

The Atheist's Guide to the Religion

- How to Create Your Own Religion -

This is a work on the philosophy of religion (2024) and discusses how to create a personal religion. We live in a progressively more horizontal and lonely society, driven by floods of indiscriminate information and disinformation that diminish any pretences to authority, with the socio-economic unit moving down from a family to an individual. In the democratic West people have never been freer but lack initiative to choose from wider options. As vertical power structures that support anything institutional wane, combined with more and more time at our disposal thanks to AI, we may find it helpful to have a methodology of finding one's own religion, instead of being lured into any unsavoury institutional religions.

The shortcomings in reality are balanced by the wealth of imagination via the thin thread of a 'miracle' transmuted from coincidences by the duality of mind between the rational predictivity of coordinative mind and the solipsistic collapse of the coordinative centre. This is where a personal religion hides and also makes the philosophy of religion so distinct from the philosophy of psychology.

T.Iwamoto

The author (Tetsuaki IWAMOTO/ronnie-babshka@live.co.uk) reserves all rights under American, European and International copyright laws.

‘But the awakening is contained in the dream, for in the depths of his delirium this imaginary creator of Reality connects with himself as a real Creator of an imaginary world’

Jean-Paul Sartre

From ‘Saint-Genet, comedian et martyr’

Contents

| | |
|--|---------|
| ◇ Overview and Summery | 4-19 |
| <Modality of atheism> | |
| 1. Reality of Imagination | 20-27 |
| <Mind as receptacle of fictions> | |
| 2. Imagination of Reality | 28-37 |
| <In itself vs descriptive representations> | |
| 3. Philosophy of Imagination | 38-42 |
| <Construct of described reality > | |
| 4. ‘Miracle’ | 43-56 |
| <The most fundamental construct of religion> | |
| 5. Institutions and their In-built Incompetency | 57-85 |
| <Walking through the valley of the shadow of death> | |
| 6. Religion as a Personal Fairy Tale | 86-103 |
| <Daemons’ universe> | |
| 7. Analysis of ‘Fairy Tale’ | 104-114 |
| <Rationality of irrationals> | |
| 8. Aesthetics of Religion | 115-123 |
| <Belief and human values> | |
| ◇ Epilogue - Exempli Gratia - | 124-144 |
| A Latter-day Andersen | |

◇ Overview and Summery

<Modality of atheism>

Talking about ‘religion’ one encounters the nebulosity of its meaning, from the classic institutional religion of a belief system comprising of a narrative make-belief, a socio-economic organization and its proactive roles in a wider society on one end to a non-theistic tenets without reliance on the notion of deities on the other. It is also not uncommon for largely secular viewpoints to regard a religion as part of the culture and linguistic value representation as with the Sea of Faith movement. It is so easy to talk about a religion for a philosophically untrained mind as it has a wide spectrum with many facets and layers. In fact, you can connect it with virtually any aspects of life regardless of belief/non-belief. And yet even a religion in a wider context needs an ingredient that captures imagination of its followers.

The most common denominator for all religions including non-realism is the identity of self. Institutional religions give easy answers in terms of hierarchical belongings. Becoming part of an institution helps one to consolidate one’s identity, which provides a psychological basis for one’s place in a wider society and gives guidance as to how to navigate one’s life. Traditionally one’s identity was closely aligned with a family orientation. A religious, linguistic and cultural backgrounds initiate an introduction into the question of identity. Like it or not, one is often introduced into a religion following a family tradition. Then come gender, job, education, etc. as we become more aware of social belongings.

However, our society is now less family orientated and more individualistic along with a more open and cohesive society and social sophistications owing to digitized identification. Our society is now more and more organised based on individuals as a social unit, although the evolution varies largely depending on socio-economic wealth, which tends to promote liberal and less collective tendencies. In most advanced and democratic economies even looking after an aging parent is left to a state through health and social care services, not an individual’s legal obligation, while not long-ago parents and children formed an asset/liability relationship, if not in explicit law, though social contract and stigma. It used to be families that were a base unit for social appraisals such as incomes, taxes, benefits, obligations, even law and justice, with a varying degree of evolutionary differences. Even a more democratized society like England classes and incomes derived from family orientations obsessed people not long ago as is the case with Jane

Austin's characters always affixed with annual incomes and estate values, and in Japan with its recent feudal legacy incomes were granted to family units, and individuals are nothing but a tool for a family continuation.

When the society is more orientated on an individual as a unit instead of a family, we end up with more identities, some of which may even be conflicting with each other, and a religion is just another identity instead of being a parametric identifier. There is some nostalgia for a simpler identity away from complicated and conflicting identities, and some people turn toward a religion in order for a minimalistic reorganization of over-complicated life. This is where religious comebacks are seen. However, seeking a solace in the shadow of an institutional religion to sort out complex identities do not really help because an institution is itself also at the mercy of relentless individualizations and is unable to protect individuals in the nostalgic myth of an all-embracing, benevolent religion. Overflow of information and misinformation ruthlessly cut any institutions into pieces, where an identity cannot rest in peace under the aura of authority. Trust between people wanes, categories are shaken, and beliefs in institutions are in doubt. Institutions are under the siege on many fronts, financial, political, social, AI as well as fragile discombobulation of a public/private person. See how the once mighty Catholic Church underwent through a cataclysmic image change on the back of paedophile scandals, or for that matter the British monarchy. Being a catholic priest is no longer a particularly respectful identity even in Ireland or Poland, or being a Royal in UK. A solid, reliable identity is in short supply, and religions are no exception. Corporate identities in our time of economic doldrums are also shaky. Even in Japan people are less certain to identify themselves in terms of who they work for. Needless to say, even gender identities are in question on the back of more and more liberal social attitudes.

Most people lack any substantive core of inner representation and thus rely on external identities due to feeble intellectual capacities. Identities thus obtained give an easy anchor to hook onto the seabed of superficial values and unsteady footings. Besides external identities are often provided by unscrupulous institutions whose ulterior objectives are not for the benefits of the seekers of identity, but their own power base that depends on the number of followers and their financial contributions. Borrowed identities as such make one a tool of an institution and are often causes of conflicts within and without, reflecting internal and external struggles for cohesive identities and benefits thereof. It is external identities and one's propensity for self-discovery via this easy

route that end up with unhappy saga of frustrations and ultimate dissatisfactions.

We seek identities as we are conceptual thinkers. An identity provides you with a means to differentiate yourself from others and orientate yourself as a particular with predictive needs for your advantages and benefits. An identity that originates in your internal needs is harder to obtain as it requires careful analyses of yourself and what makes you happy. Whereas an external identity saves you all these troubles and gives you an instantaneous gratification, with the proviso that what comes easy also goes easy. You could acquire many such identities with designs or by accident. As such identities often belong to institutions, and institutions have their own objectives, you could be busy sorting out dynamic correlations between external identities. You could have nationhood orientations (say being Scottish as well as being British), a religious preference (e.g. a practicing Catholic) and a gender identity (an unrealized Gay) on top of being an environmentalist vegan and an unenthusiastic civil servant. Taken seriously these are a heck of lifetime agendas to sort out and keep you busy for nothing. On the other hand, you might, on reflection, realise it is e.g. playing guitar that makes you really happy and wish to create your own music. In the end this latter internal identity of being a musician wins over various external identities in the sense that he feels being true to himself and above all happier in so engaging.

We are social beings. It is thus that external identities and their material benefits tend to precede internal identities. External identities can keep you busy enough to dig into internal identities too deeply. Besides labels external identities bring you are handy markers to navigate our sea of institutions and institutional benefits. We prioritize external identities so as to ensure reasonable material comforts first. Identities sought externally, especially when they come with useful benefits, are usually burdened with conditions that demand some efforts. The costs of becoming members of sought-after institutions also enhance preciousness of such identities and may compromise any needs for internal identities, as one is happy with one's attainment of such identities and their guild-like merits. Traditionally professional identities such as doctors, lawyers and accountants brought people not only satisfactions but also respectability and reasonable income. Some people felt little needs to seek internal identities, which, in our days, tend to be confined in the fields of extra-religious spirituality. This tends to present us the dichotomy of the material well-beings combined with the poor inner life.

The wealth of material benefits stemming from external identities coupled with the relative lack of internal identities is a consequence of our social priority over self-identity. Schools, universities and jobs are geared up towards social wellbeing rather than self-awareness. This ends up with too many people with well-trodden social qualifications but with relative inner poverty. Historically speaking we have beguiling material wealth with too little of the guiding self. Such as minimalism to reduce material wealth (or more likely, appearances thereof) to match the appreciating self does not really enhance quality of life if the self remains with the inner poverty. On the other hand, institutional religions can no longer help enhancing the self as they are denuded not only of secular power but also of respectability (and mysticism) that can afford us to place them at the centre of our coordinate of value cognitions.

The gap between an institution and an identity provider is fatal if this institution fails on the egalitarian ground by being on hierarchical orientation and is therefore skewed in its benefits distribution. When institutions fail to deliver good, solid identities due to their own fallibility, we are left with ourselves to come up with a usefully lasting identity. Unlike a social device like an institution we are, however, more subject to flow of fragile external imageries. Less institutional external identities are more results of dynamic relations between the self and the identity provider that provokes emotional contents through external imageries, rather than socially useful benefits. Here benefits are emotional mirrors of the self. The self is dancing with itself as it were, with the benefits of engaging with itself. Pop stars, sports heroes, media celebrities of various kinds, even populist politicians can be such cheap identity providers, although we should not forget men like Hitler who overpromises and then turns into a black hole that wipes away rational borders between power, identity and benefits. Historical conundrums that run their courses by exhausting viable combinations of power, identity and benefits equations tend to end up in these suicidal missions of irrational emotions. Our football crazes are miniscule representations of irrational identities and are direct cousins of amphitheatrical combats that are cornerstones of Roman political resources. Politicians, old and new, know how to handle identities where there are no useful benefits.

It is institutional fallibility of faulty identities that provokes identity crises necessitating individual interventions, which result in multiple self-remedied identities. Thus, there are derived institutional identities that call for internal and external struggles with little concrete benefits to identity bearers. This is a first step to an institutional collapse. Institutions that fails to provide a unified, socially useful identity create social

instability and end up negating themselves. This is how schisms of one kind or another devour religious institutions. Combined with hierarchical benefit distributions institution-based identities fail not only socio-economically but also psychologically.

Why we enjoy, let alone believe as with the case in religions, fictions? Realities, even physical realities, are, strictly speaking, part of fictions. Physical realities depend on axiomatic frames of descriptions for their representations, such as the absolute space and time (Newton), knowability of locations of every mass and extrapolated speed of massless entity (Relativity), unitarity and Hilbert space (QM), etc. These axiomatic setups are themselves arbitrary and even mutually contradictory (e.g. Relativity vs QM), though the Newtonian frame is explained away as part of Relativity spectrum. These axiomatic representations with their modelling capacities to good approximations to perceived structures of raw data in terms of useful predictivity look essential and indisputable as a matter of conceptual necessities, nevertheless there are elements of human arbitrariness and fallibilities in terms of measurability (units definability) and translatability (energy exchanges). We like and accept these axiomatic frames because they seem to work for our human purposes, like calculating necessary quantities of fuels for chemical reactions to go to the moon. In short it is capacities of human engineering that dictates usefulness of such representations. We think these axiomatic frames work because predictability afforded within them is reasonably covered up by degrees of engineering imprecisions, so long as human purposes are reasonably achievable. Human maths may not be a paragon of epistemic precision but is a reasonable approximation of the language of the universe insofar as we do not expect conceptual perfections. Engineering can only be human engineering and remains approximate material translations of modelling ideas of immaterial precisions.

