easily shred into nonsense, I began to “read between the lines” and tried to discover what reasonable or interesting idea the author might have had that he was trying to express with his inadequate words. In this way, I discovered quite a few very interesting ideas which Lord Russell would never have noticed.

I have figured out that when authors would write about “occult mysteries” there were often some very intriguing ideas buried under their verbiage. They pretended deliberately to conceal some important Secret, without which one could not be expected to understand what was being discussed. However, I became convinced that they were not concealing any Secret at all! They were trying their hardest to convey their idea, even when the idea itself were not fully clear to themselves! They were skirting around some precocious idea that they couldn't fully grasp themselves, but they were convinced that they were onto something important, if only they could figure it out, and they

were leaving their notes for the guidance of later adepts or scholars. I have encountered some very impressive ideas which I have gleaned from writings of this sort (*e.g.*, *Coelum Philosophorum*, *Seven Canons of the Metals*, by Paracelsus, as obscure a work as you can find anywhere, yet out of which I pull one dazzling plum after another).

Now, in the case of religion, it is easy and fun to take it on its literal face and reduce it to shreds, laughing all the while. But I suggest, Professor Dawkins, that you might miss some very interesting ideas this way.

I notice that you employ certain key arguments over and over, confident in their impregnability. One of them is that it is useless to nominate “God” as the creator of the universe, because any God capable of designing the universe in all its complexity, to say nothing of simultaneously fielding prayers from millions of devotees, would present a far more complex “solution” than the problems it attempts to solve. But, before I introduce my own solution, a “God” which is supremely simple, yet fully capable of producing the universe in all of its complexity, let us take a closer look at the problem itself.

The problem is very real. Thomas Aquinas tells us that there must be a First Cause, and that is what we call “God.” Your reply is that “God” does not advance the argument at all, but only makes it infinitely more complicated. However, I have not seen, anywhere in your book, an alternative suggestion as to how the universe came

into being. It is not enough to postulate some “Big Bang.” What caused that big bang to happen anyway? Why did it happen at that particular moment? What was there prior to the big bang? If there were nothing, what does that do to the law of conservation of matter and energy? It is all very well for science to describe the Big Bang, beginning from the first twelve-millionth of a second after it happened, but what about the initial event itself?

So, for better or worse, there remain some real problems, as yet unresolved, concerning the initial cosmogenesis. I consider this a theological or philosophical problem precisely because it concerns territory upon which scientists fear to tread. Well, “fear” is not the right word, but a scientist will not speculate beyond the data (it is practically the definition of a scientist). As yet there are no clear data upon which anyone has been able to found a satisfying answer to the questions of cosmogenesis; therefore it remains for philosophers and/or theologians, who do speculate – yes, even beyond the data! As a scientist, perhaps you have no respect for this or interest in it, but there are plenty of people who find themselves desiring to speculate, even when there do not exist adequate data to allow for a scientific solution.

Thomas Aquinas has defined “God” as “that which was responsible for the First Cause.” You can’t argue with a definition. You might not like to use the word, but that’s tough. OK, out of respect for your truculence on the use of the word (and to escape the historical baggage which it carries) let us paraphrase Aquinas by saying, “We define *the Philosophers’ Stone* as

that which was responsible for the First Cause.” Now, it is meaningless to deny the existence of the philosophers’ stone, since it is defined in the context of whatever was responsible for the First Cause. The appropriate question now becomes, “what is the nature of the philosophers’ stone?”

Now, when we put the question in this way, we are far more likely to advance our understanding than we might have been by simply rejecting the concept. Rejecting the concept of God is just as useless as positing a God in the first place! If you reject God as the name to refer to the first mover, then what do you propose in its place? (This is simply the inverse of the child’s question, “Who made God.”)

However, it is not entirely useless to introduce a term such as “God” (or “the philosophers’ stone”). Language is built up of complex ideas to which we assign the symbols of new words, and then we are able to use those words in the construction of yet more complex concepts, in much the same way that mathematical formulæ, or the theorems of Euclid, are built up out of smaller units. You may as well say that the whole of Euclid’s geometry is frivolous, since all of it is contained within his definitions and axioms anyway.

So, while it clearly does not resolve any problems of philosophy or theology, to put a term upon the agency of the First Cause is not totally useless. It allows us, for example, to proceed

to the next (and far more important) question, “what is the nature of the philosophers’ stone?”

You have found that notions of God are all but universal in every culture and every time. Rather than just to reject the whole concept, it seems far more stimulating to discover just what is at the bottom of this idea. It may turn out to be nothing at all (your position), but I take the position (habitually, when considering complex or surprising propositions) that there may be some real and useful idea going on, and I try to discover what it is. In a surprising number of occasions, I discover something real underneath an idea which may, on the face of it, appear to be nonsense to the likes of Bertrand Russell or yourself.

In the present case, I propose that what is responsible for the nearly universal belief in God is a kind of collective unconscious, which I suggest is literally self-conscious, not only in the same way that a human being is self-conscious, but even more than that, since the consciousness of all life on earth would constitute a much higher organism than a chicken, a dog, a cat, or a human being. I have no trouble imagining that all of life on earth (we may call it “Gaia,” to use a simple term to stand for a complex idea) has all of the attributes of a living organism, including self-consciousness, and to a higher degree than any expression of life found on earth.

There are many surprising phenomena which might be explained by this concept (for which science has nothing to suggest, other than to reject the premise). When a mother suddenly jumps

out of bed in the night, feeling that some accident has befallen her son, many miles away, it can be explained, at least in principle, as knowledge transmitted through the medium of this universal life consciousness. In the same way, prayer could conceivably make its way “to the throne of God,” and it is equally plausible to imagine that this Consciousness is able to direct the energy of life in ways that might amount to the answers to prayer. Note that since this Consciousness is not omnipotent, nor (even) omniscient, it could not be expected to ameliorate the ravages of flood, fire, pestilence, earthquakes, etc. We speculate that this Consciousness is composed of the accumulation of all lesser consciousness on the planet. Like any other being, it will have an “ego,” the function of which is to assist the organism to survive, first, and then to flourish and grow. To the extent that lesser beings contribute to this goal, they are closer to God.

Obviously, there are many people on earth who are lost in confusion, flailing around in regions of chaos, whose energy is only working against God and the survival of life. A sober assessment of the present state of the earth would suggest that God is not necessarily winning the battle of Good over Evil, another famous paradigm that appears to have some sort of meaning. I do not, however, attribute a consciousness to a force of Evil, as in the old concept of the Devil. I consider the Consciousness of God to be at a point at the “center,” a place of balance and clarity where all good things converge. On the other hand, while this point of perfection is the singularity of God, there are an infinite number of ways to move away from God into error and chaos (with progressively

diminishing consciousness). By the way, I do not want to get unnecessarily complicated in this introductory summary, but I have figured out that both of these directions are aspects of “God.” The focus of clarity and balance at the center is what holds the cosmos together into patterns of order, but the movement away from the center is the original spark of life which created the cosmos in the first place. Think of the analogy of evolution: there could be no life at all unless the patterns of energy followed reliable laws, but there could be no evolutionary growth without the constant reaching out into the unknown in search of novelty.

Notice that this concept of God would not have been present at the founding of the cosmos, nor is it omnipotent or omniscient. It would have evolved along with every other aspect of our world.

Speaking of evolution, I have noticed that when you speak of evolution, you speak about “natural selection” which has to do only with the selection of variants after they have appeared. I guess you are satisfied to go with random mutation as the cause of the variants. But I want to look into the nature of this “random mutation.” And what do I find? Funnily enough, I find exactly the same principle that I nominate as the agency behind the First Cause! Thus, while my main idea of God (this Gaia hypothesis) seems to have nothing to do with the First Cause, it turns out that all of evolution seems to proceed upon the very same basis as I am proposing for the First Cause itself! The logic here may be a bit

obscure, and it is really not important to me to make any positive identification of the two ideas of God, but I find it very interesting.

So what is this motive principle that causes the Cosmos to come into being in the first place, and which causes all life continuously to reach out into further complexity? I call it “The Laughter of God” (which is the title of my most recent book, www.tree.org/b1.htm#LAUGH). The laughter of God, which causes all of this, is based upon the joke (“a separation of illusion from reality”) of attributing meaning to opposite ideas which together add up to the same thing: nothing. Specifically, the initial joke is the distinction imagined to exist between Zero and Infinity. Of course, the two terms mean exactly the same thing, *at the limit*, only apparently referring to two different concepts by imagining an alternation between them. This sets up an imaginary field of vibration between the two opposites. Successive applications of the same joke cause endless reaching out into further complexity, until we finally have the appearance of an entire cosmos, which is really just Maya all the time, as the entire boondoggle adds up to Zero (or Infinity), the Singularity through which it passes from time to time as it works through its cycles.

There is even a mathematical formula for this idea of God:

$$0 = \infty$$

The source of this random mutation at the heart of evolution is that anything might switch suddenly into its opposite at any

time. If it were not for this fundamental uncertainty at the basis of the cosmos, everything would have worked itself out, finally, to zero or infinity, leaving us without any universe at all. However, due to this principle (noticed at the level of quantum mechanics), we have a dynamic and interesting cosmos that goes on amazing us day after day. And Who knows to what further adventures it might lead? Who, indeed? Perhaps it is the Cosmic Consciousness of God that influences the “random” mutation of events reaching out into Novelty.

You might ask from where this proposed concept of mine might come, and I can only reply that it is inherent in the metaphysics. The concepts of Zero and Infinity, along with the Present Moment: NOW, all popped into Being simultaneously, initiating the entire cosmos *ex nihilo*. I cannot reduce it further than that. If there is a Mystery that remains, I am content to call it God.

By the way – throughout your book you discuss numerous ideas relating to religious practices, and I find myself in agreement with almost everything you say. However, I want to point out one inconsistency that may be important, since it highlights the way circumstances can appear radically different depending upon one’s point of view. Chapter 9 leads off with the sorrowful account of poor Edgardo Mortara, who was taken from his Jewish household at the age of six and raised as a Catholic. You report how the Catholic establishment could not imagine anything other than that they were performing a wonderful good work, saving this poor boy

from his inevitably distressing life as a Jew by inviting him into the warm bosom of the Catholic faith. I fully agree with your view that such an arrogant point of view is thoroughly wrong.

However, later on in the same chapter, you detail the story of the State of Wisconsin filing suit against Amish parents who preferred to raise their child in their own community with their own customs rather than releasing him to the public school system. In this case, you seem to be siding with the State of Wisconsin, lamenting the loss of education for the poor Amish boy! What is the difference between the two cases? The difference is that you seem to feel that a respectable Jewish upbringing is probably preferable to a Catholic upbringing, but, on the other hand, you have this feeling that, *of course*, a modern education in the public school must be better than for any child to stay at home learning his family's values. The problem is, who gets to decide? The child? I believe the Supreme Court made the correct decision – we allow parents the right to determine the way they want to raise their children, up to the age of majority.

