

Web of Lies

This title refers to not just any web of lies in general, but a particular and single common web of lies in our human culture. I believe that this is the most complicated structure in the universe and yet everybody is part of it and everybody knows about it in the most direct way. Our participation starts when we learn to talk. Talk in our own mother tongue thought to us by our family. But our particular language soon loses its importance, because we learn about the whole world, where many people live with different languages. Our language allows us to communicate to others, but more importantly, to think. We can only contemplate what would a wild child raised by wolves or lions think about. We heard about such stories, but it was never really tested. Indeed, it would be a very cruel experiment, to deprive children of the language, just to see how far they can go without it. We can all agree that such language deprived children would become retarded, and as adults, couldn't be taught a language later. Thus suggests that at a very early age, language opens up an intelligence that is a dormant capacity in all of us. We can also see that by the age of four, five, children can learn their language perfectly, what's more, they can use it to understand the whole world around them. Philosophers and scientists tried to figure out what the main feature of this human intelligence is. Usually, they interrelated this problem with the wider question, what consciousness is in general. This widening of course, provokes the two specific questions, whether animals or machines can be intelligent. Science fiction even used these possibilities to entertain us. I myself only a few years ago, realized that behind all these problems lies a much more obvious one, right in front of our eyes, which we were simply too blind to tackle. After the child learns to speak and goes to pre school, then school, starts the real childhood. This is much longer than the few years of toddler age and yet we have no idea what's happening in this period either. The things we learn in school are the least important contributors of this period. School might be a miniature version of society, but even without schools, childhood goes through the same hidden metamorphosis. We don't need the cruel test that I mentioned above for babies, because in history we had children growing up in all possible environments. The ten years that we spend in this fully intelligent and yet "not finished" state hides more mystery than the awakening of the intelligence in our first few years. This is the period when we learn, secretly and slowly, how to live in the web of lies. Without solving this riddle, we'll never even get close to raise the right questions about the seemingly more fundamental, human intelligence or general consciousness. It is strange that I only realized this a few years ago, thirty years after that I turned my back on society as a measurestick of truth. So now I know that we all have four distinct periods in our lives. Early childhood or the awakening of intelligence, childhood or the learning of lies, adulthood or the slavery in lies and finally a few seconds or minutes before we die, the final confrontation with the web of lies. Life should be a preparation for these final moments.

As I said, everybody has some knowledge about the web of lies. But I also said that that's all we learn for the ten years of childhood. So I had two different meanings of knowing. In childhood we learn how to use and how to be used by the web of lies. Just as when we ride a bicycle, we can't think about how we do it, the same way efficiently live in the web of lies we can't face the full depth of the lies. Particular lies can be still observed, but these never get to the core of the devilish and universal game that we play. In spite of this, sticking to the particular details of individual lies that we face, we can slowly develop a sense of preparation for a cataclysmic awakening. So, what keeps us from combining the here and there already appearing signals that something is basically wrong in the world and come to the conclusion that we are on the wrong track? Simply, because we don't have an other track! We might think that children who are so dependent on their surrounding are more in need of

safety than adults. But we are wrong! Adults who already practice the living in safety, can very rarely go back to the state of child and ask what should I do. All these might give an impression that I'm worried about the individual getting lost in the false safety of lies. This is not true! Once you face the full depth of the Fall of Man, you don't care about the individuals. The billions of poor souls living phony lives is not an issue for the awakened, just as it is not an issue for any of them either. The real issue is seeing the truth, just as it is even for the billions of blinds. This seems contradictory, but in fact it's very simple. All this means that the only real motivator of our actions is what we regard to be true at a moment. Our brain can help us to gather more facts and thus, widen our judgment of truth, but it also restricts us to combine the facts that make judgments. The whole point is that it all happens in the brain for everybody, regardless of their level of intellectuality. So, it's not our social commitments, our hunger for material possessions, passions and fears that keep us in slavery, only our brains. There is no outside the brain mystical web that entangle us into doing what we are doing. It's all implanted already in our brain! That's why we needed ten years to become an adult. We learnt to think, to become a loser. The world is still a constrain we have to live in. If it rains, we go under a cover, but not to go out, because it rains is the decision of our brain. The brain knows at every moment exactly and in all details what our options are. We make our decisions by these options. That doesn't mean that we can't have parallel and contradictory thoughts. In fact, the brain uses these conflicts to keep us combining towards bigger truth. A gambler knows exactly that he will probably lose and yet, keeps on betting. This very sense of "freedom" from the determination of our reasons is false though. We never work against our brain! Even falling in love is a computational result of the brain, a best tactics not to face some things. This all might sound hopelessly devilish, but actually it's a good news. If everything is in the brain, then at least we don't have to deal with God and destiny.