Our universe is an anthropic universe because realities of life, i.e. human realities, are real only insofar as we are right in their middle as a matter of the anthropic tautology of we are as we are because we are (i.e. conceptualizations make us). We describe for our necessary conveniences that set us up in this human world of anthropic realities. Here non-realism is like a meta-belief that shelves the questions of hierarchical supernaturalism onto the ontology of human existence. 'God', 'miracles', 'afterlife', etc. are substituted with a human culture that practices a religion without clarifying the nature of human existence. Questionable concepts of realist religions are turned into unquestionable acceptance of our existence and culture. This is a religious version of the anthropic

principle. We are as we are because we are. God may have no objective existence, but our practice of god worship is there as part of our culture, which implicitly assumes that our existence has a purpose, and therefore even god as such has meaning. By the same token supernaturalism too has a meaning that is existence of some sort. Here raw existence of observable data, physical existence of equational descriptions and linguistic existence of cultural acceptance are part-overlapped and shifted around to avoid direct answers, and god of linguistic existence is extrapolated into god of necessity as fit our purpose of existence. To say our existence has no purpose would be the self-denial of this very writing. This 'god' can be replaced with 'spirituality' as with some Hinduism (Charvaka) or even 'nothingness' as with some Buddhism (Zen, more later) in the sense that material humans are a collective existence that has a culture of self-preservation, which transcends materiality.

There are many, in fact too many, works in this area of philosophy that is superficial at best and makes little epistemic contributions since it centres around arguments on empty concepts. One can fabricate sophisticated narratives on the existence and its consequences, or the non-existence and its consequences, of objects referred to by meaningless as well as referenceless words. A word has a reference but less of a meaning if the conceptual model in which this word plays a role is inconsistent and incomplete. A model can be consistent within but inconsistent without as we have no theory of everything. Most of human conceptual achievements have degrees of inconsistency and incompleteness. Even the most rigorous and accurate of our scientific models in maths and physics do not escape such fates as they eventually rely on axioms, the self-evidence of which can only be seen through the resultant inconsistent and incomplete system. A tautology/paradox. This exacerbates as models move away from observable data and enters into the realm of fictions. Here a word has more of a meaning but less of a reference. Its meaning is everyday usages and shines through the cobweb of storylines fabricated by mixtures of words of ordinary language.

We appreciate and even enjoy a fiction because a human reality is also a fiction built upon man-made concepts that give rise to our socio-economic tools of mutual existence and assign arbitrary values to their consequences. Take 'money', which is our invention with no objective reality. Its tangibility is entirely based on human relationships of obligations ensured by various concepts such as 'law', 'trust', 'credit', etc. that change its colour depending on their social footings. Revolution, legal fatigues, inflation, its recently acquired digital aspects, etc. can render it altered meanings. 'Money' in fictions signifies changing

dynamism in human relationships, and we enjoy its catalytic effects in weaving relationships without too much artificiality. See importance of 'money' in fabricating stories in 'The Count of Monte Cristo' or any of Jane Austen's books. There would have been no thrilling revenges without fortunes befallen from the sky in the former, or Miss so and so and Mr such and such of so many £ a year underlining social dynamism without detailing unexciting personal backgrounds, and millions of their derivatives saved unnecessary narratives without going into repetitive mechanisms of social hierarchy. Miss so and so of so many pounds a year already tells us her social predictions and directions without tedious explanations, and we only anticipate if her intelligence and chances can increase/decrease her fortunes by tackling social dynamism. Here imagination augments reality as man-made reality is also a product of imagination.

This is a work on the philosophy of religion. In talking about a religion, one should draw a distinction between a religion as an institution, as a theology and as a personal myth. Institutional religions are a religion used as a tool of Circle of Identity (see my 'Self, History and Future') and serve as a transmitter of power, which ultimately contributes towards horizontalization through tangency and encompassments. Historically institutional religions played and still play a role in vertically orientated power structures alongside socio-economic models embraced within nationhood status. There were times when religions provided socio-economic power structures themselves through doctrines of identity, which collided with founding of nationhood. You are expected to believe in e.g. 'God' as prescribed in details in scriptures of worship. To prove your membership 'God' as you understand must be the same as 'God' so institutionally prescribed. Here comes in many gestures, of your citations of scriptures, of respects shown towards religious authorities, of generally meek demeanours, etc. and identity can go into petty details such as how to make the sign of the cross, in some cases developing into wars between villages in Tsarist Russia of not too distant past (persecutions of Old Believers). The problem is institutions are human institutions and are tainted by human socio-economic problems, of powers so endorsed, which are deployed to maintain a religion as a human institution that requires funding, of hierarchical order to be maintained, which has a tendency towards viscosity, of transmutations between public and private persons, which lead to hypocrisies. Religions practiced through human institutions are generally and inevitably tarnished despite efforts to reform now and then. This exacerbates when religions mix with secularism of nationhood politics. Schism of public and private persons in religion is further compounded by that in secular civil life, causing

stresses in the managements of life in general. In short not only human institutions are corrupted by money, privileges and pretence but also tend to attract unsavoury characters intent on power that confers advantages in human relations (e.g. paedophiles). As with any vertical power structures there are always greedy and more determined characters who are attracted by socio-economic benefits brought about by hierarchical structures rather than by what these structures stand for. In the days when providing foods on the table was a struggle maybe there was a stronger excuse to get attracted by any such structures (e.g. see 'Le Rouge et le Noir'), but in our days when obesity is a chronic social problem you have more base elements of attraction like power, money and sex that chronically help sucking in dubious people e.g. in politics. Dare do I mention one recent senior British politician who was good with oratorical speeches and cut an authoritative figure but turned out to be ready to broker political favours in exchange for millions from a bankrupt hedge fund, not to mention desperate attempts to promote Huawei for whatever reasons, and no doubt many more and much worse examples of this kind across the world, not to mention the like of sleazy half-comedian Johnson character. They are all contributing to diminish public trust not only in politics but in any authorities. Religions in our days have less to give in these aspects but still there are plenty of people who choose a religion as a vocation because of illusions of power. I can even think of some disgraced politicians who opted for a religion as a post-prison career. On the other hand, if you are decent enough to be genuinely religious, you are likely to be not so skilful in climbing the ladder of powers. It is not a religion per se that is wrong, but its socio-economic aspects as a human institution that taint what it wishes to represent. Here being sagacious is seen through as a pretence for the sake of a human status, we became too clever for our own good not to believe in any authoritative hearsays and manners. If you are genuinely sagacious, you probably should have no human characters, which in one way or another muddy a path ahead towards bona fide respect and leadership.

Notwithstanding its tendency to fail as a human institution, a religion has an intellectual necessity to theorise its belief system in terms of a supra-human dimension. This is a religion as a theology. Even god-less Buddhism has many theologies and schools, including one with the theology of no theologies (Zen). A theology is a metalanguage over its primitive narrative base because a narrative is a storyline of make-believe. You do need quasi-philosophical arguments that sound clever and convincing so that a story transcends into a universal abstract. That is, through imagination words of concretes and particulars become abstract enough not to attract easy rebutting. This is the same as

promoting a language into a metalanguage, in which a referenceless word acquires a meaning through a narrower structure of a metalanguage. The ordinary language is vast, shapeless crisscross jumbles of often conflicting value-systems and allow meaningless words to float around on the back of sentences that cannot be truth-valued. A word that cannot be juxtaposed to so-called reality acquires a meaning through a value system, which by itself is a matter of ungrounded belief and the number of followers and easily contradict many other value systems. It can even be just a social code. In order to escape from this conundrum a metalanguage is created such that avoids conflicting and contradicting value systems and in so doing refines its methodology of establishing itself as a superior dogma. That is, it starts with metaphysical assumptions that have wider and more applicable domains and follow through their logical progressions a la rules of inference. No wonder we have many so-called logicians of Catholic origins. Here there is nothing illogical with having any assumptions as their logic does not concern with their assumptions no matter how silly they may look. A metalanguage is so constructed as to be meaningful on the back of agreed set of axioms that can assign a meaning to a word that is vague at best in the base language so long as axioms are not self-contradictory. The rest is the question of how many people want to speak that metalanguage, and of course the more the merrier. In short, a metalanguage is a language to be spoken among people so chosen to solve problems that inherently cannot be solved in the base language. You construct a language that assigns meanings to otherwise referenceless words by agreed codes of minds so coordinated as to solve problems by wills of people that choose to speak this language. That is, if you are too dim to face base problems, then you create a language that metamorphoses those base problems into linguistic problems. If you cannot solve problems by science, then solve them by logic of assumptions, which boil down to a number game of believers, like a fake news that becomes a real news, given enough supporters. If there are enough people to believe in a metalanguage, the mankind needs no science. This is a way of stupefying people. We tend to have meta-something when people are incapable of tackling problems by honest works with straightforward tools of first-order language, by elevating base problems into linguistic problems. Here comes metalogicians, metamathematicians, metaphysicians, etc. with their axioms. This approach is fine if we are endowed our intellect by God as we used to think in olden days. Then good axioms have validity of God, if not directly, then at least indirectly. On the other hand, if we are not God's agents, then axioms are just human rules that conveniently suit certain schematic needs prerogative to beholders of relevant theories until overwhelmed by inconsistency with rival theories. Here the power of a

theory is its encompassing capacity and the number of followers to the extent that people are hopefully and at least eventually more or less reasonably intelligent enough to know a good theory with a higher explanatory spectrum.

For example, God does not exist by laws of science known to us, and if it does, we know no descriptive method of referencing to it since there is nothing to point at. There are no observable quantities that can measure and describe God, not even any mathematical units applicable to God, remembering ∞ is not a number but a connective (see my 'Maths, Logic and Language' and 'Life, Universe and Everything', both @philpapers). There are no equations of physics that predict miracles or connect with miracles. In short 'God' is an empty word with no contents that bring about meaningful expressions. So, we have a language that axiomatically starts with 'God exists', 'God is as described in scriptures', and 'scriptures were given by God', meaning God tautologically exists by himself, and he created people in his image as prescribed in scriptures, but if you add 'God does not interfere with men in whatsoever ways', then of course it does not matter if we believe in God or not. This would be physicists' God, i.e. the Creator. Be it quantum mechanical 'consciousness', Wigner's 'observer's observer' or Einstein's 'the old one' or someone who does not play with a dice, it is metaphysically there to allow hypotheses to take hold of chain of equational reasoning. It becomes a religion when we make a connection between God and us. This could be in the form of someone chosen to represent God in our world, narrated through scriptural events of miracles and sufferings pro nobis. The question is posed why God take the trouble of such a representation. This is where a theology over and beyond the base narrative of storyline is called for. The first-order language of a fictional story is a matter of fairy tale. You may believe it like a 3-year-old girl with her favourite fairy tale. Or you may not believe it like someone grown more streetwise. It is a matter of juxtaposing descriptions with observable realities or, for a shortcut, the world of the common sense obtained through science, superficial or otherwise. The metalanguage avoids this need of juxtaposition by schematizing the fairy tale into a self-contained and self-sufficient organization of conceptual relations. It is not about if a fairy exists or not, but about descriptions of relations between the fairy and its world, in which it must exist in order to sustain viable storylines. You and your intellect are there to critically inspect relational consistency once you accept the metalanguage, while the base story is a matter of make-believe.

