

Selected Essays
by Giles Hayter
a critical review

ALEXANDER J. TAYLOR

<i>Ego Genesis</i>	1
<i>Higher States of Consciousness</i>	4
<i>The Mathematical Myth</i>	11
<i>The Philosophical Helix</i>	16
<i>The World of the Workers</i>	21
<i>Conclusion</i>	24

Caution: these essays, and this subsequent criticism are to be read with a bucket of salt. I am not qualified in any way regarding philosophy, (unless you count Religious Studies at GCSE and CE) and so many of the arguments here are likely to be poorly phrased. Furthermore, Hayter's essays may induce bouts of rage and stress over the lack of explanation that he gives on any new piece of terminology he invents.

You have been warned.

these essays are available at gileshayter.com/essays.asp

Ego Genesis

*THE ORIGINS OF CREATION STORIES, AND THE BRONZE AGE FOLK WHOSE
CHILDREN WE ARE*

I am going to work through these chronologically, rather than in the order that they were posted on Mr. Hayter's website. The first of these five essays, "Ego Genesis" was released in July 2019, and tells an interesting story without delving too far into Time Cube-esque rants. Of course, little phrases like "meta-zero oneness" sneak in to the mix every now and then, but for the most part, the first page is a straightforward narrative. He makes a point about how we are unable to "picture the vastness of space without stars or planets to give it scale", and I believe he is trying to make a point about how pre-ego-genesis humans did not have self-understanding, or some other equally hard to determine concept.

The fact that the ideas that he attempts to present are so fundamentally grey and impossible to grasp does not lend itself well to this particular 'overly extended metaphor' method of discovery. On a purely practical note, I find it difficult to believe that Hayter seriously thinks that basic psychological concepts like self-awareness clicked in immediately, rather than evolving over the course of hundreds of millions of years. Furthermore, the date that he chooses for the story, 4004 BC, while the hunter-gatherer states of the people in this story might be true, it is also true that elsewhere cities with hundreds, if not thousands of people had formed (Trypillia, Naqada, Mesopotamia).

Regardless of this point, it is at the start of page 3 that we see the invention of a word I have not been able to fully understand thus far, the "you/world" versus the "you-world". Perhaps it means the conflict between you and the world, and then the unity between those two concepts which creates you,

as you are influenced by the world and influence it back. All the while, it keeps returning to an oddly intimate story between the subject and a girl, Mura, who sees that the subject is struggling with both inner emptiness (caused by his ego genesis) and physical emptiness (he neglects to pick dates). Eventually the subject is cast out of the tribe, where he begins to “forage for food”, and then some years pass. He understands the concept of shelter-building and crop-raising because, well, “You just know, somehow.” After a longer period of time, you begin to age, and Mura’s great-grandson reveals that he has the same problem - his date-skin is empty.

Part 2 begins with the subject telling Mura’s great-grandson that his destiny is to not let his secret die with him (the secret being his ego-genesis, which is often unhelpfully referred to as “Lake-eye”) and then informs Adam (the great-grandson who is given a name halfway through the part) that he must toil because of some weird indecipherable parable about two fig-trees. One is close and covered in figs, but it is dead, and the other is distant and tall, and “holds up the sky”. The subject then dies.

Part 3 begins with a quick explanation of how the Lake-eye secret spreads down generations until it is common knowledge, and then suddenly, it is the present day. He makes a point about the difference between present and historical “myths” by which he presumably means “inexplicable things to most people”. Historical myths are harmless, he claims, compared to modern society, whose myths contain “chemical formulae”. Perhaps I am reading into this too much, but the point that he appears to be making about how no one understands how everything works any more is an interesting one, as it is virtually impossible to be an expert in every conceivable field in the modern era. He then makes, in my opinion, a completely separate point about addiction and how it can affect even the most well raised of us, because cleanliness and manners don’t

change the human condition, they merely “paper over the cracks”.

He then states that we have been ready to reap the rewards of “consciousness” (whatever he means by consciousness this time) but we have not tended to the roots of consciousness - that is to say, “We don’t remember what we’ve each been through.” Now, this statement is arguably the closing point of the entire essay, and it can be interpreted in two different ways. Either he means something akin to therapy, where we haven’t talked about things in our past which might disturb us, or perhaps he means it in a cultural way, as in, we don’t understand our origins. Of course, the latter point only really makes sense if the story that he told about ego genesis is true. Of course, Hayter wants to make one or two more points about the state of the world before going, and this is a particularly interesting one. He says that we do not need to overcome faith, but to update it. Hayter appears to be implying that we need to update faith to make it more... rigorous? But then, it becomes less based on faith? How can you update faith? Of course, he says that the purpose of humanity is not to defeat the unknown, or to “establish the primacy of hard rationality”, but the antithesis to this does not necessarily mean letting faith be pervasive, the ideas of rationality and faith can co-exist. We don’t necessarily have to be religious with our faith. I’m sure he would make some point about quantum mechanics letting faith exist because of the nature of probabilistic outcomes, but alas, that is for another essay, another time.

