1. Hegel, Freud, Hubbard.

Like a creek that ends up in the ocean, we have to start with a seemingly special line that ends up in the most general truth. Yet even formally, a certain absoluteness can be seen from this line. Hegel was not only the last classical philosopher, but also a total of all philosophy before him. This can be seen at once if somebody reads his lectures on the history of philosophy. Every single thought that is original in the History of Philosophy is mentioned and clearly explained in this work. And then, as an even more amazing confirmation of Hegel's position in the history of thought, one of his students, Marx, initiated a complete opposition to Hegel's philosophy and yet claimed that he conserved the real truth of Hegel. This in fact, had a direct effect on the "survival" of Hegel, because in the communist countries Hegel became part of the required literature, almost like an ancient sacred text.

But we have to start at a central and absolute truth about Hegel, and like all absolute truths it concerns a lie. Because as our motto said, "The truth is always complicated, but the lies are always simple". This lie can be approached by starting with a reaction of Hegel to a motto of Newton that he placed in one of his works namely, in his Optics. It says that, "Physics beware of Metaphysics". What Newton meant was obviously that physics should keep to its own logic of mathematical and observable truths, rather than enforced concepts from philosophy or religion. This is even more understandable if we remember that Newton derived the Kepler laws of planetary motions from his simple physical principles. Kepler himself, regarded his laws as God given rules. Most interestingly, one of his "Godly" rules turned out to be false and has since been forgotten. It's also important to see that Kepler had an exceptionally good mathematical mind and this initiated physics as such. Indeed, the whole point of physics is that it applies mathematical rules in nature. If we also require that these mathematical laws are derived from simple principles, then of course physics was born not with Kepler, but with Newton. I would tend to go back and start with Kepler, because later this unique relationship between them repeats again as Maxwell and Einstein. Just as Kepler's exceptional mathematical mind was able to grasp something without the full physical understanding of it, Maxwell's exceptional mathematical mind was able to grasp an even more universal law, namely of the electromagnetic waves, without the full understanding of its physics. This also puts the right emphasis on Einstein because, only his Relativity puts the Maxwell laws into a meaningful framework. This also answers to those completely mistaken claims that the earlier mathematical results of Poincare already mean the birth of Relativity and Einstein only "stole" them. Then again, this doesn't justify the awful behavior of Einstein towards Poincare. But that's another story.

Returning to Hegel. He made the witty remark that Newton's motto of, "Physics beware of Metaphysics", in fact means that, "Physics beware of thinking". We might just appreciate this remark formally if we realize that all thinking is indeed metaphysical, but it is relevant even in a deeper sense and this was also expressed by Hegel, namely that physics and mathematics are only operating in a non metaphysical sense, because they derive results from assumed principles without going further into these assumptions. What disturbs here Hegel must disturb anybody who dwells into mathematics or physics too. But the difference is that those who truly venture into math and physics will soon realize that everything that might be beyond the assumed principles must be kept hidden in order to keep to the truth. This is just one particular manifestation of Formalism. The beginning of Formalism goes back to the origin of

mankind. The name, Formalism, itself was only given in the new mathematics, but we can clearly see it already at Euclid. The basic problem of his geometry is parallelity. Intuitively, we see parallelity as two lines in a plane that:

1. Are the same distance from each other at any point of them.
2. Go in the same angle to any line that crosses them.
3. Never cross each other.

The basic fact is that any of the above three description is enough in itself to define the parallels, that is the other two automatically follows from it. Yet as we can see, they use different concepts. The first distances, the second angles while the third crossing. Clearly, this last one is the simplest because the crossing of two lines is merely the existence of a common point. This in itself suggests that lines should be regarded as collections of points, or as we say it today as sets of points. Yet this "set" concept was not used by Euclid. A general set concept would have meant to define sets in general and then specify planes, lines, circles as special sets. That's how we regard them today. But Euclid regarded these as primal concepts in themselves. This was already one big Formalist step because obviously he realized the underlying set meanings, yet intentionally avoided them. But, the real, more obvious formalist step was that after struggling with the three above mentioned features of parallels, he was able to crystallize the exact statement that is necessary to prove that the three are equivalent. Not surprisingly, he used the third non crossing property and his famous Parallelity Axiom, said that, "To a line through an outside point in a plane, there is only one single line that is not crossing the original line". This single non crossing line can then be called the parallel to the line, through the chosen point. Most importantly, not just the definition of parallels is given by the axiom, but with the other axioms of geometry, the other two features of parallels can be derived. Again I have to emphasize that years and years of thinking back and forth, up and down became crystallized in the seemingly ad hoc choice of the axiom. Those who really went into geometry knew this depth of the Parallelity Axiom and tried to replace it with other basic assumptions. The greatest classical mathematician, Gauss was the first who realized that denying the Parallelity Axiom doesn't lead to immediate contradictions, in fact it leads to quite amazing "non real" geometries. He thought that nobody would understand where he ventured and left his results in his drawers. Later, when young mathematicians approached him with the possibilities of new non Euclidian geometries, he simply replied that he already discovered these, without even complimenting them about their results. He did the same in other subject matters and caused incredible sufferings to many young geniuses. Gauss plays a central role in our particular approach through the Newton-Hegel controversy.