In the first-order language we may laugh at the girl who believe in a fairy, saying we see no such a thing. In the theology of a fairy the existence of the fairy is a given, even if all failed the fairy exists in the girl's mind or in a weird parallel universe and relates with all other things, fictional or real, in her mind. The theology is there to expunge first-order references and replaces with conceptual relations. Thus, this language overrides our common-sense language and engages us to explore relational storyline between fictions and realities by assigning plausible non-referential meaning to 'fairy'. It could be a Socratic daemon or a Platonic idea that the girl is seeing here and there in relation to her some psychological conditions. Or there may be some juvenile manipulations to call for such an existence. The first-order language is superficially a language of common-sense with concrete references and therefore appears scientific based on verifications. The parallel postulate, if dealt with by metalanguage, would have created a theology of parallel geometry instead of non-Euclidian geometry because the quantifiers would have metamorphosed into untouchable axioms by elevating a relation into a relation of relations, metageometry being a lot easier than creating a new geometry. However, above and beyond simple juxtaposition of language-reality is necessity of descriptions that combines language and reality, without which language is a schema with variables, and reality is phenomenological constructs without conceptual causality. Therefore, our mind gives rise to metaphysical parameters that put language and reality together so that they make sense based on concepts.

Concepts create relations, even relations of relations, between language and reality. In science e.g. space, time, numbers, probabilities are such parameters, and together they create scientific realities describable in equations of order, magnitudes, directions, etc. Or value systems based on socio-economic needs may represent such parameters and describe human realities fashioned in arts, religions or politico-economic manipulations. The former aims for models of exactitudes useful in reducing reality into scientific principles on simple assumptions, which can also be consistently applied to engineering, while the latter describes realities in human dimensions anchored around parametric concepts like 'life and death', 'the sublime', 'good and bad', 'money', 'identity', etc. etc. that command secondary concepts and furnish them with a structure of reconciliation, in short turning phenomenological reality into an ordered human reality with purposes. Here the engineering is the application of the former for the benefits of the latter. 'Thing in itself' behind human concepts may or may not have a structure, but is deduced to have a structure through descriptions, such as the absolute space and

time, or Hilbert space, in science, or value systems, so that our perceptions become describable in science and in life. This is reconciliation of objects with the subject that is necessarily coordinative and predictive. Structures give us directions and a sense of purposes. They may be there assuming our maths is the language of the universe, or, failing that, we create structures as we describe our objects.

So far, I touched upon a religion 1) as a social institution, 2) as a theology, and I am happily an atheist with regards to these two points. However, there is a religion that powerfully overrides superficial rationality. That is an aspect that amalgamates imagination and reality. Human mind is a product of 'predictive brain' that is also essentially coordinative and endows us with an ability of descriptions. Being coordinative entails some elements that are outside its own sphere, definiens of coordinates so to speak. A coordinate is all things in it and their relevancies to its centre. In the absolute space and time, the actual centre is outside the coordinate and gives rise to space and time as such so that things in it are conventionally measured via an imaginary centre, which is a mathematical fiction, thus allowing infinite range and speed, whereas spacetime is the propagation of a centre itself and is in a wave-particle form that represents space-time transmutations through c , becoming relativistic. The former is absolute as the coordinative frame is a given, by God (or us as cognisor as if being an agent of God) as it were, thus having no defining border with a fictitious appearance of being limitless, as with numbers. Here the coordinate is a mere tool of descriptions with us as an outside describer. Newton was literally a God-like observer independent of his coordinate. The latter is relativistic as we realise we are also part of our coordinate and become a centre of reference frame. Things are relevant to us as entangled observer, and this exacerbates as space and time interact, with us in it. I touched upon the case of quantum probability elsewhere ('Life, Universe and Everything').

Likewise, a coordinate of values uses parameters that are primary to subservient values. Such parameters are less visible as they are coordinators of secondary concepts and are therefore less descriptively represented, like Newton's coordinative frame. Here they would look as if belonging to the sphere of imagination, whereas subservient values would look more real. Primary concepts are such as that oversee religions, ethics, aesthetics, our politico-economic preoccupations, etc. regardless of whether these domains of human perceptions are real or not. They often present themselves like philosophical paradigms based on which various discourses take place arguing conceptual intricacies from human perspectives. The entirety of practical philosophies is about

conceptual niceties concocted from irretrievably confused states of essentially non-communicable human minds. We live together, but the language does not make us one and the same. Our language as a tool of communication is intentionally loose and open-ended as it has to be learned instead of being down-loaded. Moreover, we live in a world where information, essential and trivial, genuine and fake, come flooding at a touch of bottom (except control-freak China) and pervades our free and proportional formation of opinions. Screenings and digestions of information are a skill that requires intelligence and trainings, without which we may be drown in this sea of information or go delusionary. Too much information can be as bad as too little information.

If you believe you were created by God, then you can sort out problems of language (semantical and syntactic tautologies and paradoxes as well as essential difficulties of communications) by axioms of metalogic. For then this metalogic may contain some element of godly interventions. On the other hand, if you think there is no God, then you and your language is a binary totality, and your metalogic is merely your metaphysics that does not and cannot contain any symbols referring to yourself. The fact that we are still embraced by paradoxes and tautologies is a proof that there is no God.

Finally, I wanted this work to be as independent as possible and refrained from referring too much to other works of mine, so that it should be possible to read this with little preliminary knowledge. In encountering particularly philosophical passages you can ignore and read on without much loss on essence, or may wish to consult the below works. I made available 'The Elementals' on the philosophy of logic, 'Maths, Logic and Language' on the philosophy of maths and 'Life, Universe and Everything' on the philosophy of language at philpapers.org, which are freely downloadable, despite being offered a publishing contract. Further 'Self, History and Future' on the philosophy of history in a book form seems to have a fair proportion available in snippets through Google Books, if you are interested. This work was originally intended as 'Reality, Hypotheses and Imagination' on the philosophical interpretations of the Anthropic Principle and sprang while writing 'Life, Universe and Everything'. I wanted this work to be less technically philosophical and more enjoyable in writing and reading. It assumed the current form to give a more positive touch to a religion, which, if only released from institutional grips, cannot be all that negative. Free from conformity a religion too has a place in man's freedom. The most important undercurrent in all my works is the 'wholiticism' in the form of $(x) > x$, which also embraces the essential

multi-layeredness of mind that explains tautology/paradox as source of our numerical representations and ∞ .

I am not naturally inclined towards any religions and have no interests in the so-called philosophy of religion. Religions have some fundamental problems as they are invariably institutionalised, which is best understood socio-economically. Another problem is how to intellectually overcome 'miracles' that are the most essential cornerstone of any religions. Without adequate methods of incorporating 'miracles' into philosophical treatises you will not have any proper philosophy of religion, and of course 'miracles' are the diametric opposite of our so-called sciences and make any such acceptances generally a laughing stock (e.g. Anscombe). Nevertheless, religions are there, our needs for religions are there, and philosophy cannot go past this problem as merely psychological and socio-economical irrelevances that have no proper place in our ontologico-epistemic understanding of the universe.

Buddhism's non-theistic characters found some attractions in the modern West, disappointed in the Christian doctrines of God, its ontological shortcomings, usual institutional hypocrisies, etc. This includes intellectuals like Russell, Heidegger, Nietzsche, Husserl, Schopenhauer, Hesse the novelist, etc. They seemed to find especially Zen interesting, in that disciplined self-enlightenment is seen almost synonymous to phenomenological reduction. However, historically it is precisely Zen's philosophical high-mindedness that failed it as a religion. Most people are not so intellectually inclined as professional scholars. Zen may be interesting if you have got time and inclination for meditations, but peasants tired in daily toils, soldiers who have to fight and kill, deserted Zen Buddhism, preferring easy-to-understand Pure Land Buddhism with its Nianfo and quasi deities, which is psychologically identical to prayers to God that redeems you and promises you the heaven. It is the idea of something supra-humans rather than meditations that rescue you. So, well-intended Buddhism ended up as a half-superstitious practical religion. After all a religion can do away with God but needs patrons (money), without which it cannot sustain its existence. In the end people's practical desires overrule a good philosophical doctrine. That is why Zen temples declined, and a few surviving ones cater for misguided businessmen's summer meditation courses. Throughout history Buddhism went through popularizations in order to appeal to ordinary folk's imagination and ended up as a religion with deities (including Buddha himself), prayers (Nianfo), heaven and hell, etc., all the things that modern intellectuals despise. Popular Buddhism is a far cry from idealistic Buddhism of transcendental

meditations. Buddhist monks are just as disappointing as Christian priests and Muslim mullahs, with their human desires, greed and faults. In the end it is human colours that taint well-intended religious aspirations.

Finally, I touch upon the reason why an atheist is not likely to find non-theistic idealistic Buddhism particularly useful. This is a religion, if it is one, that negates conceptual representations. Concepts are human tools of descriptions embedded with certain value systems. Whatever we understand this way is intrinsically biased towards accepted epistemic orthodoxy, which is after all why we use language as tool of communications. Without shared values we cannot communicate, and even to communicate with one's self we cannot start inventing one's private language. Besides our whole society, like it or not, make use of epistemic stock of knowledge, including science and engineering. For idealistic Buddhists who deny ready-made values that guide us to usual pitfalls of sufferings, such as desires, wants, disappointments, frustrations, etc., they are thus best advised not to rely on conceptual descriptions and always try to intuit direct awareness, whatever it may be. No wonder Husserl liked this type of Buddhism. This ultimately leads to solipsistic scepticism and denial of epistemic achievements acquired thus far. However, peace of mind obtained thus through meditations should not really enjoy fruits of social accomplishments based on our conceptual representations. They then should lead a simple life of hermit without benefits of any social infrastructures. Otherwise it is a hypocrisy of self-delusion.

The idealistic Buddhism, not unlike phenomenism, tries to explore the subjective consciousness, and ironically that is the reason why it had to make itself a religion of practical Buddhism. The qualia obtained thus is a consciousness freed from intentionality and is supposedly naked, in that it has nothing but itself to focus on and transcends burdens of conceptual representations. It even denies the use of language as language only provides interpretations. Such a consciousness is a mind unapplied to, or disappplied from, its environments and is empty of coordinative relevancies and is not far from what I call 'solipsistic collapse'. Setting aside the problem of realistically obtaining such a state of consciousness, i.e. a mind without contents, this would be, rhetorically speaking, a world without colours. Whether we would care for this grey world called nirvana in our short life, knowing this grey world is coming anyway in one form or another, efforts for this enlightenment seem beyond ordinary people's comprehensions, unless you perceive Karma in a darker colour than grey. Instead of metaphysical mumbo-jumbo of someone who live on other people's labours, ordinary people prefer a supra-human agency,

so that imagination imagines away imaginations. Why add imaginary sufferings on top of physical sufferings? You who had time for metaphysical ponderings, are responsible to provide an easier solution for those who are incapable of deep thinking or cannot afford time for meditations. Thus, comes practical Buddhism of a supernatural deity and Nianfo that guarantees the heaven for ordinary folk.