The last big turnaround in human thought was in Timothy Leary's brain, induced by LSD. That's reality! Not an intellectual breakthrough, rather a simple acceptance of the inevitable. There were other less famous people, bankers, FBI agents and businessmen who after taking LSD turned around, but Timothy Leary expressed it as a movement, "Turn on, tune in, drop out". So he wasn't bigger than those bankers, FBI agents or businessmen, he just had a bigger role. But the sixties are gone dude, what the hell are you talking about. Yes indeed, the sixties are gone. It became incorporated into the web of lies, that we can sell and implant into the brains of newer generations. A more important question, and that's what the "critical" new generations always ask, what happened to the awakened brains. If they could become burnout social morons, then how deep was their awakening? For a while, I myself was bitter how Timothy Leary became a clown at his old age and "gave up" the big cause. But there was no big cause! There were lies and there were truths! And today there are new lies and new truths. Also, for me to stay the only hippie of the world, was not cause by a deeper dedication to a cause, rather a wider field of truths already at that time. At the day my friend Michael gave me my first LSD pill, he stopped at my bookshelf with the dozens of math and physics books. Took off one of them, opened the yellow North Holland publication's Set Theory book, looked at the weird symbols and asked: Are all these are really important? When the flowers on the curtains opened and my watch started to climb backwards and my brain was trying to figure out what was happening, I didn't think of any of the math or science that I learnt from those books. It took me an other twenty years to figure out why I didn't think of those books and what's wrong with them.

The lies that we learn as children partially are passed through the special lies of education. Usually, we fight against the information that we are supposed to learn either because we are lazy to learn them or find them boring or irrelevant to our lives. So the child never really asks whether he is really thought the right way at all to learn those informations. We all heard the joke that "those who don't know how to do it,

will teach it". Indeed, teachers are not respected, neither by students nor by society. The teachers don't rebel against this because deep down they know, that they are guilty of something so deep and fundamental that could only be called as the "original sin". Yes, teaching is the most sacred activity of Man! The changing of a mind without matter and power by merely exposing it to an other mind. But what should we expose? The required facts of a curriculum? Are there things that we can only learn from a person and not from books? The education system is so deeply rotten that these questions don't even matter. There is however a very definite difference between the informations transferred by the education system or the media or the publications of professionals. These three seemingly could be gradually deepening levels of "teaching". Indeed, the media with the most basic level that has to appeal to all, the education system with its organized general knowledge and the professional, containing the new. The truth is that all three is infected with the same "virus", but causes three different type of "cancer". This "virus" is Formalism. This word was only coined for the new mathematics and at that time it expressed a positive tendency to write all mathematics as formal sentences of Logic and Set Theory. That I borrow this word from mathematics is not a personal choice. Mathematics is the center of all knowledge and contains all possible lies in its purest form. First I just saw how Formalism was predating new mathematics. For a while I even thought that the initiator was Gauss, the boy genius who became a bitter old man. They called him "the fox" because just as this animal erases with its tail its foot prints, Gauss erased all the steps that would indicate how he arrived at his discoveries. Realizing that these discoveries were actually proofs of new theorems, we can even appreciate this "erasing" tendency, because we might think that it was for the clarity of the final proof. But this is not so! Mathematical Logic was still not existent and many of his proofs wouldn't be exact in today's standard. Today I see that his intentions of just giving the facts and keeping all personal informations about what he saw hidden were just an other step in the long line of Formalism that goes back to the caveman. Going backwards, we can see how Euler, Newton, even Euclid, were already perfect Formalists. In fact, the best example is Euclid, because the elimination of Geometry, from the education system is just happening. The parallel line that is one of our basic, a-priori concept was the biggest problem for Euclid to formalize. He saw, just as we all do, that there are three distinct properties of the parallel lines. Firstly, they have the same distance from each other everywhere. Secondly, they will bear the same angle to any third one that crosses them. Finally, they don't cross each other. Euclid thought a lot about these three properties, for years. Yet today we only know what the crystallized result of his thoughts became, namely a single assumption from which the identity of these three follows. This so called parallelity axiom says that for any line, if we pick an outside point, then through that point there is one and one single line that will not cross ours. Strangely, even this crown of his thoughts was not simple enough for others and so many tried to derive the existence of this line from some simpler assumptions. The way to do this is to imagine if for a line through an outside point there would be more different lines that don't cross our base line. Getting a contradiction could be regarded as a proof of impossibility. But nobody could get a contradiction, instead weird possibilities appeared for lines that seem curved in our world but do not contradict any rules of straight lines. The first person who ventured into this wonderland of impossible parallels was Gauss. He liked what he saw, but realized that nothing tangible came out. No proof of new or old unsolved theorem. So he threw all his results in a drawer. When later, the son of his friend sent him a work discovering these new parallels, he sent a short reply saying that he can't praise the work, because otherwise he would have to praise himself, since he already had discovered all that. Here we see where Formalism goes into immorality. Gauss caused the misery of many young mathematicians. In spite of this, he was a very moral person in some other aspects, for example, when Napoleon stopped his income and