Personally, I happen to agree that a modern education would be preferable to being raised in an Amish culture, but it is not for me or you to dictate to other parents how they should raise their children. I can understand, in principle, the point of view of the Amish, who have their own community values which they feel are superior, in many ways, to contemporary culture. Something will clearly be lost, but something else will clearly be gained, and who is to say what is best? I will stand up for the rights of parents to make

the call. Pulling an Amish child out of his home and sending him to the public school to be raised in the modern style is exactly the same crime as pulling a child out of his Jewish home to be raised as a Catholic. Your good intentions are comparable in every respect to the Catholics who were convinced that they were doing the right thing to give Edgardo Mortara all the advantages of life as a good Catholic. The moral here is always to look very carefully at the other side of every issue, and not to be too quick to be so sure that you are always right.

Reality Economics

March, 2009

I have written a previous article about what I call “reality economics” (*vide*: The Fall of the Dollar, from *The Laughter of God*), but here it is March of 2009, and, like everyone else in the world, I am watching the entire worldwide economic system falling into chaos, and I am baffled by the methods which are proposed to “restart the economy.” Everyone seems to think that if only everyone would start buying products once again, then everything will be just rosy. I remember George Bush’s simple recipe for curing an ailing economy: we should all go shopping. Now I hear on the news that Germany has come up with a brilliant plan to get their economy moving again: they have instituted a program of government incentives for people to buy new cars by paying prospective new car purchasers to junk their older cars.

Here is an opportunity for me to explain again what I am trying to suggest by “reality economics.” While the German government wants everyone to buy a new car to stimulate their economy, and they are so convinced that this is the solution that they are providing government money to wreck older cars, I would propose a diametrically opposite strategy.

I would propose that, instead of spending trillions of dollars trying to pump up sagging economies, governments should act like every other business or private party in economic trouble: stop

spending money! If banks, mortgage companies, insurance companies, or automobile manufacturing companies are unable to operate profitably, let them declare bankruptcy and liquidate their assets. If company A wishes to pay out multi-million dollar bonus packages to its executives, they will not be able to compete against company B which asks all workers, from executives on down, to accept a pay cut in the interest of remaining solvent so that they will stay in business and be able to continue paying any salaries at all. If demand for a company's goods are way down, close the factories until inventories fall to levels where it will be appropriate to reopen the factories again. Instead of encouraging everyone to buy a new car, encourage everyone to fix their old one instead.

If there is widespread unemployment, fine; just invite all the unemployed to live in peace on the Free Farm (www.tree.org/b1b.htm#Freefarms), planting trees or growing fruits and vegetables. Sooner or later enterprising individuals or companies will figure out something useful to do which someone, somewhere will pay them for, and gradually a new economy will evolve to replace old industries which are out of date.

Take the automobile industry, for example. It is not just General Motors that is in trouble; car makers all over the world have seen their sales drying up and blowing away. The fact is that there are just too many cars in the world, and not enough oil to run them for much longer anyway. Let these companies go bankrupt one by one, selling off their assets until the few companies that remain are able to survive by supplying cars to what remains of the

automobile market. Let the market determine which companies will survive to make the next generation of cars. Or, alternatively, let those companies whose executives are paying themselves fat salaries and bonuses just fail in competition with leaner companies which devote their attention to spending their resources more wisely, with a view to providing greater value to their customers – better quality vehicles for less money than their bloated competitors. I still believe in the free market – if everyone had not panicked but simply let the losers fail and drop out of the race, then the companies which survive would remain a part of the evolving economy, and those which couldn't keep up would fail, and their stockholders would take the loss.

No company is “too big to be allowed to fail,” and this includes the United States of America. If foolish economic policies push the country into bankruptcy, well, so be it! If the voters and taxpayers just shrug their shoulders while the treasury is being systematically looted, whom will they blame for the decline and fall of the United States?

I remember after George Bush's second fraudulent election most Americans simply shrugged their shoulders and said, “I guess George Bush won,” when, in fact, he had done nothing of the kind. In striking contrast, it was only a few weeks after that fraudulent election that there was another fraudulent election, this time in Ukraine. However, in the case of Ukraine, some hundreds of thousands of Ukraine citizens wouldn't stand for it; instead of shrugging their shoulders, they took to the streets of Kiev, loudly

denounced the fraud, and refused to go home until the government gave in and promised new elections (in which the other party won).

I also hear on the news that the Federal Reserve has decided to print up another trillion dollars or so; overnight, the dollar loses much of its value on the news. But, what can you expect? They have no more money, and no one will buy any more Treasury Bills, so they can't think of anything else to do except to emulate the Zimbabwe economic miracle. Perhaps it is time to shop for a wheelbarrow (to carry your money) before the prices go up.

No one is going to bail out the United States government. China will only continue to purchase treasury bills as long as they believe that it is in their interest to do so. When they decline to renew their loans, the world-wide economic upheaval will make the present mess look like a Sunday School picnic.

When anyone finds themselves in financial trouble, the solution is not to try to spend your way out of your troubles; the solution is to spend less than you are earning, so that you can manage your debt before it reaches levels from which it is mathematically impossible to recover. I remember the spending of the Reagan years. The short term consequence was an appearance of prosperity; the long term consequence was a massive impoverishment of the country which was directly responsible for the present financial crisis.

So, what is the message here? Is it simply to stop spending money? No; it is more complex than that. If the government

spends money bailing out failed companies like banks, mortgage companies, insurance companies, or any other failed or failing business, or if they pass out goodie bags of cash money in the form of tax breaks, then we can look forward to the collapse of the United States government in our lifetimes. But if the government spends money for good value received, such as schools, health care, railroads, investments in alternative energy, and massive programs of tree planting, providing edible fruits and nuts, or other worthwhile crops, as well as addressing the principle causes of climate change and declining personal health (the declining levels of oxygen in the environment and corresponding increase in levels of carbon dioxide; *vide*: The Cause and Cure of Disease, from *The Laughter of God*), then there is some hope that these worthwhile expenditures, embodying the underlying principle of “reality economics” will eventually repay their costs and even lead to an improvement in the country’s financial health. On the one hand, I am hopeful to see that President Obama is trying to make a lot of very worthwhile expenditures, but, on the other hand, I am worried to see trillions of dollars being thrown away into Black Holes. The only hope of survival for the economies of any country in the world is to follow the principles of reality economics and make every dollar pay.

It may be difficult to stand by and watch while companies like General Motors go bankrupt, but every good gambler has to know when to hold ’em and when to fold ’em.

A New World

April, 2009

There is a sense in which I have welcomed all of the upheaval in the world today. I am a philosopher, and one of the sets of symbols and imagery that has always appealed to me most strongly is the Alchemical Process of Change. The process of Change is absolutely fundamental to any idea of philosophy or metaphysics. The Greeks were barking up the wrong tree, looking for some ultimate particle (which they called “the atom”). No, what is really fundamental, in this cosmos, is the process of Change. That’s where it all happens. The present moment, **Now**, is the Philosophers’ Stone, the agency of change.

The alchemy lesson is very short and simple: *Solve et Coagula*, “to break apart, and to join together.” It is the alternation of these two directions of energy that is responsible for the unfolding of the infinite cosmos. In practical terms, what that means is that in order for something new to come into being, the old has to be broken down. For a long time (all my life) I have had the idea that this world was in need of a major makeover. I imagined myself, two millennia later (not *millenniums*, please!) looking back at these primitive times – from a larger perspective, these are still the Dark Ages. From the vantage point of some time in the year 4089, there is not all that much difference between the tenth century and the twentieth, or twenty-first.

Now is the time for people of the earth to work out a new political and economic arrangement, which encompasses the whole world, and is emphatically NOT any kind of *Pax Americana*, nor even a *Pax Sinensis*, for that matter. A lot of people seem to get really terrified at any such notion. “Surely you don’t mean a *New World Order*?” Am I with the Illuminati, trying to promote some sinister plot? Well, yes, I am. Now it is out. (*Sinister* just means “to the left.”)

All I can say is that it is not surprising that anyone should be terrified of any such notion as a major makeover of the world! Conservatism is a very natural concept: “if it is working, and life is going on, don’t fix it!” The problem is that it isn’t working, and life is no longer going on. Not only are people dying like flies from cancer, AIDS, and other diseases, due to the direct cause of the insufficiency of oxygen in our atmosphere (itself directly caused by the loss of the trees), but the business as usual for the human race includes wholesale genocide in so many parts of the globe that it is no longer news. So it is time for a whole new Contract, one which includes the entire field of life on the planet, to make the effort to keep life alive, at least for one more generation; and perhaps the next generation can figure out a way to pass on some remnant of life to the following generation.

What am I talking about here? How about a world-wide Constitutional Convention, to work out terms for a new world? As I see it, all of the problems of the world stem from one fundamental problem: the fracturing of the field of Life energy into

a multitude of diverse energy streams, like Don Quixote “jumping on his horse, and riding off rapidly in all directions.” Yes, the problems of global warming, cancer, and the loss of the trees are serious threats to life, but until the entire planet is somehow united politically, the threats to its survival, while overwhelming, just cannot adequately be dealt with.

So what is the practical continuation of this idea? How about the formation of an international World Union Conspiracy to set up an entity that will address itself to the problem? It will not be easy, but, until the political union of life on earth is realized, there can be little hope for much substantial progress against the enormous problems facing the survival of life on earth.

Secret Societies

May, 2009

There are so many popular books out there, titles beyond number, detailing the accounts of Secret Societies throughout the ages. In almost every case, the authors of these volumes try to convince themselves (and, as an afterthought, their readers) that these Secret Societies have endured intact throughout the ages, still retaining their Secrets, and still carrying on their secret activities in furtherance of their special agenda.

I have made it a major part of my life's work to examine these Secret Societies, ancient and modern, along with their doctrines and their secrets. I have studied from original sources, as well as from private initiation into the mysteries from old sages, masters, and adepts. I would like to present my findings here.

There are, broadly, two kinds of Secret Societies – political, and philosophical. In many cases, of course, societies whose major activities are political hide these activities under the cover of a purely philosophical society.

According to the Grand Conspiracy Theory, all of these Secret Societies, throughout the ages, have been interconnected – essentially, variants of One Big Mother of All Conspiracies. While many of these secret societies have had specific political aims, e.g., the destruction of the French monarchy conspired by the Masonic

Lodges during the days leading up to the French Revolution, the main and obvious goal of all of the politically motivated societies has always been the simple and happy thought of Ruling the World.