I already praised Hegel's History of Philosophy as the proof of his culminating role in philosophy and yet, in this very work he reveals himself as the person who remained totally ignorant about the very role of science. He repeats his critic about Newton and adds that it is no wonder that since then physics hasn't progressed much. First of all, this is false because Newton's physics became completely transformed by the time of Hegel, with amazing new Formalisms replacing the simple Newton laws. But, even if we just stick to the simple Newton laws, we can ask what they actually predict. As I said, they imply the Kepler laws of planetary motions, but also they imply all details of our particular solar system, if we have enough observable data. I also mentioned that Kepler had a false "fourth law" that would tell the exact planets of our solar system. Now, the Kepler laws themselves were not completely satisfied by our planets. This is so because the true three Kepler laws are consequences of the Newton laws applied to a sun and a planet around it. But of course we have more

planets, and even though the sun is much bigger than the planets and the planets are far from each other, they still disturb each other's motions. To take the planets themselves into consideration and thus establish the exact motions is of course an incredible task because as we see, it is a delicate balance of cause and effect. Most amazingly, even when they regarded the planets themselves and used the Newton laws, the calculated motions were still differing minutely from the observed ones. The only explanation by those who believed in the absolute power of the Newton laws, was that there must be smaller unobserved masses in our solar system. Whether we call them planets or not, is immaterial. The main thing is that Gauss carried out these incredibly complicated calculations (without a computer mind you) and predicted not only the existence, but the observable time of Ceres, the biggest "rock" in the asteroid belt. The actual observation of Ceres should have made Hegel realize the fundamental wrong that he was in! It's not about whether we regard Ceres as a planet or not! It's about the power of science, to tell when and where to look up the sky with a telescope and see a tiny rock reflecting the sun's light! To see it accidentally is impossible by the law of big numbers, because the sky is simply too big and Ceres is too small! Hegel's argument about the narrow mindedness of science going from blindly accepted axioms to mere obvious consequences is true and it is an earliest critic of Formalism. But, not to see that nature itself has to play part in this effectiveness of Formalism is even more blindness. The simple truths of course, as it is always with a lie, is that his own incapability of seeing the details of science was covered up by his criticism. In fact, the situation was even worse because, he effectively stated that the search for a new planet is pointless because there must be seven planets. So, he fell back to Kepler's God designed solar system. And of course, even if we regard Ceres as a rock and not a planet, after Hegel's death, Neptune and then much later, only in the twentieth century, Pluto was discovered.

Freud seems like a person out of the blue after Hegel, but there is a very deep connection. Thinking, observed by the thinker himself was Hegel's "art". The aboves showed that obvious lies could still remain in such self observation. That doesn't mean that Hegel's observations were false, but it proved that consciousness can be quite easily betrayed by simple ignorance. The word consciousness was also accepted as an alternative for the thinking process by Hegel himself. His main work, the Phenomenology of the Spirit is actually the evolution of consciousness. Scientists also tried to "crack" the problem of consciousness, in fact there were so many new theories that the French Academy stopped accepting works that "solved" the mystery of human consciousness. Freud turned the whole consciousness problem around when he realized that there are tendencies with repeated laws that are completely unconscious. This turnaround and intentional ignorance of consciousness was different from the purely philosophical oppositions to the big classical line of objective idealism. One such counter philosopher was Schopenhauer, teaching at the same university as Hegel. He just as Gauss, regarded Hegel as a simple charlatan. They were both wrong! Gauss claimed that philosophers say either something obvious or something false. This is not true. There are things that are not obvious, and neither completely false. One thing is sure, that Hegel never stated the obvious. In fact, Gauss' criticism is most applicable to Schopenhauer. He claimed that the logic of consciousness, if there is any at all, is not so important, because there is an illogical force in nature. His main work, The World As Will and Representation, already reveals in its title, where he is heading. Indeed, he believed that titles should reflect the content. This is very admirable and in all respects, he was a very admirable person, much nicer than Hegel. But, the truth is that there is no mystical will in nature,

he was chasing a shadow. Later, he was claimed to be a forerunner of Freud, which is a complete nonsense. Schopenhauer created a false philosophy while Freud created a false science.