some French mathematicians tried to influence the emperor to restore it, Gauss refused to accept it. By the way, his children estranged from him, and ended up in America. This fine line of Formalist immorality repeats again and again for all famous mathematicians and scientists.

In 1969, Rome, I ordered in the American bookshop Paul Cohen's Set Theory and Continuum Hypothesis. I didn't speak a word of English. I wrote the Hungarian meanings above the words with a pencil and as the pages went less and less marked words appeared. One of the basic theorems of Set Theory is the Well Ordering Theorem. The proof in Cohen's book is only a few lines. In Hungary, the only book I found on Set Theory was Kalmar's university textbook that started with a praisal of Stalin's revolutionary linguistic achievements. The Well Ordering theorem was four, five pages and inconceivably complicated. When in 1972 I returned to Hungary, I went to see Andras Hajnal, who was the most famous expert on Set Theory and told him that it is a nonsense that still there isn't a usable Hungarian book on Set Theory and Logic. Rozsa Peter, an old girlfriend of Kalmar, wrote a classic book before the War titled "Playing With Infinity". Hajnal told me that there is no point in publishing one in Hungarian, because those who are interested speak English anyway. A few years later, when Paul Erdős visited Hungary, I wrote him a letter, in detail, about my disappointment that teaching or writing good textbooks is not regarded as a goal for any of the experts. I still have his totally idiotic reply with the naïve and honest simplicity of a genius. Even later, I read that when he learnt that Posa, one of the wonder children of my generation, decided to be a teacher, he sighed "Ah, he's gone too". Erdős admittedly believed that the only purpose of life is to prove unsolved problems. He even spent his money on rewards for new proofs. All this is even stranger if I tell that his friend, Polya, wrote the famous words that: "No amount of knowledge can replace the correctness of vision". Indeed, this is the clue to education. We have to transfer our vision. We have to tell how we see, so the other person can have a head start. Because that's what it's all about. Giving up our advantage, give away the result of our blood, sweat and tears. The Formalist would say that "seeing" is a personal matter and should be done by everybody for himself. There is no line separating the dry Formalism of smart people, that avoids unnecessary philosophizing including the explanations of how to visualize the facts, from the selfish Formalism of stupid people and bad teachers, simply exploiting their own advantage. For the smart, there is always a lure of discovering something bigger, for the stupid, the lure is life itself, to confirm, while be above somebody else. When I read Paul Cohen's book, I knew that he must be different, that he tried to explain truly how he saw. When I met him in Stanford, he indeed was different and yet he was already on the same false track as all geniuses, lured by Formalism. He decided that he will solve the Riemann Hypothesis. He once decided that he will prove the unsolvability of the Continuum Hypothesis and he succeeded. So what's wrong with going for the next? The wrong is that he has a lot of things that he could share and he won't because of this false track. When Cohen proved his big result with a totally new method called "Forcing", he had to go to Princeton to show it to Kurt Gödel. He was the biggest living mathematician, the only one who could find a possible error in Cohen's proof. Gödel was already crazy for a long time, and opened the door only enough to slip the paper through. There was no error and Gödel approved. This visit should have given a warning for Cohen for the paths not to follow. Especially if we think about Gödel's friend at Princeton, Albert Einstein. Unlike Gödel, who is only known among professionals, Einstein became the symbol of modern science. The lies about Einstein are the most manipulative examples in the web of lies, even though the facts are quite simple and straightforward. Some white supremacist idiots, claim that Einstein was a scientific nobody who stole all of his discoveries and the jews helped him, claiming his priorities. Sadly, these extreme anti Einstein opinions are actually helping to conserve the false image that the mass media formed. It's true that all the discoveries of