It is interesting and surprising to see there was someone who managed to cast doubts on the nature of language 2,500 years before phenomenalism, when most races have not even discovered pleasures and wonders of written language. However, language and its conceptual stocks built up sophistications and proven records in the form of science and engineering, arts and socio-economic modelling, etc. We do not live in a naïve world of simplistic imaginations where a therapy of meditations can attain enlightened states of mind away from sufferings, imagined as well as physical. Today Zen Buddhism, the most advanced non-theistic religion, is one with least followers compared with popular Buddhism of quasi deities and prayers. Zen Buddhism, popular circa 14-15th centuries coinciding with the rise of samurai, leaves legacies in art and cultures. The most revered artist Sesshu was a Zen master, and his paintings and garden designs had long-lasting influences on Japanese culture and psyche. Rikyu's art of tea ceremony incorporates Zen in architecture and mannerism. Legacies aside, today Zen temples are overcome by temples of Pure Land and its derivatives, and the worldly yoga replaces the religious Zen (meaning meditation). I would rather do philosophy (the epitome of the art of language) than Zen (the antithesis of the linguistic descriptions).

1. Reality of Imagination

<Mind as receptacle of fictions>

Objects of imagination are presumably concretes and particulars as physically presented to our cognitive faculties. They, however, acquire supra-physical qualities through mental processes of representations. That is, objects thus processed are presumably linearly connected with concretes and particulars as we assume that the physical space and time of these concretes and particulars is directly related to the mental space and time that assigns meaning to such representations. This unqualified assumption is tested through predictive power of modelling as we manipulate representations to see if it matches to changes in concretes and particulars. This works because by the same token by which representations are made, we also create our tools of scales and measurements. Thus, changes are scaled and measured and generally found to match to agreeable precisions allowed within the modelling capacities of our tools and their physical correlations, with the difference being that between our tools (e.g. conceptual representations, human maths, etc. and their combinations thereof) and the bona fide language of the universe, i.e. a naked structure of the nature as it were. The difference will be expressed as various levels of energy expenditures incurred by our engineering. If you use more coarse and primitive engineering tools, then it would generally result in higher energy usages and roughly measured thus, meaning representational tools and measuring tools should roughly correspond in their refinements. The best physics we have in day-to-day spectrum of engineering needs is still Newtonian approximations, relativistic and QM based engineering being outside our usual needs or engineering capacities. Thus, energy needed to get from Earth to Mars is calculated by Newtonian mechanics based on the engineering of chemical propulsions. Relativistic or QM based engineering may be more precise and efficient but is beyond our overall engineering abilities.

Unlike raw concretes and particulars that are presumably governed by the physical laws of nature, concretes and particulars thus represented in our language, i.e. imagined objects, however, acquire an extra freedom, in that they are only governed by laws of relevant language, be it ordinary language, maths, physics, etc., but in return constrained by rules of that language, which schematically and approximately assimilate aspects of physical laws. Some tries to replicate the physical space and time like Cartesian coordinates or Hilbert complex space, but some are more loosely governed based on linguistic laws and quasi-scientific common sense. In conceptual representations used in ordinary language as well as

in science categorizations play an essential role for our understandings of nature. Instead of dealing with each and every concrete and particular as they present themselves we categorize them based on various parameters such as space, time, matters, interactions, energy levels, density, wave length, set, group, topology, etc. Some parameters are essential as with dimensions, some are for schematic conveniences, subject to paradigmatic frameworks. In ordinary language, however, there are elements of arbitrariness in categorizations as it is a jumble of criss-cross value systems that are the bases of categorizations and thus a same object may be categorized inconsistently and incompletely. For example, what is generally referred to as 'man' may be 'people', 'Homo sapiens', 'humans', 'economic animals', 'bastards', 'fart bags', etc. depending on chosen usages reflecting our value considerations. Obviously, some usages are contradictory as their values are not always inclusive.

Categorizations are essential in our understanding of the world as concretes and particulars are in themselves raw data and become information that constitutes our epistemic stock of knowledge after turned into tools of modelling, be it through scientific processing or through human value appraisals. Besides categorizations are also a tool of housekeeping, greatly simplifying our epistemic cataloguing, saving repetitious wastes of intellectual energy, although we may have to check our methodology of cataloguing every now and then as it often happens with paradigmatic evolutions of scientific frameworks. Concretes and particulars become universal abstracts when they are firmly engaged within established paradigms of a totality that accommodates them as parts of its structure. This is more pronounced in ordinary language, which is loose at best in structural confinements as it concentrates on value sides of concepts, where concepts are bloated and ballooned and can float around in a less structural space of ordinary language. Whereas in science it is relational sides of concepts that have to be exacted and finely balanced as with various equational expressions.

It is thus that we can play around with different frameworks of concepts, some in ordinary language, and some in science or even in quasi- or pseudo-science, without much conflicts as they are kept apart paradigmatically, unless we choose to mix them on purpose in order to make a claim based on intellectual preferences. We can make parallel-processing even when a same concept has different referents so long as we can differentiate them structurally. That is why we can talk about 'field' consistently, be it in Maxwellian electrodynamics or in quantum field theory. This gives rise to an indeterminate space of concepts in which multiple structures/schemata of concepts are accommodated for

processing, and in which concepts can float around without structural constraints, not unlike free electrons. It is this unstructured cavity that imagination finds it most comfortable as it is free from efforts of trying to make sense of structures that are inevitably metaphysically founded in its conception, arising from the origin of assumptions, and which cause paradigmatic conflicts relationally and/or on value. This cavity space is a meta-space, the space of spaces, so to speak, that accommodates structural spaces. When structures are not model-compatible, i.e. neither logico-mathematical nor engineering-adoptive, it becomes a narrative space that utilizes ready-made relations and values of ordinary language. It is also here that materials for parallel-processing are stored as structures go through epistemic appraisals. Concepts are refined and exacted according to structural needs of consistency, completeness and encompassment, but their skeletal remains stay to be picked by imagination, which need to be fired by metaphysical inspirations in order to metamorphose into a theory or quasi-/pseudo-theory (i.e. story).

For example, out of unstructured ‘energy’ one defines the exact Einsteinian ‘E’ in relation to ‘m’ metrically processed through kinetic ‘c’, while ‘energy’ is still there to be Newtonian or quantum mechanical, or something more primitive like an animalistic libido. ‘Energy’ may have acquired an Einsteinian meaning of scale or a quasi-numerical value, it may still be used by imagination for a narrative storytelling, which fills an unstructured space. Einstein’s E has a schematically exact meaning as crystalized in his equation, so does its primitive brother ‘internal energy’ that is molecular and chemical in nature used in thermodynamics. ‘Energy’ in our storyline is nebulous in meaning unlike its use in physics that is governed by equational strictness that paradigmatically defines its domain, while we want to use it in our ordinary language as meaning something of kinetic power, potential and/or actual. Thus, we redefine ‘energy’ to suit our lack of exact physical knowledge but more useful for our intended story of everyday needs, without referring to pathway transfer mechanics/dynamics. This is possible because our ordinary language leaves it to concepts to structure themselves within boundaries of their semantics and syntax. These structures can be narrow and strict if concepts epistemically adopt physics, be it Newtonian (coordinative in an intuitionistic way), Einsteinian (a wider spectrum) or quantum mechanical (coordinative ∞ that represents supra-mathematical self-energy due to field-interaction).

We have a fair knowledge of what ‘energy’ is in text book science, but are still far from a complete knowledge as can be seen in our inability to account for ‘dark energy’, ‘singularity’, etc. Our loose use of ‘energy’ in

ordinary language does not contradict our scientific knowledge of 'energy' because a scientific theory is ultimately founded on metaphysical assumptions that are only justified by a theoretical consistency and completeness, the range of its epistemic encompassment and its practical applicability (i.e. engineering) insofar as a theory is a set of descriptions. For example, Newtonian mechanics assumes the coordinate of the absolute time and space among others. Einsteinian relativity assumes c that is constant regardless of sequential proportionality. If space (distance) and time (speed) are defined via c as the only common unit of measurement, and are used to measure c , then not only such a measurement is tautological but also fail to reflect the sequential nature of spacetime evolution via density, not to mention quantum uncertainty. There is no way of knowing if c is the same at different spacetime frameworks. Besides knowability of locations of every possible energy/mass that is dynamically interconnected is beyond our maths, other than gross approximations. Then throw in quantum unitarity, the uncertainty contained within probability amplitude, observer deterministic nature of a wave function, etc., even 'energy' in a narrow and straight context becomes a metaphysical subject. We do not know if complex Hilbert space is really equipped to represent everything quantum. In short 'energy' or any other essential concepts with implications of exact and precise physical representations have enough leeway to be used in narratives of storytelling. A fiction has its own way of rearranging concepts on its own metaphysics of space and time. One metaphysics has no power to impose itself on another until and unless all our minds are merged strictly on scientific principles. That is why Harry Potter has no needs to express his magic power in physical equations to advance his stories.

The question is how the world of observable realities and that of fictions are related, considering one metaphysics has no intellectual right to rule over another except for a complete merger of minds. It essentially boils down to necessities of descriptions and roles of metaphysics in descriptions. Descriptions are an organized set of propositions that may include equations. A proposition may externally refer to something juxtaposed in the external world, and its domain is pre-set by metaphysics that manifests in so-called axioms, which are primarily concerned with a space of representations, i.e. a number space. Thus, descriptions here are language of modelling, claiming to represent the external world partially or wholly. Sciences at large belong to this representational language. Although, considering language is a product of mind, whether it can truly represent the external world, especially 'wholly', that is an eternal philosophical question. On the other hand, language is also a tool of

communication (even with oneself) whose function is to provide purchases for minds to merge, so that facets and layers of concepts are unified for internal consistency and completeness. That is, we communicate so that we do not have to communicate. Whether this is achievable or not, that is another question. This side of language refers to the internal world that is represented not by a relational structure of modelling but by the logical consistency and completeness of self, undivided and all encompassing.

The two functions of language, i.e. the external representation and the internal self-fulfilment, are mutually dependent in order to achieve a self-preservation that governs a mind as biological entity, in that without understanding its environments a mind cannot navigate its ontological self in the context of biological utilities and, by extension, of intellectual curiosities as biological borders are blurred between wider physical borders, and without a *raison d'être* a mind has no reason to bother to put itself in an environmental context. It is thus a simple person has no compunctions of not going beyond basic minimum epistemic understandings and staying with an animalistic self, as we often find in most mediocre people. The two functions of language allow us mental schism of indulging in science or pseudo/quasi science on one hand and still enjoying pleasures of fantasies without confusions, allowing us religious scientists even today.