As I said, the simple lies reveal the most, and in Freud's life this is the most obvious! He could have ended up as a failed psychiatrist or even in jail after his cocaine treatments for hysterical women. But he was a survivor, in fact, he rose as a new phoenix after his observations about the subconscious tendencies. We all heard about the wild consequences that he derived, with phallic symbol, oedipous complex, and so on. The theoretical constructs like ego and Id are even more confusing and would qualify as the dreaded "metaphysicals" of Newton.

But the deterioration didn't finish with Freud and his followers, rather with an "opposer" who repeated Freud's observations about the subconscious and instead of building metaphysically on it, combined it with a Hegelian self observation. Thus, the cycle became complete in a mediocre theory and a new religion by L. Ron Hubbard. And yet, the intensions were just as pure as at Hegel to go beyond the trivialities of everyday life. But, the mistakes were even more obvious too.

2. Marx, Darwin, Leary.

If Hegel, Freud, Hubbard was a strange line, then Marx, Darwin, Leary seems even more so. And yet, it will make all sense. I already mentioned that Marx was a student of Hegel and tried to inject Hegel's intellect into his own philosophy. The fact, that he called this new philosophy Dialectical Materialism, means nothing because in fact, he was an idealist. You might think that I meant this in the everyday sense, that he was believing in the ideal of communism, but that's not the case. In fact, this ideal is the least idealistic element in his philosophy. The word "dialectical" was supposed to emphasize the Hegelian new element in his materialism, as opposed to old "mechanical" materialisms. Lenin, as a true marxist studied Hegel, in fact wrote a whole book of notes to his major work. He said that Marx turned Hegel to the right position from standing on his head to stand on his feet. It's a nice analogy, but doesn't change the fact that Hegel was artificially dragged into the philosophy of communism.

Darwin, just like Freud, started from simple facts, but instead of opposing something mystical, he was able to explain something mystical in a quite simple way. In fact, this simplicity is the extreme because it's the self evidence of mathematics. It's obvious that individual plants, animals have minor differences. These so called, mutations, are regarded as the individual features, still ruled by the similarity of the species. But the question of how the species were formed remained a mystery. The seemingly perfect design of each animal to its lifestyle easily suggested a Godly design, like Kepler's laws. The idea that animals might have developed from each other was natural, especially due to the observed fact that the fetus goes through forms of earlier species. The main mistake in the idea of an evolution before Darwin was, that it assumed that the lifestyle of the individual, somehow changes the individual itself. So for example, a giraffe has a long neck, because it is always reaching up to the leaves. Even more mysteriously, then this ability to cope with a lifestyle, has to be transferred to the offsprings. So for example, those giraffes that are better in reaching to the leaves, somehow transfer this ability to their offsprings. There were obvious signs against such transfer because as we all know, the accidents, damages, that we endure are not transferred to our children. On the other hand, many

of our features do transfer. So this division of transferable and non transferable properties is the basic problem. Today we know that all those properties that we are born with, can be transferred, but those that we gain in our lifetimes, can not be. Amazingly, even in the middle of the twentieth century, there were scientists who still believed that acquired properties can be transferred. Some froze butterflies to prove that the offspring were more cold resistant. An other case, was even darker! An assistant is tampered with some rat experiment that tried to show that cutting off the tails would lead to shorter tailed rats. Eventually, the fraud turned out and the scientist committed suicide.