Higher States of Consciousness

A CONCEPTUALISATION OF THE HIGHER STATE, AS PERTAINING TO EDUCATION

Now, having read these five essays before, this is the one that I am looking forward to the least, due to its completely impenetrable subject matter and abundance of newly-invented terms. First of all, we have the idea of Meta-0 consciousness, which is defined as basic cognition, and nothing else. No awareness of the cognition at this stage. Hayter then follows this up with a definition of Meta-1 consciousness, which is thinking about basic cognition, which could be considered akin to psychology. This is, he claims, what most people do. Meta-2 consciousness is another level of this, “awareness of psyche and the study of psyche”, which translates to “awareness of psychology”. Of course, this is set out back to front, making the reader have to link the concepts up in their own mind without having it presented to them. In doing this, Hayter has ensured that only people who are functioning at at least a Meta-1 level can read this text.

He then makes a point about how it is harder to build concepts than it does to maintain them, and uses an analogy from chemistry - he says that sometimes, the activation energy needed is higher than the energy required to sustain the reaction. Why he needed to devote almost an entire paragraph to reiterating an analogy is beyond me, but we will continue.

Hayter now makes the claim that the creation of a “Meta-0” deity like Yahweh required “Meta-1 self-awareness”, which, if you translate it out of his meta-jargon, is the first concrete statement he makes in any of his essays thus far. Unfortunately for him, it is wrong. Of course, in arguing against any of Hayter’s points, anyone else is at a loss because he can just claim that the meanings of terms like “Meta-2 consciousness” and “self-awareness” were misunderstood by any potential

opponent. But as I see it, concepts of deities do not need Meta-1 self awareness, they can arise through basic cognition alone, they do not need to be rooted in an understanding of the human condition, in fact, most are rooted in a lack of understanding of the human condition and its relation to the world. Take, for example, rain dances. A tribe goes for a long time without rain, so they begin to get desperate. They perform a dance, and the rain comes the next day. So, the next time they need rain, they dance again. Any time it works, the dance is upheld and its functionality praised. Any time it doesn't work is put down to the mysteriousness of the world.

Hayter attempts to make the point that to understand God, you must first briefly dip into the world of Meta-1 understanding, but I do not think this is true for many who are entering religion under the guise of societal or parental guidance. No thought is needed on the subject, it is just taken as is. Not very many people have the same notion of God as Hayter, which is a hurdle that he must attempt to overcome.

The next item which Hayter introduces us to without so much as a single word of explanation is the "Four Concept Model". Now, I believe that he is referring to the four fundamental objectives that a conceptual model should ideally have, but I am not sure. The idea of the Four Concept Model is more of a socially oriented term, not one in which just a single person partakes. Furthermore, the idea of the Four Concept Model is not touched upon ever again. It is brought up and dismissed without so much as a passing explanatory sentence.

He claims that "God is the unconscious psyche" and uses this point to prove that Meta-2 thinking causes us to realise that this is the case, and that "Western culture" is happy for people to be Meta-1 aware, but not Meta-2 aware - we are not allowed to meet God, according to Hayter. This is not the first time

where spirituality is pitted against “The Man” in these essays, nor will it be the last.

Yet again, Hayter introduces another ‘thing’ out of the blue, namely “G/U”. I believe it means “God/Unconscious”, but I could potentially be wrong. Nevertheless, it seems to work if it is interpreted as such. Using the concept of G/U, he works through a cycle of logic which appears to show that a relationship with G/U is impossible. Each of these steps has its own issues, but the one I have the most contention with is the point that “Transparency requires a relationship with G/U”. This is something that he has just asserted, potentially so that his logic comes around in a neat circle - it is almost too good to be true. And if, as he says, the process of getting to understand G/U is inherently circular, then it is fully impossible. How can you break out of circular logic? With more circular logic. Hayter decides it will benefit him if he adds another phrase which we will have to wrap our heads around, which is called “altitude”. In this essay, it can be interpreted either as ‘level of Meta-awareness’ or ‘proximity to God’, both will give you the same result.