My first conclusion has to do with the continuity of these societies, both political and philosophical. Yes, in just about every case there has been direct continuity of these secret societies from the very earliest times up to the present day. However, this continuity has not been through the numerous outward forms. Many thousands of Secret Societies have come and gone, over the years, and the names of many old ones have been applied to new incarnations, but these societies, as formal structures, have been continuously evolving and changing, and most of them have had significant periods during which the formal structure has not survived; but the real transmission of the ancient knowledge, mysteries, and secrets has always been through the direct instruction of old sages, masters, and adepts to new students and initiates.

In this way, the most important aspects of the intercommunication of these holders of the ancient wisdom has been comprised more of the mycelial connections which pervade the substrate, rather than the more visible occasional fruiting bodies of the formal Secret Society.

To continue the analogy of the mushroom, the “occasional fruiting bodies” of this underlying mycelium perform a very

important role: that of scattering seeds far and wide, and finding candidates for the transmission of the knowledge. Thus, the proposition is that the really important repository of ancient wisdom (or political conspiracy) has never been the occasionally manifesting Secret Society, but rather the presently living body of sages, masters, and adepts (under which I include many others using other titles – altogether different titles in the case of political conspiracies, of course) which has continued as a kind of living organism within the much larger organism of all life.

So, let us get right to the point, focusing first on political conspiracies: is there some Secret Society of persons who meet, either in smoke filled rooms or conclaves at the grotto, and control the world by their actions? Sure; there are lots of them! But is there one, or even some few, of much greater importance, whose members really do exercise the dominant controlling hand over the evolution of life on earth? That answer has to come in two parts: in the main, no: there is no one minding the store; they have all gone fishing, or they are Out to Lunch. No one really knows what is going on! There are so many influences all along the way from every quarter that trying to figure out what is happening and what is going to happen is hard enough, let alone making any effort to control it. This world is careening along at haphazard, with no one at the wheel; it is stumbling and blundering in the dark, and unfolding into chaos on all sides.

But, on the other hand, there are lots of people who band together for a common purpose, and there is a way that their

“secret society” forms itself into a matrix of mycelial connections that, here and there, rears its head as a Conspiracy mushroom, spreading seed to new ground. When it comes to the Conspiracy to Rule the World, what does it take to become a Member? The answer is that it takes a significant portion of Wealth and Power to accumulate influence. So, like any Masonic Lodge, the higher degrees are composed of those of progressively larger shares of Wealth and Power, up to those who are most powerful at the top.

This concept organizes the formation of a structure that is far more important than any specific collusion in conspiracy for particular advantage. It creates the imperative for every level to maximize the rate at which the Wealth and Power is further accumulated into the hands of the Wealthy and Powerful.

This Beast, too, is a living organism. It has been in existence since ancient days, and has been the cause of the perennial belief in the Grand Conspiracy.

The problem is that the goals of this living beast, of maximizing their own advantage for their own benefit, are in conflict with the survival of life on earth. That is why I propose that the political authority be taken out of the hands of the Wealthy and Powerful, and put into the hands of those who will guard it as a sacred trust for the survival, health, and flourishing of life on Earth.

But the Secret Societies which hold the transmission of the Ancient Wisdom have always seemed more interesting than

political societies. Secret Societies are hierarchical and are arranged as a series of concentric circles through which the candidate proceeds towards the center, where the final secret is held. The whole point and essence of a “secret” society is that there is some Secret that they have and guard, that other people don’t know. This principle is so fundamental that it really doesn’t matter at all whether there is a secret or not. The old Master of the Secret might finally whisper to the candidate for the thirty-second Masonic degree, “Ivory Soap floats!” That isn’t the Secret, but it would satisfy the requirement just as well, since the vast majority of seekers never get anywhere close to the center, where the true mysteries and secrets are held (even when they think they have, or have been told that they have).

In the case of the Freemasons, Hermetic Philosophers, Rosicrucians, Cabalists, Gardeners, and others, there is a Secret, although at all times and places there have always been only a very few who have known it or understood it. In many cases, the Guardians of the Secret don’t even understand it themselves, but faithfully transmit all the Keys with which their Society has been endowed in hopes that some future scholar, philosopher, adept, and/or visionary might rediscover the Secret. There remain many such Keys to which the Secret has been lost, such as the Tetragrammaton, the four letter Name of God, the meaning of which has been revealed in our own work (*vide: Patterns of Illusion and Change*, from *The Laughter of God*). The Secret is the final resolution of the Mystery of Life which illuminates the nature of being. I have expressed it as a picture of the Third Arcanum.

The Stone that the Builders Refused

June, 2009

“The stone that the builders refused will always be
the head cornerstone.”

— Bob Marley

Those words by Bob Marley are intended to convey a very nice message; however, there are a couple of errors in the way the idea is presented. In the first place, “the stone that the builders refused” would never be selected as the head cornerstone! The quotation is taken from *The Book of Psalms*, 118:22, and the original quotation runs something like, “the stone that the builders refused will become the capstone (keystone of the arch).”

There is a big difference in the qualities required for the “head cornerstone” and the “keystone of the arch.” In general, when a mason is building an edifice of stone, he will be looking for stones that are as perfectly square and straight and regular as it is possible to find (carefully dressed that way from the quarry). As for the head cornerstone, it must be the most perfectly square and straight and regular of all, since all lines and levels will be based upon it. For the rest of the building, the best stones will be wanted, of course, although some stones may be accepted which are not entirely perfect, but when a stone is really not square at all, but is some kind of trapezoid or worse, it will be entirely rejected.

This rule applies to the great majority of stones used in construction, but “the keystone of the arch” is an altogether different story. The arch was of critical importance in Medieval stone masonry construction, as it made possible a whole range of construction features that included windows, doorways, and even major support columns and galleries. The “key” which made an arch work was a stone at the top center of the arch that was not square: it was wider on the top than on the bottom, so that the pressure of the remaining stones would maintain the shape of the arch from collapsing. Of course the builder would search among the rejected stones to find some irregular stone that would be suitable for use as the keystone of his arch.

Now, taking another look at Bob Marley’s song, it is easy to discern his intention: while square and straight and regular may be a useful ideal for an orderly society (when the concept is applied to people), it is the one that is different from the others that is singled out for the most important and critical positions. While masses of society may be built up of row upon row of identical, square, straight, and regular units, it will be the different ones, the original, creative, and independent ones which will take on the leadership positions. The ultimate illustration of this is an army, in which absolute conformity is literally drilled into the soldiers so that the whole becomes a uniform and mindless machine, while it is the senior officers who retain their independence and creativity, and make all the important decisions. I think it is an unfortunate aspect of modern society that, all too often, schools are run along the lines of armies and military academies, in which all novelty, originality,

and creativity is deliberately squelched out of any incipient nonconformist pupil who might dare to think for himself, or have an original idea.

However, there is another problem with Marley's presentation of his idea: when he says "the stone that the builders refused will always be the head cornerstone," it almost sounds as if all that is required is for a stone to be rejected for it to be exalted to the position of head cornerstone. In fact, however, there will be a great pile of rejected stones, and all but a very select few will be left as rubble, perhaps pounded down into road base.

So we might suggest an alternate reading for Marley's song: "the Keystone of the Arch will always be a stone that the builders refused" (all keystones are made from rejected stones, probably additionally worked, but not all rejected stones become keystones of an arch, and certainly not head cornerstones).

The moral of this story is simple enough: while we can respect the importance of the great mass of uniform, square, straight, and regular (stones, people, or anything else), we should also recognize the even greater importance of the few that are unique, "creative," or otherwise different in some essential way from the straight and regular majority, as it is this introjection of Novelty into the system that allows the universe to remain in existence at all, and is responsible for evolutionary change and growth.

Knotweed

July, 2009

Re: BBC World News: 23/VII/09 “Knotweed.”

So many times I am baffled by some idea – some prevailing attitude – that just seems to me to be wrong, wrong, wrong. For example, cutting down trees just to chip them up into pulp for paper is the single most damaging act of terrorism against Planet Earth in its entire history (which may soon be coming to a close if that virulent pestilence, the human race, is not brought under control quickly). From the loss of oxygen and the accumulation of carbon dioxide, to soil erosion, loss of species habitat, and the loss of many valuable forest resources, the liquidation of our ancient forest is an act of astounding stupidity.

Speaking of getting a virulent pestilence under control, on tonight’s broadcast of the BBC World News there was an article about the problem of knotweed, and the way in which it was proposed to combat it. The whole approach seemed to me to be so incredibly wrong and stupid as to merit criminal investigation! Knotweed is apparently a very tough weed that spreads persistently, and invades and takes over wherever it goes. Apparently millions of dollars (and pounds) are spent annually to combat this pestilence, and now Science has come up with a natural, biological control for the problem. They are breeding a population of super vampire insects that will attach themselves to

the knotweed and gradually suck out the plant's juices. This is proposed as a solution to the problem!

Before I tell you my solution to the problem, let us take a look at the deliberate production of these biological weapons of mass destruction in the form of the very hungry, and equally virulent, sucking insects that will go head-to-head with the knotweed. I am a gardener, and I love to spend a morning out in my garden, watching my roses grow. I always grow a great many plants wherever I go, and more seem to spring up around me, as I plant seeds and take cuttings all the time.

I know all about those sucking insects! They are the scourge of the earth, the blood-sucking parasites that just live by draining the vital fluids of other forms of life. Mosquitoes are part of that gruesome company, and the presence of mosquitoes on the planet is the strongest argument I have ever heard against the existence of God. I must say that I have studied philosophy, metaphysics, and theology all of my life, and I have finally understood a concept of God that explains that problem, as well as the whole "problem of evil" (how can you believe in a merciful God who is all-powerful and all-good, in the face of the manifest evil that is in the world?). The solution is simply that God is not all-powerful, and He actually needs all of the help He can get! In fact, that is what He is, and from where He gets His power – from Us.

Anyway, back to these disgusting, blood-sucking insects (of course I use the term "blood-sucking" as a figure of speech, because

the insects they are breeding for the knotweed will be consuming plant fluids, unlike the mosquitoes I was vilifying earlier). Anyone who would deliberately propagate and cultivate a strong, hybrid, super-vampire insect that is powerful enough to go head-to-head against knotweed should be immediately apprehended and apprised of their error. These insects may not confine themselves to knotweed, but may go after anything juicy. I would want to see a huge population of sterile males introduced into the colonies of sucking insects (for example) instead of seeing them deliberately cultivated so that they can be thrown against the knotweed problem.

The worst thing about the idea is that even if it is “a complete success,” the whole project is still incredibly stupid! What would happen, of course, is that a huge infestation of bugs on the knotweed would gradually reduce the vitality of the knotweed, but the knotweed would fight back with all of its considerable resources, so the result would be huge populations of diseased and unhealthy knotweed, covered with bugs, looking disgusting, dirty, evil, and contagious; and it would be prevailing in that state for the foreseeable future, in an endless death struggle.

