

## The One in Politics

The reason why this article is made available here is that the author noticed, much to his surprise, that the 11th September incident went uncommented at the Tucson 2002 consciousness conference, although it clearly indicates the crosscultural clash of two competing consciousnesses.

From the premise that all wars are religious wars the conclusion is drawn that the present war between America and Arabia is an inner-Islamic war. - The term "One" is used in the sense of Parmenides of Elea (540 - 470 B.C.)

Within short, the President of the United States of America will attack a former vassal. But for a lack of sufficient reason he would have a while ago. The reason he finally came up with reads: "Hideaways are illegal in this one world." - F.D. Roosevelt lead the US into and through World War II on the grounds that this war was exactly this, a world wide war, a war on the single battle field remaining: Earth. This world was one world, he maintained, and in it only the One could possibly exist: One set of values, One economic system, One political structure applicable to all nations, etc. - After Great Britain had conquered the world in the 19th century, it justified this by boasting to have put an end to history. For all future - if any - the world was to be substantially British as to its systems, structures, and general order. Henceforth it would forever keep up the best state possible. Any further evolution could not result in anything other than mankind's decline.

The One has been dominating politics ever since the French Revolution (1798 A.D.). Armies are shuffled around the globe not by treaties, defense coalitions, and organizations of nations. All of these may be considered forms of manifestation of the ideal One. A system of shared values is the glue of NATO and other alliances, while threats from potential aggressors are of trivial importance.

Some empiricists might argue that all this shows is the influence of technology which by itself connects global results to local causes. The sooner we understood, and obeyed to, this network of world wide interrelations the better for us and mother Earth. - But, this is merely an update of the old propaganda of totalitarianism. The One is progressively claiming religious status. Politics defined as "art of the possible" would never count incalculable war among its possibilities. Nowadays politics strives to render possible the impossible. What does the latter consist of?

The revival of the One is the rational reaction to the empiristic diversification of the world. Whenever this diversity progresses at a higher rate than existing paradigms can cope with the esoteric One steps in to calm things down. The once and for all illustration of this mechanism is provided in the book of Genesis (Bible, Old Testament): Noah, as the One, saves the world that is being flooded by a multicultural society that was not included in God's design of the universe. Noah isn't right because he is right, nor because he is good (in fact, he is an alcoholic, see Gen 9,20 ff), but because he is alone. Being alone is the necessary and sufficient reason for being elect. The competitors (see Gilgamesh epic, where Noah has rivals) get drowned, because they are many. To claim divine right for your doings you need to be forsaken. - The fight against such a hero is necessarily one of violence, not one of words. Because, he is right, no doubt about it, and there can only be one who is. The attack against the World Trade Center did not mean war, because it meant it, but because it meant challenge - the challenge of a certain One who challenged a different One.

The One challenged has been around for a while, as outlined above. So, who is the new guy in the ring? - Even before knowing the answer, we know one thing: The champion will be facing a row of challengers, each of which will be One of a kind.

Islam understands history as having come to an end at about 300 years after the death of the prophet, i.e. around the year 1000 A.D. Then, Allah decided to close the "Gates of Wisdom," having shared all of His knowledge with mankind He ever had meant to. Ever since, history hasn't been history,

but devil's doings.

The only difference between this interpretation of history and the British one outlined earlier is the one of ancientness. The British copied everything from the Arabs. Thus, the challenger is Islam challenging itself. Challenger and champion are identical, the latter merely being an updated version of the former. One and the same religion, Islam, is fermenting, using peoples, and wars between them, as vat.

So, all we should do is stand back and watch. All of this is nothing of our business. We are being abused, and we should refuse to be. If we did, Islam would die, as Christianity has perished, in Europe. If we play, Islam will grow, and will conquer Europe - of which there is nothing bad about, ofcourse.

The present war, too, is a war of religion. All wars are religious wars. The evolution of religion is what wars are all about. Nothing is more important than religion. Religion is the author of history. Religion sacrifices those first who strive to survive. How does it work?