Hayter’s claim that we have a “robust psychic model for God” means very little, in that he can claim that one of the many varying ideas humans have about deities could potentially be correct. What he means by psychic is even less clear, does he mean it in the modern, psychological sense of the word, or the more literal ‘psychic medium’ sense? It is impossible to discern.

Another large contradicting point comes where he claims that an understanding of God (ie. “A relationship with G/U”) stems from Meta-2 consciousness, and that this higher state of consciousness is necessary for us in our “post-religion” state of society. But how can you have the belief in a God, of any kind (even one as vague as being defined as the “unconscious psyche”) and also be in a post-religious state? Hayter addresses

this point very vaguely by failing to state clearly whether he believes that God exists and manifests itself in the human psyche, or that God is merely the human psyche, and there is nothing supernatural. If it is the latter, which I suspect it is, then why bother renaming the human psyche to ‘God’?

Now, we begin to unpick what could possibly be the least accessible part of the entire selection of essays - the term “OT¿0”. What it means, I have no idea. The only vaguely philosophical concept I have come across with the label OT is the idea of Operating Thetan, which is the final stage of Scientology. I do not think that Hayter is a scientologist, though his capability for inventing new terms is on par with L. Ron Hubbard. Speaking of new terms, Hayter introduces the idea of a soul, and asserts that it is the “*sine qua non* of spiritual survival”. In the following paragraph,

OT¿0, must function at (a minimum of) the Meta-1 level. Drunken Meta-0, ignorant bliss, is not transcendent: consciousness has no part in it. Soulfulness involves self-awareness. So the meaningful thoughts and actions that are essential to living as an individual are soulish, Meta-1 actions. In the ego desert, in the land of dry Meta-1 self-awareness, soul is the water that sustains, the sine qua non of spiritual survival.

Hayter introduces several new concepts and ideas, some of which already have meaning attached to them (soul, and the variant “soulish”) and others which are not explained or expanded upon at all, or even given proper names. We learn approximately nothing from this paragraph, at least nothing that doesn’t reflect on the state of the author’s critical thinking skills. The idea of the “desert” takes us into part two of this essay, “Altitude”.

He states that the philosophical landscape is akin to a flat desert, we can spend our entire lives walking around it at the Meta-1 state, and it takes us years to find “what is soulful and what isn’t”. Thankfully, Hayter has already defined what is “soulish” as the “thoughts and actions that are essential to living as an individual”, so he has set that out clearly. He uses the term $OE\hat{0}$, which is yet another completely unexplained term that is so similar to the already existing term $OT\hat{0}$ it feels as if it is a spelling mistake. He then claims that humans have a way of exploring the “desert” much quicker - to rise above the plane, to “foray into Meta-2 space”.

He then eludes to how you can travel from basic Meta-0 cognition to “Meta-1 transcendence”. This is an interesting part, because the first time I read it, I was intrigued by this point and somewhat disappointed he didn’t run with it as his main argument. Unfortunately, I had the sense to read it again and it turns out that this series of paragraphs are truly some of the most issue-ridden in the essay.

Hayter’s point that placing expressions of belief in front of simple statements of opinion can turn them from Meta-0 to Meta-1. On the surface, his example of “men are slimy” versus “I find men slimy” seems to work well for him. Unfortunately, this is not quite the case. If Hayter says that this “psychic caveat” only works to turn Meta-0 expressions of opinion into Meta-1 expressions of opinion, then the first statement “men are slimy” is indistinguishable from “I find men slimy”. For example, if you disagree with the statement “men are slimy” then you could consider it an opinion without the need for the opinion statement “I find”. Hayter fails to understand linguistic concepts such as the differentiation of fact from opinion, and seems to think that statements can only be “self-examinatory” if they explicitly contain words like “I think” or “I believe”.

He then decides to drop the fragment “bombarded with consumerist shit as we are” in-between later parts of the

paragraph, which does precisely nothing to further his point, and further cements his hatred of “The Man”.

Hayter calls upon the help of Benjamin Franklin to help him with his argument. Franklin’s argument, by itself, makes sense, but as we have since deconstructed the logic behind Hayter’s ‘opinion language’ point, it has to stand on its own in the essay. And I must say, yes, it could be useful to “forbear ... the Use of every Word or Expression ... that imported a fix’d Opinion”, but I fail to understand why Hayter is likening this to his own point. Surely if he forgoes opinion words, then he is sinking back to Meta-0 cognition, at least, according to Hayter.