The knotweed may be a persistent and dominating pest, pushing out other growth, but at least it is admitted to be something of an ornamental, when it is not infested with bugs. In fact, just about any healthy stand of greenery of any description, would already be a huge improvement to the environment in many places. In cities, for example, if there are healthy stands of

knotweed where there would otherwise be just waste land with a few struggling weeds, it doesn't look like a problem to me. So, until a patch of knotweed can be eradicated, you might as well leave it alone. Turning the stand of knotweed into an ecological disaster of diseased bushes covered with bugs – an ongoing situation that would probably go on forever – neither the knotweed nor the bugs would ever give up the field – would be so much worse than the *status quo*. It would hardly be much better than dosing the plants with toxic pesticides – the traditional control. The ebb and flow of their battle would determine the landscape of that knotweed patch for the next hundred years, but it would gradually stabilize at some diminished proportion of its healthy state, as the knotweed would probably manage to survive with a certain population of virulent, sucking bugs all over it.

That solution is so stupid that it frightens me as well as baffles me. I would much rather see flowering, fragrant rose bushes, than a stand of knotweed under attack by a host of sucking insects. All of the leaves get covered with insects as the insect population continues to grow fat and healthy off the laboring of the knotweed. It is scary to think of what might happen if the insects were actually to win, and kill off the knotweed – where would it go next? Would it just quietly allow itself to go extinct, since its need is finished, or would it obey the biological imperative and try to survive and multiply, looking for new hosts? And finally, even if the bugs manage to kill off the knotweed, the whole remaining mess, dead bugs and all, would still have to be dug up and carted

away, before the land could be restored to available utility. I suppose that project is government funded.

But, as I promised in the beginning, there is a better way to deal with the problem of knotweed; my solution is better than dosing them with toxic pesticides, and it is better than launching a cultivated strain of sucking, vampire insects into their environment to attach themselves to the plants, in perpetual embrace forevermore.

I simply offer to purchase that knotweed at \$35 per ton, as much as you've got. Spread the word, and when a serious knotweed harvest gets underway, we will be there to purchase it.

I have made handmade paper for many years, and I have been very impressed at the quality of many, many common plants and agricultural waste material in the matter of their potential utility as a source of fiber for paper-making. It seems to me to be really stupid to make paper out of trees. If wood were used to make something valuable and durable — a home or well-made furniture — that doesn't seem to me to be so much of a problem. But it is the wholesale slaughter of clear-cuts for the chipping mills that really gets me sickened.

There is a much better way! Instead of harvesting the last of the ancient forest so that our mailboxes can be filled with junk mail, there already exist many sources of available cellulose for paper, mainly from alternative annual fiber plants, such as flax, hemp, and kenaf, and agricultural waste from the production of

food, so that plenty of paper can be made without cutting down any more trees.

Re-plant the rain forest in chocolate trees, carob trees, oil-bearing trees, and many others, and just use all the available alternative cellulose materials for paper-making. Case in point: knotweed. In general, the tougher a weed is, the more promising it is as a candidate for paper-making. When you have a really tough, obnoxious weed, it will probably make most excellent paper. Kenaf is a good example. It is a tropical plant that will grow very large and fast, ready to harvest after a single growing season, and it is loaded with cellulose, the stuff of paper. I am not sure how good knotweed will be as a paper source, but it doesn't matter. Whatever cellulose there is will break down into paper, and whether it turns out to be a real winner like hemp and kenaf, or of lesser quality like sugar cane bagasse or wheat straw, it will almost certainly repay the value of \$35 per ton that I have offered to pay for it.

Bring it on! Allow some time for waiting in line, as the trucks are weighed and paid for their load of knotweed (calculated on a "bone dry" basis, and the relative humidity of the plant material will be factored into the price we pay). Since I could easily pay for 100 tons per day at that rate, and even more if it were available, I expect that people will be harvesting stands of knotweed wherever they are found, staking their claim before other bounty hunters get there first. We are talking about total clear-cut harvesting of the knotweed, a process that will be infinitely superior to waiting for a

hundred years while the bugs gradually bring down the mighty knotweed – or fail in the attempt! No; it will not only be much better, but it will be a whole lot faster simply to cut all of it down. One day you have a big patch of knotweed that doesn't look too bad except that it's everywhere and won't give anything else a chance; and a few days later you have a patch of bare ground, seeded with wild-flower seeds, or planted in grapes or roses, and another truck waits on line for the weighing scales, loaded with all of that knotweed.

Please forward this article to those scientists from the Super Vampire Insect Project, and tell them to go take a walk in the garden.

Einstein's Fundamental Error

March, 2010

I couldn't resist the title – I have recently seen an old Sherlock Holmes movie (The Creeping Man) in which some blowhard was just telling his secretary to announce the title of his talk at the next meeting of the Royal Society – “Darwin's Fundamental Error.” I thought it was pretty funny.

Einstein's fundamental error was to assume that the speed of light were constant, among all the other measurements of time and space, motion and gravity.

“If time could change depending on your velocity, Einstein realized, then other quantities, such as length, matter, and energy, should also change. He found that the faster you moved, the more distances contracted (which is sometimes called the Lorentz-FitzGerald contraction). Similarly, the faster you moved, the heavier you became. (In fact, as you approached the speed of light, time would slow down to a stop, distances would contract to nothing, and your mass would become infinite, which are all absurd. This is the reason why you cannot break the light barrier, which is the ultimate speed limit in the universe.) . . . he also showed that matter and energy are unified and hence can change into each other.” (from *Parallel Worlds* : a journey through creation, higher dimensions, and the future of the cosmos, by Michio Kaku)

“Einstein realized that matter and energy are just names for different descriptions of the same phenomena.” (my edit)

I am thinking that the universe is filled with descriptions of phenomena all of which are relative to everything else. So why should the speed of light arbitrarily be determined to be constant? To be sure, any one concept can be considered to be constant, and everything else described around it, but that is like the Ptolemaic theory that the earth is stationary and the sun and planets revolve around it. I always thought it were arbitrary, and the earth could just as well be considered stationary as anything else – the Sun, for example. But we finally learn that all parts move within relative aspect of everything else, and that the speed of light is no more exempt from this “free float of currency” than anything else. You may peg all other currencies against the dollar, but, ultimately, the dollar, too, will be seen to hold a position towards all the other currencies which is, in fact, relative to them.

And, like Copernicus’s alternative description of the movements of the heavenly bodies, of which the earth is just one more, led to simpler and more obvious descriptions of those movements, so, also, it may be found that there may be more illuminating ways of describing the events of our cosmos without adhering to the concept that the speed of light must always be assumed to be constant.

In fact, it seems to me, on the face of it, that Newton may have been more “correct” after all! I have always thought that

“time” were not an observed phenomenon in the way that motion or even gravity may be – time is an arbitrarily applied yardstick by which other phenomena may be described relatively. It seems like a more intuitive way of looking at the movements of the heavenly bodies. Thus, instead of all the bending of time and space and motion and mass, you might have, in some descriptions of phenomena, situations in which it is the speed of light which goes “faster” or “slower” than other movement. Of course it is all relative, but that is not to say that Ptolemaic cosmology were equally as valid as Copernican cosmology – the use of Occam’s razor to follow the simplest interpretation of events will lead us to the most efficient and beautiful explanations, which are rightly assumed to be the most useful indications (sidestepping altogether, as having essentially no particular meaning, the question of which description is “actually” the correct one).

Thus, reinterpreting all the most recent data from this perspective, allowing the speed of light to fluctuate just as much as any other measurement, depending upon which description appears to be the most useful, or the simplest, may yield a whole new metaphysics, or may simply re-instate Newtonian physics as it used to be before Einstein’s interesting speculations. This is not to suggest discarding all of Einstein’s work – it may be that his mathematical descriptions of the relationship between matter and energy be perfectly correct, but that it is just the assumption that the speed of light be constant that is the applied hand-brake to the wheels when trying to understand the flow of events in the cosmos.

§

I may as well tackle gravity, too, while I am about it. I think that “gravity” does not describe some funny force that pulls objects together; but rather it is the other way around: the “Natural” state of the universe is Zero, pure nothingness. “Time is the measure of error.” (from one of my earliest books, *Jokes*). Some force must be applied in order to create the Mother of all Distinctions which causes the undifferentiated universe to spring into being. This outwardly directed energy is the Yang aspect of God which created the cosmos at the Big Bang. So, when all of that energy which maintains the cosmos in a state of error, or manifestation (“All manifestation is error,” from the same book of *Jokes*) be finally dissipated, then the apparently discreet elements of which our universe be composed will finally come together once again in the “final” (one more of a series, which may not necessarily be infinite in either direction) Singularity (the total Yin point opposed to the initial Yang). The fading of this energy is observed as “gravity.”

As described in earlier articles (e.g., *Speculations on Cosmology*, reprinted in *The Laughter of God*), I imagine a series of “universes” blinking on and off as they pass through that Singularity. This sequence makes more sense to me than one enormous Big Bang which brought forth our Universe, fully formed, all at once, like Athena from the head of Zeus.

One World Government: “The New World Order”

June, 2010

The subject of “One World Government” or “The New World Order” always seems to draw the most intense reaction from many people. “First we have genetically modified food, and then they’re going to shove One World Government down our throats!”

I have mentioned this topic before; I freely confess that I repeat myself constantly. (Have I mentioned, lately, the incredible folly of cutting down the arboreal biological layer (trees) from the sphere of the earth? Unimaginable folly, probably dreamed up by the folks who advocate burning up your house to keep warm, or the hungry worm Ouroboros who relieves his hunger by eating its tail, or the government policy of spending their way out of debt.) If only people would pay attention to me the first time when I speak or write, then I wouldn’t have to repeat myself so much.

What surprises me about this one is that my own considered opinion is that the One World Government is the single most important next step in the evolution of life on earth. I share this view with Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, Albert Einstein, Bertrand

Russell, and a great many others, many of whom have probably been prominent members of the Illuminati, in one or another of its incarnations, while we're at it!

I would probably describe my political views to be somewhere to the left of radical, yet virtually the entirety of the Liberal Consensus seems to be agreed that the One World Government is THE most sinister manifestation of the machinations of the Illuminati Conspiracy, who are perceived to be a cabal of wealthy, powerful, or otherwise influential persons who are *attempting to participate in the direction of the evolution of life on earth*.

What?? Do you mean to tell me that there are actually people who are attempting to influence the evolution of life on earth?? What a fearful conspiracy!! And the wealthy and powerful, the ones whose decisions will most radically affect the flow of events, are actually in collusion with others equally wealthy and/or powerful, in efforts to distill their combined shared consciousness of what needs to be done? Are they trying to play God? Isn't the *Law of the Jungle* good enough for them?

What is God, anyway? Perhaps every element that contributes to the (higher) evolution of life is part of whatever God is. And, surrounding that, there is a vast field of inertia representing the opposition to the ordering influence of God. This energy which is evolving, which I am calling God, actually appears to be showing positive signs of being Alive!