Einstein which are usually depicted as the unexpected results of his deep genius were actually very much “in the air” at the time of their discovery. Poincare was already lecturing for years about Relativity and $E = mc^2$ as mathematical possibilities when Einstein came up with Special Relativity. Later, when General Relativity was published, another mathematician, Hilbert came up with similar results. There is no question about that Einstein couldn't steal these, but what is more important, he regarded them in the proper physical meanings, not just as possible mathematical equations. Both Poincare and Hilbert completely accepted Einstein's priority and were promoting his discoveries as such. On the other hand, Einstein carefully never mentioned these two as forerunners or preludes to his theories and this caused a bit of bitterness in them. It's easy to understand these events in a wider context, as physicists versus mathematicians. When Alfred Nobel discovered the dynamite, it made him a lot of money. Many people died before the manufacturing of nitroglycerin became safe. So this was in a sense, blood money and Nobel thought that the “noble” thing to do was to set up a prize for exceptional scientists. He hated mathematicians for some personal reasons, so it was also a rude way to revenge them by excluding mathematics from the rewardable subjects. But if we think about where mathematics is today, with the out of control Formalist theorem manufacturing, then we have to agree that it was a wise decision. At any rate, physicists are always a bit envious of mathematicians because physics needs mathematics to formulate its laws, but mathematics doesn't need physics. For example, only after Einstein published Special Relativity, a mathematician, Minkowski realized that it can be regarded as a simple generalization of the three dimensional $d^2 = x^2 + y^2 + z^2$ Pythagoras Theorem to four dimension using an imaginary time as the fourth dimension. Later, when Einstein found the equations for General Relativity, it was only possible with the help of his mathematician friend Grossmann. There is no doubt that Einstein was a vain scientist and didn't like to share his results. But the real shocker about him was in his personal life and only came to light accidentally. His first wife, who he met as a student, became pregnant before their marriage. Einstein was so afraid what his parents, especially his mother, would say to an illegitimate child, that he sent the pregnant woman back to her home village to bear the child and give it up for adoption. In a letter, he asks her, if she “took care of it”. All this was kept carefully secret for all his life. The accepted opinion is that his first wife was mentally unstable and that led to their divorce a few years later. They had two sons from the marriage and Einstein gave his Noble prize money to the ex wife to live with the children in Switzerland. These facts talk for themselves, but the saddest part is that his daughter became sick and died at a young age, but all records have disappeared. After Einstein's death, his brain was preserved with his prior permission and several samples were sent to institutions to study. There were other murderers whose brain were studied, but this one is the most morbid case. And yet, the reason we got into all these details about Einstein leads back to Cohen's visit to Gödel. Gödel and Einstein were paid by Princeton to give their names for the prestige of the university. We could call them as celebrity guests. They didn't teach, why should they?! Anyway, Einstein spent his last decades trying to solve a unification of Relativity with Quantum Mechanics. He wasted his time and we still don't have such unification, just as the Riemann problem is still unsolved. So let Gödel, Einstein and Cohen all rest in peace.