However, metaphysics of representational language and that of communicational language are essentially different and can never be one and the same. The former is primarily for modelling so as to bridge language and the so-called external world and is there to provide language a coordinative medium to overlap the external world, partially or wholly. The degree of success depends upon how closely the two spaces (modelling space and physical space) are connected, how intuitively helpful symbolic representations are with regards to physical structures, how predictive modelling structures are, how encompassing modelling is in relation to physical space, and if time can be successfully derived in tandem with space. This last proviso is paramount to predictive ability of representations. The latter is more to do with linguistic capacity of consistency and completeness so that it can process a thought coherently and productively first with oneself, then with other minds. The two metaphysics cannot be the same, otherwise we represent ourselves and communicate with ourselves, resulting in a schizophrenic situation of confusing the external world with the internal world, worse than a mad scientist.

We normally have the both languages in a mixture of varying degrees, as they are both essential to our physical and mental wellbeing. However, the former tends to be substituted by formulaic information data as representational symbolisms expressed e.g. by equations becomes more and more specific and requires elaborate understandings combined with knowledge of specially adopted engineering. Here representational language consists in and of three layers, assuming they are all linearly correlated; firstly, of underlining mathematical language, secondly, of physical states that are purported to be thus symbolised, thirdly, of testing and utilitarian regimes, as representations are largely for practical human purposes. Philosophy will make it even more complicated as mediocre philosophers tend to go for meta-something by creating a layer of higher order language in order to tackle base problems, i.e. by turning a physical problem into a linguistic problem, where a solution is usually a linguistic solution to be found in the language they create for themselves. The world of representational language is seriously problematic (model-reality paradox), in that only very few people can really come close to appreciate problems, let alone solutions. There are no scientists who can master every aspect of science, and we are all a half-specialist of this and that. At best we only make use of representational language by labelling useful bits and treating them as accepted knowledge (pamphlet-like knowledge a la Wikipedia). Thus, it seems that deeper it goes, representational language digs its own grave, not like happy days of Isaac Newton with Man as Agent of God, where our knowledge is deemed literally a godsend, with our maths as the language of the universe. In short representational language would superficially appear as tangles of information treated as best available to our days and for our purposes. We just skim through labels with attached footnotes, thinking we are well-placed in our command of our environments and can navigate our ways around.

No wonder we enjoy our fantasies and still think we are reasonably scientific. Sciences are there for utilitarian takes, and we seem OK. After all we can go to Mars, we have a telescope to see the beginning of the universe, etc., so we indulge in fictions as if there is no tomorrow. This is where language as a tool of communication, including with oneself, manage to override representational language. We now have less of representational language and more of communicational language, as the former went too ahead of ourselves. We hallucinate we know enough by label, so we think we can afford to dream by fiction, while living in the world of quasi-science and largely Newtonian physics-based engineering, although semiconductors are bringing in more and more of quantum world. We may have more of accumulated knowledge, but our command

of language is more for communications rather than for representational pursuits. As our command of representational language diminishes, we are on the whole less creative and more imaginative. The two should not be confused because imagination is creativity without representational skills and can be self-indulgent as a game of mind, while creativity, if real, is an ingenuity of finding a new way of describing relational representations, i.e. of finding new perspectives. Even a monkey can be an abstract modernist painter of imagination, while only after hard and long trainings and with an insight of parallel processing you can make it to the rank of creative classist painters. After all it is difficult to be creative by communication only, you do need relational understandings of symbolic representations based on rules of symbols as well as of objects in order to be master of both representational and communicational languages.

There are no religions without miracles. Even Zen Buddhism assumes a possibility of spiritual freedom ('mokṣa') from bodily constraints, which is to assume that 'mind' without worldly worries is good by essence. The assumption of free 'mind' out of 'mind/body' without physical necessities is an idealization of one part out of the two mutually dependent existence and is akin to a miracle, a physical impossibility achieved by conceptual manipulation of good/bad dualism, which is a fiction, because good/bad is a concept of value for necessary navigations of life and has no meaning per se. The goodness of 'mind' contrasted by the evilness of 'body' is logico-semantically as valid as the evilness of 'mind' contrasted by the goodness of 'body'. Body/mind cannot choose one on the negation of the other. This is a pontifical fallacy of wordsmithing. There are actually no Zen Buddhist with mind as free as supra-conceptual concept of concept. Their idealization of mind 'free' from all desires and constraints, and meditations to 'free' are not 'free' from the concept of 'free'. They either believe the miracle of a free mind free even from itself or they are simplistic delusionists, especially now with their internet, social medias and pensions. I would rather hallucinate on opium (like ancient exoteric Buddhists feeling 'enlightened' with poppy seeds smoke) than meditate on freedom of mind.

A miracle is imperative of a religion and is non-coordinative by origin, which contrasts with essentially coordinative descriptions of sciences. Coordinative descriptions, however, need metaphysical constructs of axes, such as space and time, spacetime, etc., which are descriptively at par with the religious construct of a 'miracle'. A religious narrative that places a miracle in a metaphysical coordinate of space and time is essentially a fairy tale, as much of a fairy tale as a scientific narrative to

discuss their metaphysical constructs themselves. In this sense religious narratives with a miracle are poorly written fairy tales because a miracle as religious construct cannot be narrated by any coordinative constructs as they are both equally tools of descriptions. Most narratives of institutional religions are poorly written fairy tales as much as literally fictions with a storyline that desperately needs the miracle of unlikely events and convenient coincidences out of the blue sky, which are required to propel an interesting story within given pages. I am here to show a better and more plausible way of presenting a miracle through a narrative. As we realise we are neither God's agent nor master of our own so-called sciences, just a greedy opportunistic parasite of this little planet with sciences as tools of exploitations or anthropic explanations, we will need our personal religion of a fairy tale as we enter algorithmic present and unalgorithmic future (my next work 'Paradise Lost - 'AI the conceptualizer''), as we are just about getting clever enough to know anything institutional including sciences is fatally fallacious driven by in-built incompetency.

2. Imagination of Reality

<In itself vs descriptive representations>

I touched upon our current tendency towards communicational language on the back of intrinsic difficulty of representations, which became clearer with counter-intuitive difficulties of quantum descriptions. We no longer believe there is God that makes us the epistemic ruler of our descriptions. Without an absolute guarantor of our ability to describe representations become relativistic in the sense it is only internal coherency based on modelling validity that turns descriptions into knowledge. Newton assumed the absolute space and time to describe his physics, while this absolute coordinate only had a metaphysical ground to stand on. The fact that we could not question the validity of this assumption was seen to point towards God that endowed us with such an ability to come up with this unchallengeable method of descriptions. Even Einstein had some belief in God ('the old one'), who would not play dice with the universe. To confront this assumption was almost synonymous with a challenge to God as we never had any better ways of describing motions. But, then instead of instantaneous speed with which gravity interacts in Newtonian space and time, Maxwell came up with the speed of light that is the medium of energy transmissions in his electromagnetism, which Einstein subsequently established as the maximum speed available within our universe in his special relativity. Here our ability of observation replaced blind God of Newton, in that we do not believe what we cannot observe. Until, that is, we come to realise our ability to observe is fundamentally flawed due to the quantum uncertainty and observer entanglement. Notwithstanding these physical evolutions our method of descriptions essentially remained Newtonian, i.e. being coordinative. Thus, the non-coordinative uncertainty had to be dealt with by coordinative representations of Hilbert complex space, in which the uncertainty is certainly approximated within complementarity of pairs of measurements that only together describe certain physical states. Here necessities of coordinative description keep the upper hand over something that is essentially non-coordinative, because even non-coordinativeness can only be coordinatively processed, insofar as our tool of understanding is concerned.

This is a human paradox of description (model-reality paradox of modelling on something essentially non-coordinative by coordinative means) that bears significance in our religion and teaches us not question phenomenological realities. Once put into descriptions there is a metaphysics of coordinativeness with a centre from which to measure

relevance to this centre (a self). In scientific representations this relevance may come out as numerical values in terms of position, distance, time, density, vector, tensor, etc. Whereas in communicational language this manifests as various values implicit in measurements in terms of when, where, what, why and how something may be connected to a self. This is how a theology may come out of a religion, which could be a personal myth in origin, but in turning into a social entity, had to be embodied with coordinative descriptions sharable by multiple-selves via a collective representation in the form of a so-called prophet. This is an elaborate narrative coming out of something essentially supra-personal as well as extra-representative. Thus, a narrative religion expressed in quasi-measurements of various social values appears a fiction seen from representational language as it represents nothing observable. If anything, it only represents itself, and, in so doing, borrows coordinative expressions in guise of social values. In general, narrative religions always conform to a society because being coordinative necessarily means in relation to a self (generalised self) by virtue of sharable values such as morality, ethics, eternalness, love, etc. etc. Otherwise, it would remain personal and cannot establish itself as an institution, a power to reckon with.

We, sceptics, are upset because we see no observable realities in a religious foundation. They, believers, say it is faith that matters. However, faith is a relationship, and there is no faith for the sake of it. It can only be about something that causes us to believe it because it is either tangible to our body (perceptions) or reactive to our mind (emotions). Either way it is a preliminary step to establish its *raison d'etre* by latching onto us, although both perceptions and emotions can be doubted. Some religions try to solidify their ground by making a claim on both accounts by way of a miracle (the only element that gives religions a special status among narrative rhetoric), so that the easy latter can be augmented by the impossible former. Alas we have little to speak of science of miracles. Wanting both ways is a confusion over our uses of language. As mentioned, language is representational as well as communicational. A miracle cannot be spoken of by representations as it will destroy our science, which, together with engineering, is a cornerstone of our socio-economic structure and also epistemically by far outweighs religions. On the other hand, a miracle can be more sympathetically interpreted by communicational language. Communications can also be a communication with oneself as our self is a layered self of parallel processes (essential multi-layeredness of mind) that gives us a faculty of doubting Thomas. Here a miracle can be a narrative fiction that obtains its reality through necessities of self-

communication. That is, we can believe anything if it helps reconciling divided selves. For someone who rejects a religion on a rational (i.e. scientific) ground but has a psychological (i.e. emotional) need for a religion, communicational language gives a miracle a reality by power of $(x) > x$ that is a symbolic expression of a whole being larger than the sum of its parts.

This is more pronounced when a self is divided in a manner that logically exclude each other, such as rationality vs irrationality. We carry on despite such a division because our mind contains such divisions in separate layers that are supra-logical and even beneficial in creating a dimensionality structure making use of 'directions' that are conceptually more fundamental than logical connectives. Otherwise, such divisions would be intellectually destructive. Instead we even enjoy playing with paradoxes. Remember a paradox always become a tautology if turned around the axis of the objective 'I' and subjective 'I' because it is the transmuting-self (between objective 'I' and subjective 'I') that allows mind to refer to different totalities (of form, of dimensionality, of language, etc.) simultaneously whilst thinking of a same totality (see my 'Maths, Logic and Language').