Is this figure of a Creative and Positive Energy reaching out into new and unknown directions, and being surrounded by an inertia of chaos and randomness, an entirely new idea, or what? Oh, no – it is actually very, very old.

So why is everyone so afraid of this? I think the answer I hear most often is that everyone seems to be afraid that any time anyone or any group succeeds in obtaining power, they will invariably use it to further their own individual wealth and power, to the utter disregard of anyone else. If you look at the record of just about every known government, either in the present day, or in any of the known historical periods for which we have records, this accusation will be borne out with dead-on accuracy almost all of the time! With the possible exception of occasional enlightened emperors or despots, e.g.: Emperor Yao of ancient China, King Arthur of England (a legend will do quite as well as historical record – possibly better), Pericles of Athens, or Frederick the Great of Prussia, just about every king or ruler sets about collecting as much wealth as he possibly can for himself and his family as soon as he comes into power. Most rulers attempt to accomplish this by sleight of hand, but, more recently, rulers such as Ferdinand Marcos of the Philippines simply load up convoys of trucks with bars of gold bullion and trundle them right out of town. (Reported as a Joke.)

However, this universal drive to self-aggrandizement runs into a self-limiting factor: the higher you go in the ranks of wealth and power, the more radically and dramatically your priority shifts

from acquiring more wealth to *preserving what you already have*. This is the classic Conservative, who has Made It, and doesn't want anything to change which might alter his status. But when you come to a pivotal position at the top, there is only one way to ensure the continuation of your own personal good fortune, and that is for the entire field of life energy world-wide to be operating with maximum harmony and efficiency.

The second most common response to the concept of a One World Government is, "One World Government! But – but, that's *elitist*, and *paternalistic*!!" – the Elite, of course, being that famous cabal of wealth and power sometimes assumed to be banded together into a group like the Illuminati.

Let us suppose we have managed to accomplish this fiendish plot, and a One World Government is now in place; but, surprisingly, they have allowed the people of the earth to choose the person at the top, the one who will have the greatest power, and the greatest responsibility, for affecting the evolution of the flow of life on earth.

There are quite a number of candidates, and the rules for working out run-off elections are quite complicated, in order to ensure that voters are able fully to vote their mind, knowing that if their vote is lost in the early stages of voting, they will be able to vote again from the remaining candidates until there is a final winner. Most of these early choices may be made at the time of the original voting. This is called "Instant Run-off Election," and it will

soon be routinely used all the time everywhere. Because of the importance of the question, however, it will probably be necessary to have at least one secondary run-off vote, for which votes will be limited to the winners of the first primary vote.

Here are some of the more interesting Candidates:

First, there is the elitist and paternalistic candidate, a quiet little man of remarkable intelligence and extensive learning, giving him the manners of a university professor. He does not seem to be remarkable in any way, unless you listen to him closely. It is very easy for him to get lost among the great rabble of more noticeable Candidates:

There is, for example, Genghis Khan (we have managed to clone several candidates from surviving genetic material of old stock . . .), who mentions his considerable experience as qualification for the post.

Another fortunate success from our cloning tanks is Idi Amin, who has graciously accepted the nomination, and has agreed to accept the position, if elected.

Running against these formidable candidates is George W. Bush, who wishes to remind the voters of his membership in the Skull and Bones.

We wanted to offer the candidacy of Adolf Hitler, whom we had no trouble cloning back to full virulence; however, he declined

the honor, out of fear for his life, preferring to hide where he is rather than consider any return to public office.

Another force to be reckoned with is the Ayatollah Khomeini, who would like nothing better than an opportunity of extending Sharia Law to the entirety of the human race.

There are plenty of other candidates, but these pretty well represent the field. We will announce the winners, from whom the candidates for the second round of voting will be drawn, as soon as the results are in.

So, what do I think about genetically modified food? In general, I am very much against it. I think that it is absolutely imperative to maintain a viable population of natural, open pollinated fruits, vegetables, grains, and, in fact, everything propagated from seed, not only food, but fiber crops, and crops grown for any other use. Whenever seed companies try to sell a new seed, whether it has been genetically modified or created from natural hybrids, they are looking for one quality of over-riding importance: the Number One required feature of any new seed is that if anyone tries to plant the secondary seed which will be produced by the primary seed offered for sale, such seed will either fail to germinate entirely, or be of enfeebled and useless quality. This condition is the deal-breaker. No new seed has any chance of survival unless it meets this paradigm requirement.

Everyone should refuse to use seed of this kind; only use heirloom seed or seed which is open pollenated and will reproduce

itself with natural seed. It is all of these “terminator genes” which should be outlawed. I hope everyone will refuse to use such seed ever again – by which I mean just about every seed commercially available except for the few sources selling “heirloom seeds” or the equivalent. New seed from natural hybrids can always be welcome, but only when they are stable strains.

But I stop short of asserting that genetic modification should never be considered for any reason. While I am not convinced of the value of any genetic modification program with which I am familiar, I retain an open mind about such a possibility, depending upon circumstances which might not be anticipated.

Yet Another Letter to Barack Obama

September, 2010

Dear President Obama,

I have published earlier “letters to Barack Obama” on my web site (www.tree.org/obama.htm), but not this one. At the present time, you seem to be so unpopular that I would only squander my own credibility were I to publish anything in your defense (oh — no one listens to me anyway, so I may as well publish this along with the others). Surely you understand the problem: all of the seeds of economic despair have been sown by your predecessors, and you have inherited a bankrupt country. Make no mistake: while there remain many wealthy and powerful people and corporations in the United States, the country itself is way beyond bankrupt. The only reason the Chinese bankers do not refuse to renew their loans is because they, along with everyone else in the world, are terrified of the world which would follow after the United States is unable to meet its obligations. The nation has existed on credit for many years, tossing more trillions on top of the camel’s back, because there doesn’t seem to be any other option. The real problem is that the effects of fiscal policies are not

really felt until twenty years after they have been implemented, yet a sitting president must defend his record every two years.

So you are reduced to only two options: either stand up sheepishly, like Gorbachev of the Soviet Union, and admit that the American System has fallen victim to its own success: the wealthy and powerful have become so wealthy and so powerful that they have been able to enrich themselves while impoverishing the country as well as the “little people,” their less fortunate brethren. Then the American people can dissolve the Union, put a new government in its place, and repudiate the \$12 trillion debt as the extravagance of the previous corrupt and bankrupt system in its dying days.

Or, you can begin to implement a serious program to pay off that debt. Forget about rampant poverty and unemployment — there is nothing you or anyone can do about that now. Contrary to the popular wisdom, flushing more money down the economic toilet will only make the problem worse, not better. The time when an influx of cash would buy another year or two at the expense of an ever more certain ultimate collapse is long gone. Scattering another trillion dollars into the wind will barely slow down the rapid collapse of the financial system.

There is only one policy that makes any sense: slash government spending and raise taxes, especially on the wealthiest segment of the population. Yes, this will plunge the country into a very deep, dark depression from which it may never recover, but a

determination to pay down the debt is the only way to restore faith in the troubled American Dollar. This will mean that the United States will simply have to cancel all of its international adventures (read: “wars”).

I have seen pie charts of the budget: it is basically divided into three large sections: 1. Defense (war); 2. Transfer payments to impoverished (or otherwise) Americans; 3. Service on the Debt. (Oh, yes, there is also one other tiny sliver: all other functions of government, but that doesn't amount to much.) If you elect not to let the Debt continue its spiral out of the world of reality into utter fantasy land, that leaves just the Department of Defense, and the Transfer Payments. The Defense budget must be shrunk to just a tiny shadow of its current budget. The only way to do this is only to fund projects that are genuinely concerned with “defense”, and curtail all activities of war.

As to those pesky transfer payments, I have had an idea many years ago which I still believe makes a lot of sense. The current system pays out checks beyond number so that recipients can rent a cheap hotel room in the city and spend their life drinking coffee (or beer) and smoking cigarettes. None of this makes any sense to me. I would propose that paying out cash money to all of those people is not only bankrupting the country, but it is also counter-productive. As an alternative, the nation should sponsor the establishment of Free Farms where impoverished people can go and live their lives in peace, with a place to sleep and food to eat. It will be incomparably cheaper to provide direct services of food and

housing to people than to send out millions of dollars in welfare checks every month.

None of this will be popular, and you will be hounded out of office at the end of your term, but that is going to happen anyway. At least if you launch programs that might save the country, then after another twenty or thirty years the country might conceivably come out of its downward spiral and begin the long road back to prosperity. You may live long enough to be recognized as a Statesman after all.

Is God Almighty?

December, 2010

Any serious effort to discuss theology must begin with a rigorous analysis of all definitions involved in the discussion. It was the brilliant insight of Wittgenstein that when these definitions are exhaustively analyzed until total clarity has been achieved, the questions and problems will unravel themselves, and seem to vanish. It is the disappearing knot trick.

Every “problem” in philosophy should simply melt away like last year’s snow under the bright light of this process of analysis. Once “clarity” has been achieved, whatever has been under discussion will simply be reduced to “zero” (or “infinity;” the two terms mean the same thing). When the “joke” is explained that caused the divergence of the infinite wisdom into two opposite ideas, then once again “it is all one.”

It is only after this process has really been wrung dry, that it is possible to examine the fragments that might remain and see if they constitute an idea or not. Is there any point at all, for example, of introducing a term such as “God” into the discussions of philosophy? Does the whole thing have any meaning, and if it do, then what be it? (This is the subjunctive mood, Buster, and if you don’t like it, just put up with it.)

There may be nearly as many ideas of what God is as there are people to wonder about it. There are many traditional definitions, but not really any final consensus; at least, not any consensus to which I am able to subscribe. One way that I see to express the answer to the question is to say that “God is what is left over when all jokes are explained and vanish.”

Well, I have my idea of what is the most relevant and useful way to understand the ultimate resolution of this oldest of all problems: What is the Nature of God? But I want to compare that idea with some of the traditional definitions. If there is a proposed consensus, it seems to run along these lines: In the First place, it is the Agency by which the cosmos were created, or came into Being. Next, it is pretty universally presumed to be omnipotent and omniscient — all powerful and all knowing. Finally, it is asserted to be all good.

The fly in the ointment is the Problem of Evil. One way to express the Problem of Evil is, “How can you believe in a merciful God when there are such creatures as mosquitoes on the earth?” There are several other ways in which this problem is sometimes presented, but they all convey the same general idea.

I finally came to the conclusion that something had to go, and it was the idea that God were omnipotent. All of the other attributes are clear and wonderful, even obvious; but there is really no reason to introduce omnipotence among the other attributes of God. In fact, once you consider the aspect of a God which is a little

more humble than previous incarnations, your admiration may clarify and greatly enlarge, not be reduced, by “such a come-down as to be giving up the claim to omnipotence.”