Well, quite obviously, religion comes in two models, polytheism or monotheism. Atheism is a variety of polytheism. Because, the borderline between the two basic options is not defined by the number of deities revered, but by whether these are thought of as worldly or transcendental. For the polytheistic believer it is possible to be right in the face of his god. He can do right (or wrong), he can obey and be humble and devotional ("Islam"). The polytheistic god issues commandments, and the degree of belief is measured by the extent of obedience to these commandments. His power and identity he adopts from the locus of his residence, which is why believers travel to hieratic places like Lourdes or Mekka, or, in the case of planetary gods, predict and interpret these loci. The *monotheistic* god is either transcendental or pantheistic. The loci of his immanence are that immaterial (dry biscuits) that this matter can stand for the exclusively spiritual essence of the god. In the face of his monotheistic god the believer is permanently wrong. His being justified is due to an unreasonable act of grace by the god.

Islam is polytheistic, because Allah is imagined as part of the world. All of his appearances have just one and the same name. Soon after the Arabian umma (people) had conquered the orbis terrarum (the then known world), the gates of wisdom closed. When Britain was in the state of saying "Britain rules the waves," it declared the End of History. To the Arabic-English Islam, only things present are real. As soon as the world that by definition consists of things that are "there" and that "are the case" has been conquered and can be subjected to will power, nothing remains to be done and to be recognized. Typically, polytheists (or atheists) assert that there is no such thing as "free will." In polytheistic believers, will power is "alien" (in the psychiatric sense) to the individual, and replaces cognition.

Polytheism keeps the magnitude of the diversity of the world constant, but considers the world to be dynamic as a whole. Monotheism considers the world a constant, but dynamizes the process of interior diversification. Obviously, both forms of religion describe brain processes, and processes of historical brain evolution, in a number of ways.

The process of diversification starts with the One splitting into two parts, only one of which diversifies. The distance between the two is the critical measure. In polytheism it remains constant. In monotheism it is dynamic, and is equivalent to the ego of history. Cognitively, it appears as space and time.

How come religions are that stable? Only wars can eliminate them, if at all, by eliminating believers. Cognition is basically re-cognition, re-ligio, self-reference, and the ego of the individual, of each man and woman, is primordially not conscious, but self-conscious, or backwardly

conditioned. There is a Little Noah in each of us. All knowledge starts off from an intuitional knowledge about a virtual other that challenges me and my self-confidence. The only One does not exist. "No man is an island, entyre of himself," as the poet says. No man, no spirit can cognite himself. This would be equivalent to the magnitude of the distance between the two halves of the One being equal to zero. At this status, the two halves are not symmetrical, because they do not contain each other's image. This zero distance therefore is equivalent to non-existence. The real One consists of halves that carry each other's image, with one of these halves being diversified and the images in it being "abbreviated." - Part one of the One remains One, although the image of part two in it changes in accordance with the dynamics of part two. Part two diversifies until reaching an infinitesimal monadic stage, each diversification saving a tinier and tinier image of part one, thus keeping up the symmetry. The resulting totality can still be called a One, because it is the One continuously progressing to its ideal form or state of perfection. A One being diversified, but symmetrical to all regions of the universe is more perfect than a One that would materially be a One. In other words, the One is neither an atom nor a monad, but perfect symmetry, where perfectness is defined as omnipresence or omnipotence, which are the same. This is the definition of Parmenides.

To rule the world means to be the first part of the One, that part that remains One, and imprints its image on the diversifications, thus turning the world into a symmetrical image of itself, i.e. part One. Islam fighting against itself will conquer itself only to render eternity to the defeated part, represented by the conquerer. It's always the same game: Slay your foe, then eat his brain, and drink spirits out of his skull, to ensure your dead foe's eternal life.

"The same are thinking and being," says Parmenides. The first One defines the being of the existing (i.e. diversified) One. The political application of this idea thus is based on the conviction of the contingency of the world (i.e. part two of the One), i.e. the conviction of the necessity of the non-existence of the not-being. This conviction is diametrically opposed to Christianity. In Christianity, the being is contingent, while the not-being is possible. Contingency and possibility are considered rigorously contingent and rigorously possible, respectively. The dogma of the necessity of the non-existence of the not-being is the source of the standstill of the world under the rule of polytheism. The political application of the idea of the One intends this standstill. It despises sacrifices and intends the eternity and thus worldly omnipotence of the things present. Christianity it is opposed to as can be.

**(c) webmaster [www.consciousness.de](http://www.consciousness.de)**