Before moving on to the next part, Hayter makes a point about ego-identification and making sure you check all of your statements for veracity before you say them, which is true. This is something lots of people could work on. But deciding to bracket it, to call it a name like Meta-2 consciousness is off-putting. My guess is that he wanted to write a self-help book but wanted to use some philosophy terms, and he had read some Kant beforehand and had decided that the more terms he invented, the more likely it would be that one of them would find its way into common parlance. But, alas, none of them roll off the tongue, and even a reader who is somewhat experienced with his work cannot identify what some of these terms even stand for, let alone mean.

The third and final part is likely the strongest argument in the entire series of essays, and, bar a few parts where he uses his favourite terminology of the hour, it is quite convincing. I will distill it down into one simple point, because all else is merely fat.

*The cry goes up: “But psychology is too complex for the young!”
What?!*

Every subject is too complex for the young! That's precisely what teaching is for!

Hayter, for once, makes it clear what he is arguing. Education reform is an important point in his essays, and considering his status as an educator, I feel these are the points that he makes the most clear. It is important to teach children these values, these subjects, self-awareness, interpersonal understanding. I would not go so far as to claim that I would impose “dualism” on children, however, unlike Hayter. He attempts to lay the “groundwork for a conscious future”, and, if he decides to abandon the idea of G/U psychology, I would support him in his quest for education reform. To briefly link to *The Mathematical Myth*, I would say that the fact that he says that “G/U is beyond understanding” is proof that it is meaningless (as defined by Hayter) and should not, therefore, be taught in a classroom setting.

On a closing note for this essay, I believe that Hayter's experiences with none other than Mr. J. Drinkall influenced said essay, namely in the phrase:

Consider the task of teaching mathematics, a subject that many people openly hate. It is brutal for some, and yet there is progress: it's considered important, so we've learnt how to teach it.

The Mathematical Myth

A LOOK AT THE LEAP OF FAITH AS NECESSARY FOR SCIENTIFIC PROGRESS

This essay is, as the subtitle states, a “leap of faith”, but in more ways than Hayter likely intends. He attempts to link concepts of “psychic split[s]” with the integers, saying that having merely the whole numbers symbolises said “psychic split”. Hayter, with no evidence of any sort, claims that the invention of fractions was not borne out of a “search for utility”, their invention started as “art”, something that was done because it “felt good”. Due to Hayter’s other synaesthesia-related works and statements, it is likely that he would think there is some inherent connection between art and mathematics. Perhaps, he is drawing a link between ancient centres of wisdom in the Islamic Golden Age and Islamic art, which is dominated by geometric patterns and abstract forms. This is not due to a fascination with numerical forms and the patterns they make, it is more likely representative of the prohibition on representations of God and other related religious figures.

“1 and 2” is another analogy which Hayter picks up upon, I have not myself been able to find any literature which refers to the numbers 1 and 2 being sacred in this way, being “pure magic”.

Part 2 begins with the story of how complex numbers came to be, which is an interesting tale by itself, but almost unnecessary within the context of this essay - that being said, it is a worthwhile diversion, simply because it doesn’t make any contentious or incoherent points. One of Hayter’s fundamental misunderstandings of science is that he thinks it is dogmatic and will not work to try and discover things it deems “unworthy”. We do not take a ‘leap of faith’ when we propose a new theory, we don’t go into a theory presuming it to be true.

Doing so would be an unjustified leap of faith.

Later on, Hayter returns to his idea of “G/U”, and claims it is “beyond understanding, beyond objective science”. He claims that holders of a rational worldview would dismiss anything outside of the world as we know it as “fairytale”. In doing so, Hayter provides no evidence that it is anything but. It is not “blindness” to say that G/U is a fairytale, it is merely a statement which may or may not be true. If we were to investigate it, then it may or may not turn out to be useful. He uses the analogy of “Once a road is built, ... belief is no longer required to walk it.” in order to show that we must trust in his claims because they may bear fruit. This is true, the theories that Hayter posits could be true and helpful in letting us determine things about ourselves. But unfortunately for him, we are not able to test every dime-a-dozen psychological theory for potential metaphysical revelation. Relying on faith is no good when there a hundred competing and sometimes contradicting theories which all rely on faith.

If Hayter thinks that G/U is “beyond understanding”, then why does he understand it to be in a “beyond”? Why specifically G/U?