The big realization of Darwin was that all this transfer of acquired properties is not necessary to show a continuous change towards fitting better and better into the conditions of the environment. Indeed, just by assuming that there is always a slight mutation within the individuals, and assuming that the life and especially the mating advantages those that are better for the environment, will automatically bring about a "natural selection". So just as, humans were breeding dogs by choosing the wanted properties, nature is continually breeding the species by choosing the individuals to survive better or mate with a little bit higher probability. Of course, this natural breeding is much slower because the selection is not as drastic as our picking of the litters. It all boils down to numbers, especially to the high number of generations, that are required to bring about the changes. When Darwin discovered this purely mathematical possibility of the changing species, he did not claim that this is the only driving force of evolution. This was only claimed by the so called Neo Darwinists of the twentieth century and they won their case when finally the DNA was discovered. This proved beyond any doubt, that the genes are transferred without any interference of the individual life! Of course, there are extreme influences that disturb the genes themselves like radiations and so on, but the giraffe's reaching for the leaves, will not influence his genes sitting in his sperm cells in the testicles or in her eggs in the ovary. Of course, this simplicity still became a bit more complicated with how the parental genes are combining and even ensure a fail safe mechanism for inherited bad genes. More importantly, this new evolution and gene theory brought about just as many new mysteries as it demolished. Indeed, the inheritance of acquired properties became completely refuted by the discoveries of genes, but the form and abilities of the individuals still remain a puzzle. This is so, because the genes are only dictating the buildings of the proteins that will form our body. So, unlike in a building of a house where there is a whole design, and the bricks are laid according to that, here the whole design is within every brick and the bricks simply stick together perfectly to become a house. Even when we put a jigsaw puzzle together, the little errors in the cuttings can lead to a completely distorted picture if we don't force them to fit tight according to the already seen total picture. Since in nature there is no such force, it would mean that the pieces are so perfect that they simply can't fit together wrongly. That's a pretty big assumption. Beside, we have no clue how such a self organizing can operate, because in the beginning, the cells are simply splitting blindly. So every individual starts with the same ball of cells and then the inside ones die off, it becomes hollow, then it caves in, and so on it differentiates, but amazingly a cat becomes a cat, a frog becomes a frog. But this Morphological Paradox is nothing compared to the other one, which could be called the "Behavior Evolution". The giraffe's neck or the lion's tooth are perfect examples of Darwin's evolution. The little bit taller giraffes or the little bit sharper toothed lions had an advantage, so they survived more. This was possible because there are always mutated necks and teeth. But the nest building of a bird can not be explained this way. To assume that there

was a bad nest building behavior from which those individuals that built a little bit better, survived more, is insane, because only the perfect round nest is better. So the chaotic behavior can not directly lead to the final perfections that we see today. Even more, unexplainable are some other blind but purposeful behaviors especially, the tool usage. The eagle, that throws a rock to an egg to break it, can be very hardly explained as a refinement of accidental rock droppings. Indeed, if an accidentally dropped rock doesn't break the egg, then it's totally useless!

Marxism went completely parallel with Darwinism and believed in an evolution of societies regardless of the individual rulers and personalities. If nothing else then this was the most obviously refuted by the fall of communism itself. While the fermentation of the real reasons causing the fall of communism appeared in the east, in the west, the hippie movement was happening. The sixties, sex and drugs and rock and roll became stereotypes, while the real message died off completely. If someone reads Timothy Leary's speech at the Psychoanalytic society, would never guess that he soon becomes the founder of anti-establishment. At the same time as Hubbard deformed his world saving ideals into a socially conformist system of lies, Timothy Leary completely turned away from social respectability and became the clown critic. All this, may confuse us and miss to apply the only measuring stick, that is valid in the long run, namely how much truth they spelled out. And of course, all such truths are only the sheddings of lies.

Timothy Leary declared deeper truths than anybody before him, and only the confusing state of the present, hides this. So there is no way forward without accepting Leary's truths. The basic two is the following: Firstly, the establishment is a single operating system to suppress the true nature of the individual. Secondly, the individual who grows out of family and society can never get rid of the implanted seed of slavery as false ego, without the help of a mind altering drug. But, this drug influence is not enough in itself, it has to be for the right purpose and with the right consequence. So there you have it: Turn on, tune in, drop out! The truest sentence ever spelled out in human history. So then what was missing from Leary? The reaction to science and philosophy! He turned his back to his chosen science, psychiatry. That was correct, but he missed the real critic of science or rather the critic of real science. We might wonder what would've been if he had been a mathematician or a physicist. Probably he would've gone deeper and remained unnoticed. Today, the lie is bigger and wider, so to reveal it we also have to go deeper. So the times seeming to be the most desperately hopeless can actually be the most ripe.