Even the omniscience might be toned down a bit. The Omniscience of God is obviously the Collective Unconscious, as it was termed by Carl Jung, or the Mind of Gaia, as others describe it. God is Life, and Life is Consciousness. The more life, the more consciousness; and the more consciousness, the more life. However, vast as this Ocean of Consciousness may be, we can only speculate as to its limits.

Even the assumption that it must be “good” must be looked at very carefully to be sure we understand what we mean by “good.” Is Life as a whole more interested in the survival and enlargement in the whole field of life energy, or does it favor any one part of that ocean of life? To put it bluntly, is Man favored of God, or what?

I don’t present my arguments here; I only present my conclusions. The ideas and arguments are far too complex to put into words, and I don’t want to make that effort, but I think the human race does represent a very mature development of the energy of life, and, as such, its survival will always be a major part of the agenda of life. However, the survival of the trees may overshadow the importance of man; if the planet becomes uninhabitable, the race of man cannot survive.

The most pressing problem on Gaia's agenda is to reverse the physical decline of the earth. Since Gaia (or God) be not omnipotent, it must be up to Us Who are actually God, after all, to take upon Ourselves this responsibility.

Free Market Capitalism

February, 2011

Somewhere I think I mentioned an annoyance I felt when an American President is talking about his goals of spreading democracy, when, of course, his goals had nothing to do with democracy. The United States may be some kind of a democracy, but that is not what gives it its defining character. The American Way of Life has always been about Freedom. Not only political freedom or religious freedom, but economic freedom. It is a system in which everyone is free to throw up his own carnival tent and hawk any wares he pleases. The Glory Days of the patent medicines were finally shut down by the food and drug laws, and many other little prohibitions and taxes are trying to rein in some other abuses, but, to a very large degree, Americans are free to do what they want in pursuit of economic gain, with very little regulation.

This is Free Market Capitalism, and it isn't necessarily a bad thing, but it can sometimes lead to excess and abuse, and sometimes even to excessive abuse. In the case of the military involvement of United States forces, within the memory of the last twenty or thirty years, their purpose has had nothing to do with democracy (this has been shown too many times to review here), but everything to do with maintaining a *status quo* which will not

interfere with the capital interests of the United States Corporations, which is to make as much money as they can.

The problem is that the moving directive for the whole show is to make as much money as you can. On a global scale, this is just no longer an acceptable option. There are some very real and pressing problems threatening the survival of life on Earth, and the world-wide tensions and instabilities all over the globe just make the problem of planetary survival almost impossible to cope with. When it comes to burning up the rain forest, the profit motive just won't do, any more.

And I don't mean to single out the Americans – anyone who has enough money to join the club, meaning that you have enough money or power so that it matters to the Earth what you do with it – is automatically a member of the same club. Go ahead; try to get as much as you can for yourself before the music stops.

The whole planet must be cultivated as the single field of biological energy that it is. Once this is accomplished, the problems facing our survival can be dealt with, at least as the start of an on-going effort, within one or two generations. But without it, the survival of human life on Earth is seriously threatened.

Ecosystems are just as fragile as economies. We have seen, historically, how massive panics have set off long periods of economic depression: just a few things get out of whack, and the whole thing collapses. Life is very similar! When an organism's living environment is radically damaged, its survival is

threatened. We know what we, as a species, have to do. Lester Brown sums up the problems and reasonable solutions in his book, *World on the Edge*. The problem is that there is no money in it. All the money and power in the world is on the other side!

I have always laughed at people who get hysterical with conspiracy theories when they suggest that the people with money and power are actually running the world. Of course the people with money and power are running the world! Oh, it gets shaken up every now and then with a revolution, which might be bloody, as in the French Revolution, or nonviolent, as the liberation of India from England. But, by and large, it is fairly well established that the people with the money and the power use that money and power to retain the money and the power in the hands of — themselves, the people with the money and power. Now, is that ever a tautology, or what?

This leaves us with two opposing camps, with quite different agendas. In order for life on Earth to survive, we have to convince the people with the money and power that the survival of life on Earth is worth their serious consideration. In fact, if political changes could be made that would ensure the ease of addressing survival concerns (yes, that would be some form of the dreaded *One World Government*), that should make for a Golden Age of free trade.

The problem is that a very significant portion of the world's wealth is directly related to the maintenance of a perpetual war footing. Why has no one mentioned George Orwell lately? The

perpetual war, for manipulating the people and also to profit from war industries, was a central feature of Orwell's world in *1984*.

None of those huge industries are going to be at all happy with a world in which their services are no longer required. So, while some elements of the money and the power in the world might support an initiative that would allow life to continue on Earth, the industries of Destruction and Construction will oppose, to the death of the last man, anything that would reduce the amount of warfare going on in the world.

That sounds like a problem. I'm going to have to think about this for a while.

We need a different model of how to regulate this world of ours. The jungle of sovereign states, sovereign corporations, and sovereign individuals stomping around can no longer be tolerated. (As Lily Tomlin says, "This is the *Phone Company!* We are omnipotent.")

I want to establish a seat of authority: the voice of God. I literally want to incarnate God on Earth, as the chosen One of a special seminary of candidates, who will be given the very best education with emphasis on History and International Studies. The idea is simple enough: any reasonably competent person could handle the tasks required of him, to arbitrate in cases where no other satisfactory decision can be found. But we give the Authority to the Seminary as a whole, not to any one individual. It is up to

the Seminary to nominate the One who will interpret and exercise the will of God as Steward of the Earth.

We have the confidence that, as a school, they will know which one of their number to choose for the stewardship. It is a microcosm: a little world, in which the solutions to the problems of the greater world can be found. (It is simply an alchemical vessel, to those who are students of Hermetic philosophy.) There is even the additional consideration of the effect of world opinion: the energy from these other sources can contribute to the channelings of energy that could result in the manifestation of an incarnation of God. Maybe the world actually works this way, and together We can focus our energies upon our alchemical vessel and cause a manifestation of an incarnation of God to appear on Earth to lead us forward.

The role of this person would be to maintain an overview of the whole planet, with the responsibility of keeping it all alive and healthy. Such an institution doesn't have to have any legal basis at all, and a fully endowed School of International Studies could be assembled of young people selected from all over the world for the purpose of creating a kind of "alchemical vessel" from which a manifestation of God were expected to emanate. The entire school would continue their specialized study of world affairs, and would constitute the most trusted sources from which the Speaker would draw information for making his calls. Whether this institution would ever attain a political influence is unpredictable, but here is a

model in which I would place my trust ahead of any other schemes I have heard of.

But, once again, I see that I have bridged the gap – there is no reason to suppose that those who are profiting from plundering the Earth and laying it waste will voluntarily cease and desist, with or without a court order. So what can we do, here? I have put it in theological terms because it amounts to nothing less. The source of authority is the power of God. If the project works as expected, there may be a real expectation that an incarnation of God may appear, and when One is anointed, perhaps the Glory of God will fall upon Him. That's what we need – we need God to come again upon the Earth and guide us how to proceed with our stewardship of the Earth.

If the Seminary be given this mission, it will create a very powerful field of magical energy around it, and God will appear.

A Review of Zeitgeist, Moving Forward

February, 2011

“You can only get a loan from a bank if you can prove that you don’t need it.”

I have been watching *Zeitgeist, Moving Forward*, and it is pretty interesting – lots of ideas sound familiar to me from my own writings, but there is one very critical point, which they seem to miss, and it surprises me.

The whole discussion of “access centers” where you just go in, take what you need, and when you are done you simply return it – all for free, etc., is appallingly simplistic. The narrator dismisses the notion rather quickly that if everything be freely provided, everyone will simply lie in the sun and do nothing.

My own insight is that this whole idea is subject to severe limitations, and even then it is suitable only for a certain segment of the population. I envision a two-tier economic system – a free market economy for the upper tier (limited by what I have called a “resource depletion tax”), and a “free farm” arrangement for the poorer members of society (*vide: New Solutions to the Problems of the Present Day - a Plan for International Prosperity and World Peace*, 1992, reprinted in *The Laughter of God*). The problem is how to deal with poverty, because the free market capitalist economy does not adequately provide for the social problems of poverty. On the other hand, the free farm approach

encounters serious obstacles when it is attempted to apply it to all of society: it runs counter to the desire inherent in all of life to flourish and “get ahead.”

I hardly need to detail the flaws in the *Zeitgeist* (or free farm) approach to economics: no one will want brand B; everyone will want the best of everything, the newest, biggest, and best. No one will want anything used, chipped, older, outmoded – there will be no economic incentive for selecting anything other than the very best of everything. Why eat hamburger and fries when you can eat lobster and caviar?

No, my system allows for providing for the needs of the poor with a free farm arrangement, but there will have to be a certain amount of regulation in the distribution of “free goods.” For one thing, I imagine two tiers to provide a minimal, but essential degree of regulation: an upper tier of “stewards” who form the responsible core of the farm and who enjoy a somewhat better standard of living than the “volunteers.” For example, the better living quarters, better quality beds and so on, will be given for the use of the stewards, while the older stuff (or smaller rooms) will be given to the volunteers, perhaps on a seniority basis. Anyone who wants anything more will have to pay for it. Of course, the funny notion of “no longer observing money” is so simplistic that I hardly need to pass over that with more than a tolerant smirk, and I have already exceeded my quota.

So, instead of paying out millions of dollars every month in transfer payments so that deadbeats can occupy a room in a

flophouse downtown and spend their days smoking cigarettes and drinking coffee, we can simply provide space at one of the country farms where these people can be provided for in a humane way, yet at the least cost to the rest of society. This will leave the cities as spaces occupied only by those who are actually involved in productive work. When a business fails, you don't have to resort to crime and fraud – you can simply pack it in and chill out at the free farm until you (perhaps with a different set of partners) feel like taking on another project “off the farm” and “into the jungle.”

The cost to society will be hugely less (free farm *vs.* transfer payments) for two reasons: direct costs will be far less; a hundred people can be kept in decent comfort on the free farm, with dormitories and cafeterias, for the cost of a few welfare checks. But, secondarily, the immense social costs of robbery, fraud, marketing of useless junk, drug addiction, prostitution, murder, and other by-products of a necessity to come up with money every month, will be greatly reduced, since there will be no need for any of that behavior. (It won't be eliminated entirely, of course, because there are other causative elements apart from financial necessity.)

But it is an essential part of my vision that this whole free farm culture exist side by side with a free market capitalism, so that everyone can be as free as they want, but with another option for those who wish to get off the tread-wheel for a while. The other half – those in the free market who are motivated and on to something, will find they can accomplish their goals in a

streamlined manner, without being bogged down by carrying all the dead weight of loafers or drunks.