Further along in the essay, Hayter states that Euler “aptly named the unknown i ”, thus “completing the deeper-Self symbolism”. In claiming that Euler named a constant to symbolise our own lack of self-understanding, Hayter demonstrates yet again a tendency to oversimplify, to assume meaning when there is more than likely none. He then continues this comparison, claiming that the mathematical disagreement over the existence and use of complex numbers is comparable to the psychological disagreement over the existence of the “unconscious”. He claims this is “no coincidence”, which is demonstrably is. Hayter yet again shows

his tendency for the red strings on the cork-board of his mind to get interwoven when there is simply no need.

Another component of this that Hayter ignores is that we could have chosen to represent the complex numbers in one of many other ways. The square root of negative one is not “outside reality” as Hayter claims it to be - aside from making a small pun about the real numbers, the complex numbers are simply housed on the same two-dimensional plane. It is an interesting invention, but one that says nothing about any other kind of human endeavour. To claim that G/U is being criticised for the same reasons as complex numbers once were is wrong, he is attempting to gain sympathy for his theory by portraying it as the victim of an institutional bias against theories which don't fall into the worldview of the empirically minded.

All of his writing about the complex plane becoming separate from the number line makes it seem as if no one else has ever come up with the idea of a graph before. Representing two numbers with coordinates on a two dimensional plane is not something that is exactly “new”, even for 1797.

He claims that in order to solve our problems we have to move “laterally”, and while I agree with him in one sense of the word, it is likely that we do not mean the same thing by laterally. Perhaps he is conflating some of the observed meanings of the word lateral, one meaning refers to “lateral thinking”, the other merely meaning “from the sides”. Lateral thinking as a solution to the problems we face as a society could be quite helpful, but attempting to analogise it to thinking in higher-dimensional space is just unnecessary. Most of this essay could be substituted in favour of a simple statement that says we need to consider new solutions to problems. Adding to that, aside from the topic of education reform, at no point does Hayter offer any practical solutions to his perceived problems.

Next in the sights of this essay is the “rationalist”. In his typically black-and-white viewpoint, he claims that the rationalist suffers from “material success and its subsequent misery”. He conflates the idea of materialism with rationalism, presumably because they have similar origins in Western culture. Furthermore, he brings quantum physics back into his argument, claiming that its existence disproves “objective” reality. By doing so, he has conflated the ideas of subatomic particles becoming entangled over long distances and the idea that the supernatural is out there. These, by all accounts, are not similar points, and a ‘proof’ of one cannot be used to help the other. Even if there was no “objective reality” it would not help him, either, as his theories would still need to be validated, even if it was just according to one observer. And if he can then claim that because he considers G/U to be a real concept, then it is a real concept, then he has won, but secured an empty victory in which only he knows about G/U. He then continues:

*Over and over and over again, what orthodoxy
has proven to be real turns out to be only a subset.
Now is no exception.*

Which proves that he does not understand the difference between traditional religious dogma and scientific “dogma”. Scientific dogma looks to the world which we did not previously understand. If the world had been dominated by religious dogma, it is unlikely that anyone would have looked up at the stars or into the atoms which make us up nearly as much, and if so, it would have likely been to prove the existence of God.

Overall, Hayter’s point in this essay is needlessly *complex*, he

could have easily made his point by using ten lines. Saying that some problems need to be looked at from a different angle is fine, but criticising the scientific method for having a warped lens is silly when you are coming from a place of belief. You cannot go into proving something already thinking it exists.

The Philosophical Helix

*A CONSIDERATION OF THE HELICAL NATURE OF PROGRESS, AND THE
INEVITABILITY OF RETURN*

This essay is not quite a ‘full’ essay so to speak, but instead a collage of 25 mini-essays (branded ‘Helices’), none of which are truly fully formed. Going through them one by one seems the most logical thing to do, attempting to order them in any way merely results in more confusion.

Before getting to the helices, he makes a quick point about the non-linearity of progress, which is his first politically oriented point where he is able to substantiate his claims. The concept of going not merely forward or backward, but turning is welcome in an age of neoliberalism, veering away from the “communist nosedive” and “postmodern stumble”. However, he veers quite dangerously into comments on “psychic space itself”, which fails to further his argument in any meaningful way.

1. Hayter claims that everything that was once considered an all-consuming answer has led to “tomorrow’s catastrophe”. The point about nothing being able to survive “deification” works quite well, though he may use this concrete point to justify some not-so-concrete things in the future.