For the sake of an illustration, assume the simplistic case of a self that has only two selves (say, rationality and irrationality) that are mutually exclusive but are on a same layer, here $(x) > x$ works in such a way that the two selves do not cancel out each other and become 0, because by virtue of $(x) > x$ the totality of two exclusive x remains positive. The two exclusive parts react and yet remain positive if the totality of the two is larger than its parts in such a way that there is a space that can contain the two parts and allow them to react not by themselves but by an intermediary of a channel, which can angle the two parts and deflect each other. Thus, the two parts, instead of annihilating each other, leave a scope of space in which predicative characters of each part measure each other in varying degrees of angles from collision to skimming deflection. In the worst case of collision, it is not rationality vs irrationality but various predicative aspects of each label that react. Therefore, there will always be some aspects that survive the collision in one way or another. In short rationality/irrationality is an abstract concept (more of a label), and the fact that we can argue about it one way or another as if we are attached to one or the other and fight over which is right or wrong within ourselves, means we are actually neither rational nor irrational and possess something larger than both of them together. In reality rationality/irrationality has many predicative properties that can be more precisely narrated via science or quasi-science. Besides some

metaphysical assumptions can be argued both rational and irrational. E.g. the Newtonian absolute space and time is rational (and useful) as a tool of coordinative descriptions and is also irrational from a perspective of the Einsteinian spacetime fabric, although it can be part of a wider spectrum that contains both from a perspective of applicability. It is usually futile philosophy of petty academics that construct arguments based on labels reacting with each other. We all have a multi-layered mind that accommodates both rationality and irrationality. See how so-called philosophers argue about subjectivity and objectivity forgetting they are themselves neither in order to be able to argue thus. If they are one or the other, then there should not be any arguing or even listening to each other. It is interesting to observe rationality and irrationality coexist with the former as descriptions within a frame of reference that is itself irrational in the sense it cannot itself be described, let alone proved. We say a frame has a validity in terms of its applicability in the world of observables. Yet such validities work only within a part of a spectrum, and there is not yet a wholly complete spectrum that explains everything and is self-complete. Our axioms, assumptions, etc. are not really rational as they cannot be rationally explained in a way they are applicable anywhere within a larger spectrum in which their workable part nests in. Much in a similar way literally fictions have to rely on unlikely events, improbable coincidences to construct a narrative storyline within limited pages without which imaginations cannot be engaged upon to enact emotional reactions. It is almost funny both science and literally fictions need rationality of coordinative descriptions and irrationality of a frame. This situation exacerbates in case of religions in the sense that the entirety of their coordinative descriptions hinges on a frame built on 'miracles'. Remove miracles, then religions collapse, much like literally fictions elaborated on coincidences would lose finesse of a convincing storyline without which our emotions cannot be engaged upon. It appears only 'parts' can be rationally expounded, whereas 'a whole' is something to be accepted or rejected as it has no logical contents. Here a whole is a quasi-layer of mind to enact the functionality of mind.

Mind has a dynamic, accommodating space that does not become void in good health. It is not only larger than all its contents but also multi-layered so that it can play around with contrasting, conflicting and even contradicting labels. That is why we enjoy paradoxes and tautologies, which are, by definition, supposed to be non-informative and meaningless. We can work out a structure of mind through logic of multi-layered self (ontologico-notationality) that can touch upon the essence of maths and language. It is only the nature of infinity as represented by real numbers and this dynamic space of our mind that come to pose seriously

interesting philosophical problems in describing each other. Mind that ceases to possess this dynamism for one reason or another (e.g. mental illnesses, intellectual capacity, etc.) becomes dysfunctional and non-creative and often confuses the distinction between a label, a labelled self and a label's constituents, i.e. a universal, a philosophizing (skewed) mind and a concrete. This exacerbates if representational language and communicational language overlap the confusion. What is clear to representational language in terms of a concept and its referents is not necessarily so for communicational language as it is engaged with conveying meanings rather than establishing relevance. Without establishing relevance positivistically (truth and falsehood) or schematically (consistency and completeness), language can still function by tossing around concepts between multiple selves in the hope of merging self. While representational language tries to refine and perfect concepts, communicational language engages to bridge concepts between selves (in case of self-communication) and minds (in case of trying to attain a merged mind). The two languages work in tandem so that clearer and more inclusive concepts are also easier to communicate and more persuasive. Language as a representational tool is concerned with the exactitude of a concept so as to prevent disagreements. Language as a communicational tool makes sure all parties (within and without a self) assign a same identifier to a concept so as to make possible coherent agreements. We require the both aspects of language because concepts are multi-faceted and layered.

It is here $(x) > x$ provides a room for a 'miracle'. Communicational language brings out a totality that is larger than the sum of its parts because its task of assigning an identifier can only be done if the concept manipulator (mind) has an extra space in and by which to oversee concepts. Think of this space as the space of conceptual space that can treat representations as a tool and afford us comparisons, adjustments and improvements in representational processes so that we can see ourselves ready for communications. We cannot communicate something of which we are not in possession. Representations are thought processes that allow us to mirror the world (or our world if modelled), while communications (including self-communications) are more for the housekeeping of the consequences of this mirroring, so that we can contemplate the validity of a mirroring. This is like making of a sword and testing of a sword to see if we are tempering iron effectively to turn it into useful steel. Both representations and communications are essential for our knowledge formation, although we tend to emphasize the former. In case of rationality vs irrationality if communicational language tips over a rational self towards an irrational self, then a 'miracle' will be

persuaded to acquire its reality regardless of the lack of scientific representations. This happens because a 'miracle' acquires a space of representation in the move from rational to irrational in the space of $(x) > x$. In another word, because the whole is larger than its sum of parts, it can accommodate extra-physical representations in this spare room.

Assume representations are mostly works of rationality as observables and descriptive schema require judgements of intelligence as to truth and falsehood, consistency and completeness. Communications make use of representational labels with or without necessarily being familiar with such judgements. Irrationality can creep in as labels can be tossed around without knowing fine interrelations of such judgements. This is why we can talk about many things of which we are not masters. Once representations are made, they can be used as labels that carries their contents, which are available upon request as we cannot carry out conceptual analyses each and every time we use them. Representations assume we are in possession of epistemic contents of concepts, but communications make use of representations as labels. When there are mismatches between concepts (representations) and their labels (communications), which typically appear as 'talking about things you don't know', this will unravel as inconsistency and incompleteness (or more colloquially shallowness) of narratives.

However, unlike the above superficial mismatches, which are easy to spot, metaphysical assumptions used in representational modelling acquire a 'miracle' status in communications because these assumptions are incorporated in representations and are invisible as it were, but come out in communications as if embodied with tangible reality. That is, intangibility of modelling agency acquires tangibility when switched from representations to communications. Typically, space, time, numbers and other axiomatic entities such as unitarity are examples of such invisible reality. They are schematic essence that mind requires in order to represent the world onto our language. They are necessary properties of mind rather than physical objects. They order and describe objects and make sense of them coordinatively with us as the centre of coordinate, thus only in relation to such a centre implicitly or explicitly. It is the recognition of this coordinative centre that collapses probabilities into a reality.

If we create devices of measurements and scales based on our necessary metaphysical assumptions and evaluate objects and events, which are placed in a coordinate of description, then it is the fact of us being the centre of this coordinate that turns out what is called the anthropic

principle. In another word we necessarily describe things coordinatively, unaware that we sit at the centre of this coordinate because our location in this coordinate can only be at the centre as creator of such a coordinate, which manifests itself as the ‘consciousness’ of an observer. We may not be physically at the centre of the universe, but we are at the centre of our observations, which makes us look strangely unique, being as we are. We are merely at the centre of our observations as we created our own measurements and scales. Being astonished with the anthropic principle is the same as being surprised with a world of altered colour with a sunglass on. This ‘consciousness’ of the universe is brought about as probabilities acquire numerical values with us as centre of our measurements.

Thus, the so-called quantum ‘consciousness’ of the universe is merely an alter ego of us being the centre of our own coordinate with our own measurements and scales. This is a philosophical analysis of representations, but translate this in communicative language, then ‘consciousness’ becomes a ‘miracle’ because what is physically baseless in representations, i.e. coordinative assumptions, present themselves as something tangible that gives shapes and colours to our labels. Through ‘consciousness’ objects thus described are not only causally related but become an anthropic relevance. Here metaphysics of representations turns into physics of communications, where what is impossible in representations forces its way in our consciousness as narrative possibilities. This is how we create fictions, fantasies, fairy tales and religions. We are communicating with ourselves by using representational labels. Rationality necessarily requires a part that is strictly speaking supra-rational, i.e. irrational, without which representations are impossible, as much as descriptions are impossible without being coordinative. This make irrationality larger than rationality in the sense that rationality only become descriptively presentable with an addition of metaphysics. That is, underneath rationality necessarily lurks a magic power that brings out a space of fantasies, not unlike the parallel universe out of the rationality of the wave function. Here $(x) > x$ because observables cannot be described by themselves, i.e. without metaphysics of coordinates. Thus, even assuming we are rational and believe only in what we can observe, in our descriptions we need irrationals of metaphysics. We are larger in our descriptions than ourselves as the sum of observables because of this metaphysical need of ours without which we cannot even describe ourselves. It is this ‘>’ of larger us that gives meanings to miracles in religions and magic powers in fairy tales. Without this enlarged us endowed with ‘>’ we would not be able to read a fairy tale like ‘Alice in Wonderland’ or ‘Harry Potter’, which will be inevitably trashed away. In rational descriptions ‘>’ provides us with

coordinate, while in irrational narratives it gives meanings to miracles and magic powers. ' > ' gives rise to frames of descriptions that are often coordinates themselves and stay out of descriptions. In narrative descriptions they frame descriptions as chains of coincidences to create a storyline. This happens when representations and communications are less demarcated as after all we use a same language for both representations and communications. When more skewed towards a rationality ' > ' splits into a frame and coordinative descriptions.

Communicational language is subdoxastic in the sense of providing this necessity of metaphysics for our rational descriptions. This is how we narrate irrational fantasies and fairy tales rationally, and baseless fictions and religions with a cohesive structure. A true doxastic world cannot be communicated to other than one's self and is supra-linguistic, but then it cannot be described even to oneself. So how would we know what it is ? If it is describable, then it borders with 'art' that demands audience for its own sake. A describable doxastic world is therefore not really doxastic, our so-called fictions, fantasies, fairy tales and religions may start with a doxastic world, but as it acquires an audience, with a self-audience to start with, it becomes a modified doxastic world of make-believe, which exacerbates as the audience grows larger, with more elaborate and sophisticated narratives, such as moral, ethical undertones, implicit and explicit, that is more acceptable to larger and larger audience. It is moral undertones that makes Grimm's' and Andersen's acceptable to ever wider audience. Without ' > ' ethics would have no ground. It is metaphysics implicit in descriptions of ethics that brings out (x), which is larger than x. Here ethics is perceived as the foundation of moral codes and would appear as if existing on its own.

Replacing x with a self, this larger self, although identical with a self, is one that has the totality of a self, i.e. a self (body/mind) augmented with a completeness of Socratic daemon, which is not unlike G.E. Moore's intuition. It tells a self the necessity of self-communication in order to fulfil communicational language in the absence of representations. For a little girl crutching a fluffy bunny everywhere she goes, the bunny is not a representation, but her daemon, i.e. her self that communicates and augments with herself, as she is probably too immature neither for representations nor communications. With the bunny she sees herself and, together, they are more complete and more of (x) than x. In a similar way the 'Lady with an Ermine' is more of Cecilia Gallerani with the ermine, which shows her inner-self rather than represents her, than the lady herself alone. A daemon in the Socratic sense is an inner-self and augments a self by self-communication, thus making a fuller depiction of

a self. In Leonardo's allegory the ermine is there with the lady as if it is her soul, which together shows the audience Leonardo's perception of this woman inside out. The lady and the ermine are self-communicating so to speak. Likewise, in any institutional religions praying (as of prayers), singings (as of hymns), chanting (as of psalms), and their likes are essential parts of a religion, giving religions tools of communicational language allowing self-communication of achieving a larger self in these acts.