I see plenty of utopian visions like that suggested in *Zeitgeist*, but I have never seen anyone advocate anything like a two-tier system which combines socialist utopian theory with free market capitalism. It has always seemed interesting to me that the idea is a perfect marriage of Capitalism and Communism, both of which have some interesting and commendable features, but both of which are plagued with some very serious problems. Socialist utopian visions can never work unless a creative element is free to explode off the top, providing evolutionary vitality.

Oh, and, by the way, all the malarkey about the insidious monetary system with its debt basis seems to be mis-applied emphasis. The real lesson there is that debt is a killer, whether it is personal debt, corporate debt, or the national debt of a sovereign state! Once you are in debt, and must borrow more money at ever more punishing terms in order to keep afloat, it becomes harder and harder to keep from sliding ever deeper into debt. In fact, you are not expected to get out of debt; the plot is to run people into debt so that they cannot avoid financial collapse, during which time the banks continue to claim their confiscatory 29% interest for the five or six years it may take for foreclosure proceedings to close.

In the same way, on the other side of the interest pay window, once you have sufficient wealth it is easy for that money to earn more wealth faster than you can spend it, causing a continuous rise

in personal wealth. Once you reach a certain plateau, then the inertia is all behind you to become more and more wealthy. It is a mirror image of *The Descent Into Hell* whereby your increasing debt level forces you inexorably past the line into realms where the laws of mathematics will force you ever deeper into the hole until you reach a point where it is impossible to recover (legally – of course there will always remain the options of murder, mayhem, fraud, and theft, not to mention prostitution, drugs, and gambling).

This is inherently and progressively unfair, and it leads to social stratification with a self-perpetuating wealthy class over an endlessly struggling class of peons who can never get out of debt (as Alice learned through the looking glass, “you have to run very fast just to stay in the same place”), unless they are fortunate enough to hit upon some winning strategy, or join a successful revolution (not a bad option to consider, these days). It is unfair to blame the bankers who offer loans at high interest rates: the high rates are required to cover the significant default rate on the shakier loans, so that the worse your financial status, the more interest you have to pay to service your debt. Banks are not really responsible for debt: they simply take advantage of it to make money. One solution would be to outlaw the loaning of money at interest, so that no one would be able to get into debt. This has been tried, with usury laws forbidding the charging of more than 10% interest, for example. This makes sense: if your credit is so bad that no one will risk lending money to you at less than 10% interest, it probably means that you are fundamentally bankrupt, and the circulations of

debt simply postpone the inevitable collapse and give much of the profits from your collapse to the bankers instead of your final creditors. You might as well simply bail out and go to the free farm as hang on another few years with escalating debt levels until the inevitable collapse.

Borrowing money at interest is a very scary business, whether for a person, corporation, or sovereign state. The risks and dangers of falling behind and reaching a level where it is mathematically impossible to recover are very real. The consequences can be far-reaching, whether it be the bankruptcy of personal family finances, the bankruptcy of General Motors, or the bankruptcy of Iceland, Ireland, Greece, or Spain, followed, like dominoes, by all the other countries until China is left alone on the Monopoly board as the winner – and then there will be another revolution and someone else will rise to the top. I don't think this transition has been adequately appreciated by the modern world: military might is no longer the real measure of power; it has given way to economic might.

The activities of the American government might seem to promote a growing economy with a growing GDP, but that is just the visible bubble on top: the underlying real financial strength is not measured in economic activity, but by more fundamental measures of wealth: actual resources, including natural resources, money (both held and owed), and infrastructure: schools, roads, hospitals, water, and power – Zeitgeist got that much right. The world is currently played like a game of Monopoly, and the United

States is not necessarily winning the game; in fact, this should be a wake-up call, since there are still substantial resources remaining in that country, yet they are melting away very quickly under some very surprising economic theories. (*Will P.T. Barnum please stand up?*)

Actually, the “United States” is not really one of the players on the Monopoly board. There are numerous Players, both individual and corporate, but “The United States” is just a fictional abstraction (in financial terms). It is a sink into which debt is loaded, and this is one of the principle mechanisms of generating more wealth for the Players, as the “U.S. Government” sinks woefully beyond that line of total bankruptcy to a mathematical certainty, barring the fortunes of war, and/or acts of God.

It might start raining manna from Heaven any day now; I hope you have a bag ready.

Seven Ways to Retire the U.S. National Debt

March, 2011

Just recently I updated an article I wrote about four years ago: The Fall of the Dollar (reprinted in *The Laughter of God*). The original article, written in 2007, contained a graph of the U.S. National Debt from 1940 until 2005, which showed a rather sobering exponential curve, suggesting that there was no way it could go but up, up, up, at an ever accelerating pace, as is the usual case with exponential curves. The graph ended at 2005 showing a debt of about \$7 trillion. I just updated the article to include an updated graph which carried the graph up to 2010, with the debt standing at about \$14 trillion, neatly doubled over the last five years.

The point of that earlier article was that the only alternative to the collapsing value of the dollar was for the United States to embark upon a series of wars of conquest, rape, and pillage.

However, upon further consideration, I have come up with a total of seven strategies for retiring the U.S. National Debt:

1. Divine Intervention. This is the most optimistic scenario. Let us all pray for divine intervention to solve the economic problems of the American government. As I speculate upon this possibility, it occurs to me that such divine intervention would most probably come as part of a larger package in which more than just American problems were

addressed, but, as there are an unlimited number of ways in which such divine intervention might take place, further speculation along these lines would be fruitless. Rather than instructing God as to how we want Him to manage the rescue of the financial affairs of the U.S. government, it is perhaps more becoming of us humbly to ask Him to use His best judgment in these matters.

2. Inheritance. When an individual finds himself laboring under ever escalating levels of debt, far beyond any ability he might have of repaying those debts, he can always hope for the death of some wealthy relative who might leave a fortune to him, enough for him to pay off those debts. In the same way, perhaps the United States government might inherit that \$14 trillion dollars from somewhere. Admittedly, this isn't very likely, and perhaps we are still best advised to pin our hopes (and our wagers) upon the first possibility: divine intervention. However, perhaps Saudi Arabia might decide to dissolve itself as a State, or at least to gift all of its oil fields to the United States government. It would not do, of course, for them to donate the oil fields to privately owned American corporations; no, in order for this possibility to offer any relief to the American government, it must be the U.S. government itself that would be the recipient of such a gift.

I do not have all of the numbers in hand, but perhaps such a gift might manage to float the United States over its current doldrums. On the other hand, such a gift might simply open the floodgates for massive new spending, which, if they are no more sensible than what we have seen over the last twenty or thirty years, might not even solve any problems at all. In fact, much like the stories of someone who inherits \$20 million and then, through a series of bad decisions, rapidly runs through all of the money, ending up with massive debts far in excess of

whatever debts he may have started with, this hypothetical gift of the Saudi oil fields might just make the American problems even worse. But, at least potentially, we must allow that such a windfall could be the means of rescuing the rapidly deteriorating financial prospects of the United States.

3. A third possibility is that the American government discovers some new source of wealth – perhaps gold mines located on federal lands. Once again, it would be useless for any of this to be discovered or owned by private individuals or corporations; in order for it to do the U.S. government any good, it must be a discovery on lands owned directly by the federal government. However, gold mines probably wouldn't work. If enough gold were discovered (in the Grand Canyon National Park, for example) to pay off the National Debt, the value of gold would collapse. If twice as much gold were to be found, to offset the collapsing value of the gold, that value would simply fall even faster – there may not be any quantity of gold that might make much difference, due to the inexorable law of diminishing returns.

However, there are other possibilities: perhaps some amazing new element were to be found that restores hair on bald heads, rejuvenates the sexual potency of aging men, restores beauty to aging women, and restores all functioning of the body to perfect radiant health indefinitely, allowing for theoretically infinite longevity (in the absence of any fatal accident). Some such discovery, as long as it were the sole monopoly of the U.S. government, might go very far towards reversing the slide to financial ruin.

4. Wars of Conquest. To say that there is substantial historical precedent for this method of restoring financial health to a failing state

were to massively understate the case. However, let us hope, for the sake of future generations yet unborn, that the United States will not decide to go down this road. Let us all fervently hope that one of the other choices will prevail.

5. Revolution/Repudiation of the Debt. Now this is a promising possibility! Perhaps the American people, waking up to the fact that the wealth of the nation has been systematically looted by a handful of wealthy families over the past 235 years, finally decide not to take it anymore, and rise up and overthrow the corrupt regime, putting some new government in its place (after all, Thomas Jefferson suggested that a new revolution were required every twenty-seven years: every generation must arrange political affairs according to current realities). Then the new government might blandly say that the debts of the previous government were not theirs, and they disown any obligation to repay same. Of course, the present government might simply declare bankruptcy and likewise simply renounce all existing debt, hoping simply to carry on with business as usual, but, in practical terms, it is unlikely for such a declaration to go down very smoothly without a radical change of government from the ground up (i.e., from the People). This option, while perhaps able to accomplish its primary objective, is fraught with additional difficulties; however, the post-repudiation problems are beyond the scope of the present article.


6. Inflation/Collapse of the Value of the Dollar. This was the projected outcome of my previous article on the fall of the dollar: that the only really likely alternative to bankruptcy, financial chaos, and/or war is for the value of the currency to be gradually eroded so that fixed dollar amounts are repaid with dollars which are worth substantially less.

7. A Tax on Wealth. Finally, among this catalog of unlikely alternatives, some of which might even appear to be frivolous suggestions, here is one more realistic (though highly improbable) option which could, theoretically, offer a real way out of the financial problems of the United States: put a tax where the money is! After all, it is largely due to the unconscionable looting of the financial resources of the country by the very wealthy that have caused the present desperate state of affairs, so it only makes sense that those American citizens and Corporations registered in the United States with huge piles of wealth stuffed in their mattresses should be the ones to pay up the bills of the country they have so sorely treated while the rest of the country have either been sleeping or been paid off.

In case you haven't figured it out yet, this option is the one that inspires me to revisit the financial problems of the dollar. The option may not be politically very popular among those with the wealth and the power in the country, but the other 98% of the population do still retain a theoretical legal right to enact such a tax. It may be possible, for example, to mount a popular campaign to achieve this goal of taxing the rich. Politicians might be elected on a platform of promising to vote for such an idea, and Congress might pass the necessary legislation to accomplish it. However, to avoid the rapid sheltering of funds, this would have to happen very quickly. Perhaps it might even be necessary to assess the tax rate retroactively to 2010. Large teams of special auditors would have to be employed to determine appropriate assessments. Criminal penalties (i.e. indefinite incarceration until and unless the tax were paid) would probably have to be imposed.

Yes; the sharp ones among you will have noticed that these are not all uniquely different proposals. In fact, the present suggestion (of

taxing the rich) is quite decidedly revolutionary. The fall of the Bastille in 1789 might meet its parallel in the fall of the House of J.P. Morgan Chase, for example. Additionally, the formidable political obstacles to such a course of action might require divine intervention after all. Thus, when making any wagers as to the probable outcome of the current financial *ancien regime*, be sure to draft the terms of your wagers very carefully to avoid disputes.