Formalism leads easily out of mathematics, once we grasp that the main idea behind it is “sticking to some truth, without caring how that truth fits into the whole, in particular how it should be understood by somebody else”. This “definition” contains the obvious, but important fact that we ourselves feel all truths in a context of some bigger system, so when we just stick to the truth, we automatically deprive the other from the full truth. In courtrooms, they say everyday “the full truth” and then restrict witnesses, delete sentences from the record, even ask the jury to disregard what they already heard. The legal system is the most obvious example of Formalism

out of control, but just as with mathematical Formalism, we have to be careful when criticizing it. Every detail in a system of formal truths has a hidden reason. The basis of criticism should be the general attack, why the reasons are hidden in general. I remember, in Hungary there was a show on TV initiated by a very unusual high judge who tried to explain the logic behind the formal laws. The guy was even having a down to earth peasant accent and the public loved him and the show, including me. The professionals, of course, hated him! Going against Formalism always leads to conflicts! But most importantly, these conflicts bubble up from a very strange, even more hidden causes than the existence of Formalism itself. For example, if a teacher breaks away from the curriculum and tries to really teach, by raising problems, he soon will be thrown out of the system. Not for what he or she does in this respect, rather something completely superficial and external chain of events will creep in. This is so because the existence of Formalism is part of a much bigger, devilish system which we will only understand later.

For a while, I thought that Formalism is the single organizing force that creates the estranged and phony social system we live in. But I was wrong and the other just as strong second force was in front of my eyes the whole time. I already said that mathematics is the center of everything and we have to start from it again. Newton is usually regarded as the founder of physics. He combined the observations of Galileo, about the falling objects, with Kepler's laws of planets, by realizing that the same force, gravitation, causes the apple to fall to the ground and causes the moon to orbit the earth. In a later edition, a drawing was published in front of his book, showing the earth with a distortedly big mountain on it from which a cannon shoots possible trajectories farther and farther away. These can continually go into a situation where the cannon ball "falls" back to the cannon and thus orbiting is created. So if someone asks, why the moon doesn't fall to the earth, we should say: Your question was tricky, because you asked two things combined secretly! You should have asked: Why doesn't the moon fall and why not towards the earth. Then the answer is simple. The moon does fall but it doesn't fall towards the earth because it has already a speed sideway. If we could stop it, it would fall to the earth as an apple. But just as an apple, when hit with a bat, will fly away and fall at the same time, the moon must have received a speed long time ago. This speed was just big enough to make it fall continually, back to its position, that is orbit. This might seem as a big coincidence, but we have to realize that if the speed had been too big, then it had flown away, while if it had too small, then it had fallen to the earth long time ago. We might think that such convincing arguments made Newton's gravitational idea an unstoppable revolution of our world view. But this is not how it happened. Newton never presented his arguments, as I just did, because he was already in the history of Formalism. Yes, the Formalism of astronomy was huge! Millions of data collected about the positions of planets, backdated in books of Tycho Brahe, whose student was Kepler himself. The idea of the earth going around the sun was not new. Many thought about it in ancient times, but scientists already then, wanted facts, not just visions. And the facts didn't support the picture of a sun with circling planets around it. Giordano Bruno was least concerned with details, he simply loved the simplicity of the picture, in fact was also obsessed with the sun as a return of godliness. So his burning as a heretic was a bit self provoked too. Most amazing is, a letter written by Cardinale Bellermino to a friend of Galileo, to warn him to shut up the loud mouth physicist. The letter says that the church has no objection of anybody describing the planetary motions in different possible ways as motions are relative to each other anyway. In fact, more accurate predictions of the planets and calendrical facts are appreciated. But to claim that the sun is in rest, as a fact, while the earth moves is not only contradicting the simple mind, but the bible too. When Kepler hit upon the idea of ellipses as orbits and thereby calculated the planet positions that were finally perfectly matching the books of Brahe, he thought that he hit upon God's design in