2. Hayter believes that consciousness has been proven to alter the state of matter. Unfortunately, this is not the case. Furthermore, claiming that “the universe is a manifestation of the mind of God” and that quantum physics exists are two separate points, one can be backed up by empirical fact, the other is merely - to use the words of Hayter himself - a simple Meta-0 cognition statement.

3. The concept of revolution as an inherently selfish idea is very interesting, Hayter does not fall prey to the ‘all revolution is bad except mine’ idea either. But, what is a revolution if not a

“massive rethink of priorities”? [from *Higher States of Consciousness*] Hayter himself “bleat[s]” for power when he claims that “duality” should be taught like mathematics is now.

4. Unifying doesn’t necessarily have to imply that it binds. Hayter’s often overly black-and-white prose lends itself well to sounding authoritative, but, alas, fails to hold up under scrutiny.

5. This is quite a good point, all things considered. I agree with it, and also the vividness of the images is striking. Hayter is more suited to making these sort of vivid, propagandistic-like comments.

6. Hayter comments on cultural relativism in his traditional overly-simplified manner. The virtues of pagans have not all turned to vice, nor virtues of Christians either. There has not been a total upheaval in what we consider virtue, contrary to what Hayter thinks.

7. More oversimplification in the form of declaring that the zenith of Anglo-Saxonism was keeping the Nazis at bay. Is it really a “faded champion” as Hayter suggests?

8. Regardless of the inexplicable and unnecessary addition of the phrase “1-barricade”, this is still an inexplicable piece. Hayter claims that “God-terror” is a symptom of God, rather than just a psychological fact in and of itself. Just because we are scared of something doesn’t necessarily mean it exists. Would we consider childhood “bogeyman-terror” a symptom of the bogeyman? It depends if you count a mental depiction of a bogeyman to be equivalent to a real life one.

9. Addictiveness is not necessarily a polar opposite to goodness, but this is a good point.

10. Hayter posits this logical circle, but does not seem to resolve them. I’m alright with this, but the definitions of “altitude” and “depth” are poorly worded in the context of these essays. While they may be good points, they are communicated poorly.

11. This point can be summarised with the quote “consistency is a fool’s errand”. Well, Hayter is a fool then.

12. It is true that religion has nothing to add to discourse nowadays, it is merely extensions of the Golden Rule.

13. The city doesn’t want people sleeping or doing nothing because those are hours of ‘lost productivity’, not because they think that sleeping will let the subconscious thoughts bubble to the top and cause societal unrest.

14. Hayter fails to understand the definition of God as a “perfect being”, as is posited by various arguments for his existence. The truth lying somewhere in-between doesn’t have to result from two polar opposites - there can be a true and a false. Plus, the notion of ‘God’ is so vaguely defined in these essays that God might exist as the unconscious psyche, whatever that entails.

15. A good point, though he layers “The Man” metaphor on a little strong here. It makes me feel as if some parts of these essays were written on psilocybin mushrooms. At least he doesn’t subscribe to the ‘stoned ape’ theory.

16. The quote “The hardest thing to see is oneself as the yet-to-be-awoken” is actually a very good point - however, what I understand Hayter means by “awoken” is less than satisfactory for me. The rest of the point could be chopped off and it would achieve the same effect.

17. Alright, maybe this is the worst paragraph in the entire set of essays. I have tried and failed to unpick this one, I cannot see the logical connection between the three ‘points’ which he makes here.

18. Hayter makes an astute point about psychology, “bigotry is unconscious fear”.

19. Is the life of the Eastern soul blooming? Hayter does not define Eastern as an antithesis to Western, which I expected he would do, but thankfully, he restrains himself from such a black and white comparison. I believe he writes about the Western

soul because he has nothing to say about the Eastern soul, having not experienced life from an Eastern perspective.

20. Do religion and science need to be connected in the way that Hayter suggests? This is a large point which could be expanded upon over the course of hundreds of pages, take, for example, John Polkinghorne. He attempts to link religion and science, and while I can understand that at the top end of intelligent debate, religion and science are compatible. But, for most people, they are not. Either we need to sublimate religion and science into one another in order to get people agree, or to educate the public. And, with Hayter's views on education, I feel that the latter would be preferable.

21. Hayter compares the ideas of psychology to the ideas of myth-making. While the science of psychology is littered with hazy and flaccid statements, it is not merely wishful thinking like the land of myth.

22. Hayter's claim that all artists have a "psychic hand of unbearable tension" is likely to be untrue. There are many creative individuals throughout history who do not have these sort of mental strains, yet have still produced culturally significant works.