For the lack of or in absence of representations, as is often the case with religions, communicational language requires a substitute for a label (representative concept), which is a daemon for self-communication. A daemon supra-rationally represents our necessity of communications for merged mind (external as well as internal) and allows to externalize this internal necessity in the guise of an inner-self. The inner-self is not a representation but the necessity for $(x) > x$ and is produced by $>$, which is a metaphysical assumption that a whole is more than the sum of parts, even when there is only one part, because a part so recognized is always larger than the part itself on account of this act of recognition. Both communications and representations can be superficial, and most of us do not have to inquire into philosophical intricacies of representations or require any depth of understanding in order to communicate for day-to-day running of our life. Therefore, our need to search an inner-self is not necessarily on the top list of dairy life. If one finds one's ermine or fluffy bunny, it tends to come from one's need of self-communication in the process of achieving the full potential of communicational language despite the lack of representations.

In our age of science representations are best sought through rigorous processes of establishing coherent conceptual relationships via physical causalities, observational data, equational precisions, mathematical paradigms, etc. However, since not everything can be strictly scientific, this also includes various quasi-and pseudo-sciences as well as value systems, socio-economic theories, historical and religious doctrines, etc. which together produces many labels, good, bad and irrelevant. We liberally use these labels for our superficial communications, which are mostly superfluous and not even successful as we keep arguing without achieving merging minds. Most so-called communications are indeed not much more than gossip talks of fishmongers' wives. Concepts used this way are labels as only if and when we wish to pursue their contents, they then act as pathways to representational meanings. Labels themselves are epistemically pretty meaningless, but pathways must be there for labels' *raison d'être*, points of reference. Where it concerns labels that have no

representational contents, not even any possibilities of pathways, it is self-communication that provides contents as labels then refer to a self for the wholistic fulfilment of a self. This is how Leonardo's ermine or a little girl's fluffy bunny come to have its representation, i.e. one's wholistic self, i.e. an inner-self complimentary to one's self. They are not referring to physical ermine or real bunny. This is the meaning of 'God', 'miracle', 'heaven and hell', 'immortality', etc. For the referenceless 'God' to have a meaning, one needs one's Daemon, not a God-like object. It is our self that wishes to give a meaning to 'God' to form a larger self with its inner-self. Praying, singings, chanting may help the process of finding this inner-self, but the inner-self is already implicit in a self as with $(x) > x$. How it comes out, is a wholistic necessity that once one is aware of one's self, then it always entails a larger self because of this awareness that points to a supra-coordinative self, which is also extra-descriptive. Where a self is not fulfilled by an inner-self, and thus failing to get a purchase onto a larger self, due to mental incapacities or intellectual deficiencies, then generally that produces unhappiness, where x does not materialise as $(x) > x$, and is therefore deprived of the power source of $>$, without which we have no motivations to strive for more than one's biological self.

It can be said of $>$ that it gives a meaning to 'God', produces 'miracles', create 'heaven and hell', makes 'immortality', or, in short, $>$ is what motivates us to seek a happiness, as we know that $>$ is there for our taking as much as $(x) > x$ is intrinsic to x . Here a happiness is not something external for us to find, but something internal for us to create, provided that is what we want. Fictions, fantasies, fairy tales and religions are all made sense by this wholistic power that transcends the sum of parts. Without this $>$ our life will be devoid of illusions, colours and approximations of curves, and is a desolate desert of straight lines and superficial truths of positivists. Communicational language may fail to merge minds, but it is still useful to communicate with an inner-self. In fact, that is a far more important role of this language, because all failed, as is likely, we still have fantasies to hang on, which make us hope where there are no hopes. Daemon and our tool of communication, $>$, are two vital ingredients to go through our life of hell. And who knows, there just might be a parallel universe, a probability of wave function.

3. Philosophy of Imagination

<Construct of described reality >

Mind has a structure that it is unable to see as a wholistic totality. We (mind) cannot talk about us (mind) as if it is a part. Our whole mind is already there as the only receptacle of information including ourselves. An intelligent mind, a slow mind, a defective mind, each in its own way, processes its surroundings and comes up with its own picture as it sees fit for a reaction, but, although it can react, it cannot analytically dissect itself because it is a wholistic totality to come up with a wholistic picture, not a sum of parts that can view each other. Therefore, unlike language, logic, maths, etc. that can be superficially turned into meta-entity so that their base issues can be turned into linguistic problems, which is how mediocre academics deal with issues of underlying difficulty by giving linguistic answers that sound clever, mind has no meta-mind because, then, no communications would be possible within and without. Nevertheless, I extrapolate this invisible structure of mind as mind need to borrow language in order to be functional, in that language unwittingly reveal this structure by folding itself up as tautologies and paradoxes. This happens because some concepts take themselves as their values, which occur as mind is not homogeneously identical with its program (language). Tautologies and paradoxes should be not only meaningless but also incomprehensible as they bear no analytical information. But we play with them, we even enjoy them for torturous pleasures of mind. This is made possible because our mind is essentially multi-layered in order to deal with its tool (language) that is multi-layered, multi-faceted and intrinsically ambiguous so that its master (mind) can perform the function of merger of minds. This is how and why we communicate within and without, but probably with an ultimate failure.

A good example would be ; the number of numbers, if it is a number, cannot be a number of numbers, if it is not a number, then what is supposed to be countable cannot be counted. Here a mind is unwittingly revealing its structure in terms of a paradox/tautology that evolves around subjectivity/objectivity transmuting via language unable to stay one-sided. The same mind would allow us the luxury of fantasies because subjectivity/objectivity becomes even more blurred for meta-language of various kinds. A fantasy for objective mind is a reality for subjective mind. Remove the barrier by transmutation of subjectivity/objectivity inter-alia linguistic loss of identity between objective self and subjective self. This can happen because of $(x) > x$ where there has to be something that transcends subjectivity/objectivity in order to make such a

distinction. Otherwise, subjectivity/objectivity must be obvious by itself. But, of course, there are many examples that reality/fantasy is not obvious. Think of all those notions in maths and physics, such as numbers, constants, space, time, dimensions, singularity, etc. or, say, money in economics and finance, we know not if they are any realities. They are constructs for the sake of explaining away our observations in terms of mathematical structures whose validity is checked by predictability, which is by no means certain, especially given that the uncertainty is the most essential feature of the nature and that any observations are mired in measurement entanglements.

In meta-language of this and that it does not make sense to say that is a fantasy, this is a reality, etc. because the whole language is a device of mind to endorse the base language's capacity to mirror the world. We play this game because we constantly question ourselves to see if our depictions are correct and can be improved upon. The better and more accurate our depictions are, we are better placed, first, to take advantage of the situation for ourselves, e.g. market, second, to enjoy metaphysical satisfaction of knowledge. These are meta-languages constructed out of the base language for the coherence and efficiency of its capacity as tool of our cognition. However, we also have a wholistic space of the base language, which allows subjectivity/objectivity to make sense so that it encompasses spectrum of subjectivity/objectivity. This matters because there are no subjectivity per se or objectivity per se, they are a connected totality of spectrum with a blurred border. Not only there are things that are neither subjective nor objective, but also, we, each and every one of us, are the one who makes the distinction within individual allowances as per time and place. Thus, there may be someone for whom subjectivity and objectivity are blurred totalities, depending who, when and where. Although we normally classify such people as mentally incapacitated, once again in the realm of meta-language it is a metaphysical question of where and how we can draw a line between two conflicting states of cognition. What is a fantasy may be a reality depending on contexts of intelligence, emotion, even psychiatric states.

Wherever in spectrum a line may be drawn between fantasy and reality, this exacerbates when applied to the realm of model/reality paradoxes. In the sense we can only understand and interpret realities (or data) based on models, all of which inevitably use assumptions of metaphysics to start with. Some realities make better sense at the expense of some other realities, while changes in assumptions could produce incoherent overall pictures. Assumptions (or axioms) are metaphysical fantasies in the sense that they are not themselves provable. Only predictable consequences can

recommend one model over another, but since consequences are only partial anyway, the validity of a model always remains open to questions. See how the Newtonian absolute space and time were taken over by the Einsteinian spacetime to result in singularities, and yet the quantum uncertainty, if taken literally, will make physics into phenomenology. We do not yet have a theory of everything that explains everything from the start to the end.

Aside from the above philosophical pontification, it is fair to say reality/fantasy is a wholistic spectrum with blurred borders that shift with the self of subjectivity/objectivity. We imagine something is a reality on the back of objective mind, and a fantasy, on the back of subjective mind. However, objective reality and subjective fantasy change places with subjective reality and objective fantasy if a supra-logical connective is found at the border of subjectivity/objectivity. This is $>$ of $(x) > x$, where subjectivity/objectivity is a spectrum totality that is more than the sum of subjectivity and objectivity. Wherever the border between subjectivity and objectivity is, it can only be a shifting self that moves along a cognitive scale of imagination, without which physics on one hand and fairy tales on the other cannot function. Imagination is as important in physics as it is for fairy tales. In physics it gives rise to a coordinate of descriptions as can be seen in the Newtonian absolute space and time. Here descriptive frameworks are given by necessities of descriptions that are intrinsic to structures of mind as it mirrors the world by language. Structures here are intrinsic ways mind and language relate to each other as paradox/tautology, and the shifting self is positioned at where it is most commutable with other minds in terms of intelligence. That is why Newtonian descriptions look so natural that it took two centuries of ingenious minds to come up with alternatives of spacetime and wave functional probabilities. While here the shifting mind anchored on intelligence to find a right spot on the scale of imagination, fairy tales work on narrative coherence based on sentimental balance. If intelligence is syntactical for the metalanguage of languages that comes up as physics, sentiments are semantical for this metalanguage that presents itself as fairy tales. The former is seen as a skeletal structure by removing semantical contents by the use of variables, thus presenting itself as laws of the nature applicable to all things within a domain, the latter is much more of rich and diverse contents strung together by minimum syntaxes of logical rules. You can write anything as long as they are put together within the paradigm of minimum logic, thus even ignoring laws of the nature. Things can come out of nothing and fly faster than the speed of light. This can also be done in physics at a stretch, given a quantum state, thus making some parts of physics almost a fairy tale, but strictly within

the world of variables bound by rigorous mathematical structures. In a way syntax and semantics can be said to be merging where a paradigm itself is concerned.