the universe. He was much better in math than Galileo, which was the main factor in his success to formulate the laws of planets, while Galileo couldn't even formulate the laws of falls properly. On a personal note, we have to remember that Kepler lived in a protestant country, while Galileo in the catholic Italy, so when Kepler also sent letters to Galileo, to stand up for his beliefs, it wasn't quite fair. To combine these two, there was more required than the grand idea of orbits as continuous falls. Newton had to derive the Kepler laws from the gravitational force. But to do this, he needed four things, the general laws of forces, the specific law of the gravitational force, a mathematical system of how objects move by the forces and finally, a mathematical system of how forces combine for a real object imagined from small pieces. So, the heuristic picture of orbits as falls and the claim of Kepler laws as godly rules, were put aside and instead, in between the plausible reasons of the common mind and the arbitrariness of God, Formalism went ahead, creating a never before experienced flood of details. Truth upon truth was born in the head of a single man who not only created physics, but a new mathematics too. There is no comparison of Newton to anybody before or after him. And yet this man, was a vain, narrow minded, revengeful person! Dying as a virgin from the poisonous fumes caused by the unsuccessful experiments to turn lead into gold. Watched the execution of counterfeiters caught by his inventions and admitted to get satisfaction from the death of his rival Leibniz. These are shocking, even after the things I told about the later geniuses, Gauss, Gödel, Einstein. The real reason we return to Newton was not his genius neither his dark personality, merely a simple advice, he put as motto again in a later edition of his book. It said, "Physics beware of metaphysics".

Metaphysics in the Greek times was simply an other name for philosophy. This word, philosophy, turned into a joke in the English language and there were articles about the philosophy of shoe making, harvesting and so on. So Newton's warning is really about philosophizing without facts. But he, just as Einstein did it later, pulled everything out of his head. The facts only verified their discoveries after they created the full theories. Both Einstein and Newton would say that if someone wants to discover how theories are born, then let them make theories of this, but their protection of physics is against the possible flood of well sounding but false theories. So truth is just a final external criteria of theories? No, they wouldn't agree to that either. After all, they knew they had the truth before the verifications. So there is a big contradiction here and Hegel reacted to Newton's motto with the sharp reply, that the biggest physics practically said, "physics beware of thinking". But no matter how sharp and smart Hegel was, he never understood what Newton meant, simply because he didn't know enough math and physics. That's strange again, because the motto doesn't concern what is in physics, rather warns against the evil lure of metaphysics in itself. Formalism, wants to escape the self verification as criteria, so comfortably relies on the unavoidability of facts. In fact, it enjoys being true. But creation enjoys itself too. In this deeper process truth is not separated yet. We can say that all creation is true, but when the mind uses its creation, it turns away from what really created it. That's how it becomes alive. Not corresponding to reality, merely a consequence of this. Newton, Einstein looked at some facts, stuck to the truth and created new truth. Hegel also looked at some facts but didn't stick to the truth and created lies. It's not that in that those lies, there are no truth. Of course there are, in fact there are too many! We can't look into the depth of this riddle, without first going out of it. And the crucial part is to realize that a second common tendency beside enjoying the truth is to create thoughts. The name metaphysics seems arbitrary but not only has the explained logical origin but a very good sense too, but makes perfect sense too, in the end.

There are only two sciences. The matterless mathematics, dealing with laws of everything that we can visualize and physics dealing with the penetrable, touchable, senseable material world. In the first, the truth boils down to formal expressions of the

scene because what we can show, that is prove, we can explain in forms. Here of course, the contradiction is that “show” is reduced to prove. But as we try to prove, we don’t even try to show to ourselves. We are formal in the formal itself! We visualize the forms and merely want to prove. We want to win the conversation. Truth is not the issue anymore, not that it can be deleted. It might seem first that every physical is at once mathematical too, because the material is imaginable without matter in different pictures. But this splitting might deny the real physical. If that’s true then indeed our only final proof is the experiment, the facts. This not only is a result of the new and weird physics, instead we already all know this deep down. So when we manipulate in the forms we are truly metaphysical. Then the question of how we claim reality to our creations is secondary. Whether sticking letter by letter to a bible, or in foggy terms not to confront other metaphysics, are all melting into the web of lies. Everybody is always Formalist and metaphysical at the same time and if that were all to this duality, then it itself were a metaphysical splitting of the thought process. But instead, this itself turns into an exact form! It remains split after the channels of communication, beliefs and theories. So lies distinctively fall into formal and metaphysical ones. Lies themselves can not be verified, nor falsified. They are not forms corresponding to a reality. They are creations not to see the truth. In fact, they are creations not to see the problems that would create the questions leading to the truth.