23. Hayter confuses "high jetset virtues" for aspirations. Aspirations don't necessarily have to be virtues, they can be vices to begin with. His point about the movement of people is interesting, but it needs further elucidation to mean anything, since the subject matter he is tackling here is of a politically practical nature, it is not abstract philosophy.

24. Are the moralities of atheists and theists exactly the same? Does it count if you follow the same moralities, but you are being coerced into doing so by the threat of eternal punishment, and rewarded for doing good - rather than just doing good thinks for their own sake? Furthermore, Hayter's claim that we should demand faith is more than likely just demanding that people listen to his theories about G/U without

dismissing them as nonsense. They're not, but he requires people to have a lot more faith that is worth investing in an unprovable, unknowable psychological theory.

25. Alright, I will admit, I really like this one, even though it seems to contradict some of Hayter's previous arguments - there is nothing in the unknown? I'm not sure what it means, but as T. S. Eliot said, good poetry communicates before it is understood.

One morning, a fisherman found an iron chest washed up on the beach. Above its lock, the legend read: "This Chest Contains The Gold Of the Unknown." He tried to open it, but couldn't pick the lock. He enlisted the help of his neighbours, but they soon gave up. The thing seemed impregnable. Then, at last, a wise woman told him: "Nosce te ipsum." So he spent many, many years in deepest study, learning of the unknown. Finally, when he had uncovered every one of his darkest truths, he tried again. The lock thumped open. Inside the chest, there was no gold.

Good stuff.

The World of the Workers

AN ANALOGY AND SUBSEQUENT ANALYSIS CONCERNING THE LOGIC THAT RULES
OUT HIGHER DIMENSIONALITY

When first reading these essays, *The World of the Workers* was the one that caught my attention most clearly. Unlike most of the others, it had a clear premise which was laid out from the start, an analogy which appeared to make sense, and actually made me think about the practicalities of making a game like this. Of course, it's not a particularly fun game to play, but I feel with a few tweaks it could work as some weird Peter Molyneux social-experiment game, a la *Curiosity: What's Inside the Cube?*

I would recommend reading this one, at least, the first two parts of it, as it is interesting and understandable. I don't have anything much to add to what he has to say. I would advise against reading the entire thing, as the first two parts tell a compelling, but philosophically meaningless story. It could be used as some sort of analogy or parable if the story were to just end there. But, no. Hayter decided to add in a "writer" character who claim there is something higher that guides the "L rate", who claims that there is something called "The Higher". While the points he may be making do make some (extremely limited) sense in context, the whole argument falls flat because the analogy of the video game world has not been removed. It is as if he has forgotten that it is an analogy and wishes to apply his thoughts on the existence of a higher being directly onto the real world.

In this essay, he attacks "The Man" even more, lashing out at "the ravaging of our planet", "the deep and terrible malaise that has settled in Western hearts", which may be right in some unquantifiable way, but these points mainly prove to us that Hayter thinks societal change is necessary. These overblown

statements detract from his position by portraying him as some sort of end-of-the-world racketeer.

I understand that I have said numerous times that I have found the worst, or hardest to decipher paragraph in the entirety of these essays, but I feel that this one, which, unlike many of his works, is laid out into neat chunks. Unfortunately for him, all of them are either wrong or unfalsifiable, or a strange combination of both he manages to achieve so often.

Firstly, we know that meaning comes from the unknown. Secondly, we know that consciousness is not explained by material neuroscience. Thirdly, quantum physics has shown there is no objective reality. Fourthly, neither love, individuality, honour nor destiny has any home in “rational” theory. Fifthly, we know that only higherdimensional thinking can unify the physical and the psychic. Sixthly, intuition says so.

Firstly, I would argue that meaning comes from unknown places, but we can shape it ourselves, we understand it. It isn't in-built. Secondly, we have no conclusive proof for or against hard deterministic consciousness. Thirdly, not really. Fourthly, no, but that's only because of his notion of what the word “rational” means. Fifthly, only he thinks so because he is only person who understands himself truly. Sixthly... do I even need to comment on why it is not acceptable to make a point by saying “intuition says so”. If that's the case, then why bother writing this essay? If we're intuitively led towards things which are “empirically out of bounds” then why is he having to tell us to do it? I believe this to be the single worst sentence you can include to help your point. Claiming that your subjective observation is so innate to humanity that everyone, without question, will intuitively come to the same conclusion, yet, quite literally no-one has, is the most obvious display of self-

centredness in these essays. Of course, it is likely not done in an actively self-centred way, but it reveals a lot about Hayter's thought processes.