Source: U.S. National Debt Clock
http://www.brillig.com/debt_clock/

The Kabbalah and The Tree of Life

March, 2011

I have studied eclectic philosophy all my life. I learned most about the Tree of Life of the Kabbalah when I accidentally re-invented it. When I saw that what I had done matched completely what was done before, I began to think that I must be on the right track.

It was Pythagoras who had the brilliant epiphany that the Numbers of mathematics are themselves the primary symbols of the Arcana, and comprise the original Metaphysics representing our Cosmos as Emanations from God. It is like all of the laws of geometry being based upon the definitions and axioms of Euclid.

Early on in my studies I figured out that all of the philosophies and religions in the world were all based around the same series of primary ideas, some emphasized more than others. I sorted out the ideas into those ideas expressed by the number One, ideas represented by the number Two, ideas illuminated by the number Three, ideas corresponding to the number Four, and ideas relating to the number Five. The meaning of each of these primary mysteries is best illuminated symbolically by the concept of the number associated with each idea (*Pythagorean Doctrine*).

I developed simple images to illustrate the essence of each number, and this sequence of ideas represented by the numbers of mathematics formed the basis of my studies and teaching of philosophy.

One day, pretty much by accident, I happened to stack my images vertically instead of horizontally, the way I had been presenting them in my books. To my surprise, I immediately recognized the Tree of Life from the Kabbalah. At first I thought this were an amusing coincidence, but, upon further investigation, I discovered that it was not simply the visible picture that was matched, but in every case, each of the 10 spheres (*Sephiroth*) corresponded precisely to the significance of the same position on my design! At first I was astonished, but eventually I realized that it would be more astonishing if they differed, since my sequence of images was intended to convey the same sequence of ideas represented by the Tree of Life: a primary Metaphysics illuminating the Nature and Meaning of God, and His relationship with Man, and with all the rest of His Cosmos.

After discovering this similarity, it became an easy matter to develop a much deeper understanding and appreciation of the Tree of Life. This is the same sequence of primary ideas as represented by every spiritual teaching in one way or another.

This primary sequence of Ideas and their Numbers from Pythagoras is none other than the Four Letters of the Name of God: *Tetragrammaton*. I was always very interested in the Tetragrammaton, as it was said to be the highest Key to understanding the Mysteries – the *Arcana*. However, all of my research sources lamented that the meaning and significance of the Tetragrammaton, while revered as surely the highest Key to the Mysteries, has, unfortunately, been lost. But such Mysteries cannot be lost. As Pythagoras tells us, the Illumination of each Mystery is contained within itself.

vide: Patterns of Illusion and Change, reprinted in The Laughter of God.

Good-bye

May, 2011

Personal problems cause me to bring my creative work to a close.

As my life passes in review before my eyes, I have to conclude that it has been a good life. I have made a great many mistakes, and much that I have attempted to accomplish remains unfinished. Perhaps some fresh young persons of a new generation may continue some of the work I have started, or realize some of my dreams, but, as for me, I must lay down my tools and allow the EVANESCENT PRESS to achieve its ultimate destiny of vanishing like a cloud of vapor, as my small contribution to the evolution of life passes into history.

All of my life I have looked at everything the way a proof-reader does — seeing the errors and looking for a better way. Sometimes this style might make it seem that I do not appreciate what is right and good, but that is not so: I love this world and this life; I love the people in our world, and I love the animals and the plants — my love of trees must be evident to anyone familiar with any of my writings. I have to admit that it is with a very great sadness that I let it all go as I fade away into oblivion.

But it is definitely true that I have a heightened awareness of error – I see it everywhere: in my own life, to begin with. I suppose my own mistakes and failures of judgment may not really be so much worse than those of most other people. It is true that I have lived my life on the edge, with radical ideas and attitudes, and I know that many people do not understand me at all, and look upon me as flawed, but I claim the familiar defense that I have been misunderstood. I do not want to minimize my own errors – with my proof-reader’s eyes it seems to me that I have done everything wrong. In my days as a letterpress printer on my handmade paper, I don’t think I ever looked at a finished piece of work without thinking of some way in which I might have done it better: wider margins, a different font or size, different line spacing, or something. In the same way, I now look back upon time after time in which I made a bad choice or did something foolish or wrong.

Nonetheless, I am not afraid to stand in the presence of God and accept His judgment of my life. I have tried to do the best I could, and it seems to me that most of my errors were very small, though numerous. I recall little things: something I may have said to someone that I later realized must have been considered very rude – these are the things that torment me, not any really serious errors. To anyone who may feel that anything I may have said or done was wrong, I offer my sincere apologies.

On the other side of the ledger, I consider what I have accomplished in my life. I have always considered my investigations into philosophy and metaphysics to have been of the

greatest importance. I would say that my most important contribution to philosophy is my re-discovery of the significance and importance of the *Tetragrammaton* and the *Tree of Life* of the *Kabbalah*. This is followed, in my estimation, by my correlation of the primary trigrams of the *I Ching* with the planets and metals of astrology and alchemy and the colors of the aura. And in my later years, I have become more and more interested in the nature of Consciousness and its relationship with God.

Over the course of my investigations into the mysteries of philosophy and life, I have developed a complete system of metaphysics, which answers all of my questions about the ultimate nature of reality. My conclusions may be wrong, of course, or incomplete, but at least they satisfy my own requirements. One thing I have to admit is that I used to think I had a “complete” metaphysics worked out, and then I would evolve some new ideas which extended or enlarged the scope of my existing ideas. I conclude from that that I suppose that *it is only possible to know what we know; it is not possible to know what we don't know!*

However, at least I have answers which satisfy me for all of the principle questions of philosophy: the origin and nature of the world, and the meaning of God. I was puzzled by the Problem of Evil, until I finally figured out that “God” were not a Being of infinite and omnipotent power, but the collective consciousness of all of Life. All of Life: together We are God.

I should also say that I have not discovered anything new – I used to think I were formulating new and original ideas (in my youth), and then I read the *Tao Te Ching* by Lao Tzu, and I was amazed to find ideas there which I thought I had invented. Later on, after I had a whole metaphysics built up of a sequence of primary ideas, I discovered, in my life's major epiphany, that by arranging the symbols of my ideas in a vertical pattern instead of horizontal, I had reproduced exactly the *Tree of Life* of the *Kabbalah*. From there, I understood also the meaning of the *Tetragrammaton*, whose significance was said to be lost, but which was revered as the most important Key to the mysteries of life.

So I have not discovered anything new – all I have done is to have re-discovered for myself the meaning of the ancient mysteries. I have, however, arranged them all into a format which I believe clarifies their meaning better than anything I have seen presented anywhere else. All of these ideas are detailed in my earlier book *The Laughter of God*.

My understanding of God has evolved tremendously from my earliest efforts to understand things. At the age of six I experienced a theological crisis, since my father was a Methodist minister and yet as far as I could figure out it was all nonsense! I remained a confirmed atheist for most of my early years, yet I knew from the start that it were useless to denounce something as wrong without having an alternative to propose. Accordingly, I set about studying all ideas of philosophy and religion that I could find. I do not need to repeat the story of my growing understanding of those ideas, nor

of the growing understanding of the nature of God, since it is all there in my published work, but I finally came around to appreciating the meaning and significance of God. At first, my idea of God was very abstract, but the more I continued with my investigations, the more I began to understand God in a more personal sense.

This all gets very complex. There is even a trinity of ideas that comprise my understanding of God: God the Father (or Mother) as the ultimate source and origin of the cosmos, which can only be seen in contrast with God the Son, an original movement out towards Novelty and Being. This may be understood as the original “joke” of imagining that Zero and Infinity mean different things. Our manifest cosmos represents the consequence of that original Joke, and the path towards reunion with God.

These “two persons of the Trinity” might be more easily understood as Female and Male principles, or Yin and Yang. But it is God the Holy Ghost which interests me lately: the God of the totality of Consciousness that sustains and orders the evolutions of life on our world.

Looking at God in this way, and not as some all-powerful Being who is therefore responsible for all of the enormous errors and problems of the world, has encouraged me to understand the importance of our own role: We are God, after all, and it is We who must take responsibility for the state of the world!

Instead of sitting back and “waiting for George to do it,” We must shoulder the responsibility Ourselves! It is up to Us to evolve Our Consciousness towards union with God and lead the field of life energy out of our current downward spiral and onto an upward path.

As I look over the last 10,000 years, it seems to me that there has been considerable positive evolution, and yet there are many very troubling signs in our current world. There are many who suppose that it is not possible to elevate the spiritual condition of Man or Beast, and that there is a fundamental selfishness that is inherent in the nature of life, but it is evident to me that there has been some real spiritual evolution going on. In fact, it has now become imperative for the human race (which, of course, occupies some of the higher ground in the hierarchies of Consciousness) to advance the pace of spiritual evolution if there is to be any hope for the survival of life on Earth.

I have tried to address some of these issues in my own life: my efforts to establish alternative sources of tree-free papermaking, utilizing abundant agricultural waste products instead of destroying the Trees of our ancient forest, have occupied most of the last fifteen years of my life. Even where annual fiber crops may be grown, hemp, for example, it will be the seed crop which will provide the primary harvest, yielding food for human nutrition, while the remaining stalks may be used for making pulp for paper. Many of these agricultural waste products are as good or better than wood as a source of papermaking, and there is already a great

abundance of this material that is simply wasted and discarded every year.

And then, buried and forgotten among my older writings, there is my idea of a Seminary formed of young people selected from all over the world to form a school and training ground for leadership in addressing the problems of the world. I still think that this is one of the most important ideas I have offered, and that it has the potential to provide a framework by which we might evolve a better political structure for sorting out the problems of the world. This is, of course, a very tall order, but the current jungle of sovereign states, many controlled by cabals of greedy, ruthless, and very fearful men (they are mostly men) creates a very dangerous world which is beset by very severe problems which threaten the survival of life more than any other aspect of our world.

When I speak about “cabals of greedy, ruthless, and very fearful men,” which countries do I have in mind? Well, just about all of them! Some are worse than others, but there are few governments that inspire much confidence. Problem states come to mind very easily, but whenever I am tempted to think of a country as rising above their more sordid neighbors, I am told by residents or nationals of those countries that the stink of corruption in their countries is as foul as anywhere else. I might be tempted to be more specific, but I think I prefer to keep the argument here very general.

Let us all hope and pray and work towards a better world. The first priority is to survive, and in order for the human race to survive, it is necessary for the planet to survive, and that means restoring the Trees, which have historically comprised the major portion of the Earth's living biological activity. The Trees have always been the primary basis of Life on this planet, and without them there is little hope for the rest of us.



Please, God, grant us the wisdom and the strength to do Thy will.