Saying that we need a combination of both "the logic of the head and the courage of the heart" is interesting, but he does not put forward many feasible and non-nebulous ways throughout all five of these essays to link the two. You cannot link them by claiming that ego-genesis has failed us, nor by saying that no-one understands G/U psychology, not even by claiming that irrational numbers are "outside reality", or even by spitting twenty-five essay fragments at the unsuspecting reader, like machine gun fire with bullshit for ammunition.

Conclusion

IN WHICH I CONCLUDE THE ESSAY

I believe that Hayter tried his hardest in crafting these essays. I do not blame him for trying to carve out his niche in the annals of philosophy by attempting to invent terms. I can see how it would be fun. But I feel that he wants to say something, he wants to say something really meaningful, but he's just throwing everything at the wall and seeing what's sticking. I thank him for creating these essays, because I've had a good time reading them, and I hope he had a good time making them. There is a certain joy in trying to put your thoughts on the page. It is enjoyable to be able to write with clarity, not hampered by the requirement to say everything as soon as you think it. There is time for argument to stew. As George Saunders said, "And what a pleasure that is; to be, on the page, less of a dope than usual".

A lot of the fundamental points that Hayter makes are very agreeable. Education reform. Unity between human emotions and science. A re-evaluation of rampant consumer culture, not only in the face of climate change, but as an antithesis to the destruction of the variety of human experience. Some of these points are more hazy and less well-oriented than others, but they are made up for in the number of one-of-a-kind insights he briefly has. Unfortunately, he has a tendency to go too far, to create great bounds of logic which will leave any reader feeling left behind, like they are reading in on some kind of in-joke. He frequently tries to justify his points with nebulous claims of 'it just is' or, once, the infamous "intuition says so". It is okay to not have to justify these points sometimes. It's alright to sometimes just let the reader decide what they value in your argument, for its own sake. It is not required to use concepts like "soulglow" to make people understand that there might be

something wrong with the current state of consumer capitalism. You don't have to insert explicit phrases to combat the man, making an otherwise structured paragraph twice as clunky as it needs to be, all the while sounding like you're *interrupting yourself mid-thought*. The extended metaphors can go too, while it is fun to draw parallels between unrelated subjects, sometimes the human brain's desire for patterns overrides some of our more logical faculties. Chances are, if it seems like an incredible and obvious correlation that everyone before you has missed, then it's probably just a coincidence. Of course, I am not saying that every single disparate subject cannot be connected together, it's just that when anyone tries to make bold claims about basic numerical concepts signifying "psychic split[s]", perhaps it has gone too far.

Introducing new concepts one after the other and only being able to defend your argument based on your opponent's 'misinterpretation' of those concepts is not a valid way to make an argument. Next time you decide to invent or use a term like "OT&O", please explain what it means without the reader having to literally ask you, because there are no other references to it on the internet.

For a man who makes points which are barely falsifiable, he often veers into territory which paints things in mild disagreement as polar opposites, locked in war. He analogises where it is not appropriate, and makes tenuous links between unrelated topics. Of course, this would be reasonable, insightful even, if he was able to substantiate those claims. Alas, all his analogising does is demonstrate to us that he is human, he seeks meaning in the world, purpose, structure. He wants things to symbolise other things because it would be *nice* for that sort of thing to happen more often. I do not believe in the supernatural, but I believe it would be cool if things like ghosts were real. We create and propagate these mythological concepts because they interest us, they provide closure,

perhaps structure in the unknown. To have a loved one come back to visit you as an incorporeal figure would be jarring, but if we could confirm its veracity, then I would be more than happy to accept it. Unfortunately, this has not happened. There are no supernatural things that we have seen. This does not mean I am opposed to the idea of the existence of the supernatural, it just means I may look for it without expecting it to be there. I don't have faith, but I will look. Hayter needs to learn to be disappointed that the world is not as structured as he believes it to be.

But there are some wonderful moments in here, buried deep among all the rough. Trinkets of parables, a quote or two, interesting tales of how complex numbers came to be, and a constantly visible longing for the world to be a better place. I was glad to pick up the quote about "psychology is too complex for the young". It has found its way into more than a few conversations I've had, and refuted more than a few views about the necessity of education reform. Reading these essays has, in retrospect, improved my life somewhat. Alas, as for the bulk of the essays, I conclude, in the words of Hayter himself,

Most unfalsifiable things are worthless crap.