Sentiments and intelligence are but two features of mind that wavers in order to balance a psychological health of mind. They seem related in terms of a spectrum totality, in which the increase in one generally correlates to the decrease in the other. That is why intelligence craves for recognition, which is a sentiment of pleasure, although the purer intelligence is, the less it cares for recognition, as intellectual attainments can only be truly recognized in terms of consistency and completeness. Besides, recognition can be self-recognition that is provided by own mind, presumably this is where logic comes in. One can say it is lower ends of intelligence that strive for outside recognitions. Sentiments and intelligence along with other aspects of mind constitute a wholistic totality of mind in which their mixtures continuously vary in proportion to balance diversity and clarity to keep mind well-honed. $(x) > x$ as applied to our mind means this necessity of balance so that our mind is reasonably well-sourced and well-focused within so-called normality, with best-kept usability. You might call it the health of mind ensured bodily and mentally. Here $>$ is an intrinsic aptitude towards (x) that is a healthier and readily usable mind. That is why we enjoy physics as well as fairy tales if healthy. Lopsided intelligence and sentiments generally produce unhealthy mental aptitudes, tending towards psychosis. From Fritz Haber to Newton intelligence over-pursued on one hand and countless cheap and nasty identity politicians of Putin/Xi/Trump type of sentimental nationalism commonly have crippled personality problems. This is where Jekyll and Hyde hide a mad scientist and an ordinary man of uncommon greed.

Imagination and intelligence are complementary and reside in each other. It is maths that makes them appear poles apart as it unusually combines them both to the extent that intelligence constrains concepts to point-like objects of exactitude, which in turn constrain imagination. That is, maths needs both imagination and intelligence and does so under the condition that point-like concepts dictate both imagination and intelligence to their logical consequences, merging parallel and linear processing. It is for this reason that mathematical concepts are often called constructs (see 'Maths, Logic and Language'). Here imagination is crystalized as axioms, postulates and assumptions, and intelligence works out theoretical systematizations. Likewise, it is anthropic consciousness that weaves realities out of a quantum wave so that we do not drift away into the mathematical fantasies of all possible worlds. The physical

concept of a centreless universe that says nothing about everything had to be anthropically turned into a coordinate for human descriptions, so that the anthropic point of centre hones shapeless multiverses into a describable entity.

Imagination has a freer hand when concepts have many facets and layers as is the case with our ordinary language. This is the world of parallel processing where concepts hook each other without rigorous systematizations. They are happy for trials and errors from a passage to a passage and may or may not progress into a more cohesive chapter with the help of intelligence. Here murky concepts solidify into objects of value through connectives of $(x) > x$ (see 'Life, Universe and Everything').

4. 'Miracle'

<The most fundamental construct of religion>

In addressing the subject of a religion this is undoubtedly the most thorny and controversial issue, rationalist or otherwise. If you are someone who accepts a miracle unquestionably as a matter of physical fact at a personal level, then you are not worth listening to because then you are probably deranged to the extent you deny observable worlds of physical sciences and engineering, which are the most important epistemic achievements on which our understandings of this physical universe directly and indirectly depend upon. Any events against laws of observable physics are outside our paradigm of descriptions, which is essentially coordinative. Expanding counter-intuitive events such as nonlocality, entanglement, multiverse, etc. of the quantum world into the realm of everyday occurrences should be philosophically challenged unless we can descriptively show a physical connection between the two paradigmatically different worlds of the certainty and the uncertainty. One is a coordinative world made up with atoms and molecules, the other is a sub-atomic wave world of probabilities. A connection there must be, but the problem is our modes of descriptions are essentially coordinative as per classical physics of Newton and Einstein and cannot in itself handle the non-coordinative uncertainty. We have no maths that can cohesively (coordinatively) represent quantum probabilities. The Hilbert space is more of a cosmetic tinkering for our coordinative understandings than bona fide descriptions of the uncertainty (see 'Life, Universe and Everything'). It is our mathematical inability to describe the connection, not the existence of miracles, that justifies the parallel worlds of Newton-Einstein physics and the quantum physics. I say this just in case someone may wish to quote quantum events as examples of miracles. They look miraculous only because we cannot (yet) really describe them. You cannot deduct a miracle world out of the multiverse. A fantasy and a reality cannot be connected through quantum probabilities. The multiverse is a mathematical fiction out of the Hilbert space that accommodates all probabilities on orthonormality, which describes the uncertainty via complementarity of inner products. However, probabilities acquire non-zero values from the certainty of a coordinative 'centre' without which no numerical values can be gauged, meaning that this convenient space of probabilities is underlain by the coordinative notion of a centre guised as an orthogonal basis. In short, the fundamental uncertainty of the world of wave functions is artificially camouflaged for

the sake of necessities of mathematical interpretations, and is not a true representation per se. No miracles in this sense can be a possible world.

Alternatively, you may be someone who accepts the question of miracle as a matter of religious doctrine and is capable of drawing a line between the commonsensical world of everyday life and a personal world of sentimental fantasy, which emotionally underlies the former but is physically overwhelmed by the former. The relationship between the two is that of body and mind connected by language. There is a base language of data and stimuli biologically, evolutionally and anthropically programed to react in order to maintain bodily functions, and there is an extra-sensory, conceptual language that learns and refines this base language so that we better understand ourselves bodily. In this case the conceptual language can be said to a metalanguage over a sensory language. A miracle exists in this metalanguage as a concept of unreal reality that has a place as a supra-logical connective between body and mind as in the dual world of mind and body we do not know to which language belongs, not unlike asking a computer if it is the physical circuit or the software. This exacerbates if the software creates a meta-software that improves itself, then the relationship between the physical circuit and the meta-software would be an unreal reality seen from the software because it is real between the software and meta-software as there is a traceable evolutionary connection, but unreal because there is no direct connection between the circuit and the meta-software other than occasional improvements on the software that are observable by the meta-software, but not by the software.

However, the circuit would perceive occasional improvements as a miracle because it suddenly finds itself working better or worse in tandem with the software but would not know how and where improvements came from. Likewise, a miracle can be a conceptual improvement over a sensory model of working biological mechanism between mind and body through better conceptual modelling. This is all what modern medicine would appear to medieval witch doctors without any concepts of microbes, nutrition, hygiene, physiology, etc. which are products of our conceptual language. Here we create miracles towards the completeness and consistency of our conceptual language with intricate and more and more precise relationship between concepts, assisted by evolutions of scientific theories and engineering.

If a miracle is a fundamental construct, then it is indescribable seen from our usual modes of description based on metaphysical constructs of coordinates, such as space and time, because any narratives based on a

miracle are descriptively on a par with coordinative descriptions. As much as miracles can dispense with time and space, time and space can equally do away with miracles. A religious construct is paradigmatically different from mathematical or physical constructs. One does not preclude the other because our mind is essentially multi-layered. This is how being a good physicist does not stop him from enjoying good fairy tales. We may think a 'Harry Potter' world is scientifically a joke, but at a level of fundamental constructs it is not easy to say one is nearer to a reality than the other, although one may be better written than the other. After all we know the absolute space and time is a fiction that mathematically breaks down with instantaneous speed and infinite gravity, spacetime fares no better as it eventually ends up in singularity, and wave functional probabilities even deny time. A description of physics describes a reality better only to the extent that we seem to be able to go to the moon, which is a mere nothing considering the scale and depth of the universe, while a well-written fairy tale gives us a better satisfaction. We like physics better as it appears mathematically rigorous, while a fairy tale is arbitrary. However, until we have a consistent and complete theory of everything, there is an element of arbitrariness in physics too. We should not be overjoyed with Newtonian engineering of our moon rockets.

Here I enumerate four types of miracles from a perspective of rationality:

1) Rational descriptions of rational events

Assuming there is a miracle, then it can only be a personal event, and its descriptions are rational as personally observed. A miracle here is real and personal even when there should be more than one observer because there are no needs for communications as well as there are no tools of analytical communications. As soon as a miracle becomes tangible and analysable, i.e. reproducible and predictable, it ceases to be a miracle as such descriptions will replace part of existing physics. If you see an event of miracle, it can only remain a personal experience that it exists, but only for you. Here a miracle is a miracle, but cannot be said any more. It is a world where a miracle per se means nothing even if it is real. To say something exists as seen, can only be communicated to oneself as a mere declaratory confirmation of existence with no meaningful contents. This is the only bona fide miracle, which is a personal declaration of personal experience. The event is rational as no one can meaningfully dispute it, and its descriptions are rational precisely because it is meaningless outside the declaration. It is a solipsistic statement of existence recursive

to the self. No communications or external assertions are needed and expected. Problems may occur only when one tries to schematize this solipsistic world as a view to be shared by other minds. Such a schematization should only be incidentally appreciative because one schematizes what one already knows for internal clarifications. After all, one can have a philosophy that one cares nothing about its readership. This philosophy is valid if it is subjective but universal, i.e. philosophy as an art. The acceptance of a miracle as meaningfully unanalysable personal experience should deter any institutionalizations of religion because it is uncommunicable, or otherwise we should have a physics of miracles, which contradicts all existing models of physics. Here a religion can only be a personal religion not intended to be shared or communicated. There can be no meaningful philosophy of religion as philosophy is essentially conceptual that need to be shared within and without. In short, a miracle as personal experience cannot be a concept. The only way for it to be sharable is to turn it into a working fairy tale, a dynamic narrative of moving parts, which constitutes an internal world that represents a layered and multi-faceted self mirrored onto itself as receptacle of the external world. This self conceptualises the external world for its understandings, and thus has structured concepts, which then free themselves faced with a miracle as no meaningful structure can incorporate a miracle in its structure. Thus, if one accepts a miracle as personal event, then subsequently concepts of the external world made sense for our epistemic conveniences have to reorganise and regroup themselves to accommodate a miracle, thus forming a fairy tale. This fairy tale represents an internal self that is incongruous with itself that represents the external world. This is possible as a self is essentially multi-layered. We can have a rational self as well as an irrational self, both entangled within the wholiticism of $(x) > x$, as the essential multi-layeredness of mind. The only difference is both selves use a same language, which in our days of science largely consists of scientific or quasi-scientific concepts that exclude miracles. However, since a same language is deployed by both selves a fairy tale of self for internal purpose can be incidentally shared within and without and even appreciated by other minds. There can be no meaningful religions without miracles, which serve internal house-keepings for the sake of personal experience. Here whether a miracle is real or not is irrelevant because a personal event makes no sense as it cannot be conceptualised.

A miracle within the spectrum of observabilities that are coordinatively measurable belong to the domain of science, whereas non-coordinative elements of a coordinate can only be discussed philosophically, not religiously. The former, if so analysable, then ceases to be a miracle as it

should be describable coordinatively. However, as we do not yet have any consistent and complete theory of everything, there may be events/states that are not yet scientifically describable, they are nevertheless not to be admitted as observed/observable class of events/states that exist extra-physically. If they are not coordinatively locatable with no numerically assignable values, then they should be treated as fictions, especially if they involve any elements of known observabilities. On the other hand, if they relate to mathematical tools of observabilities, then they are mathematical fictions pending schematization, the meaning of which is first and foremost logical, and then practical usability. Some of quantum mechanical states are of this nature. The parametric elements of a coordinate are descriptive tools of analysability and are epistemic subject matters, nothing to do with miracles.

2) Irrational descriptions of irrational events

There may be an event that is a coincidence, and there may be many events that are coincidences, here a miracle appears centred around a self that groups together coincidences as uncanny. This happens because this self is basing itself as the centre of events from which unlikely probabilities, put together, seem to point to this self as probabilities are consequences of the consciousness. Here a miracle is a 'miracle' that the consciousness creates out of its perceptions of probabilities which would not exist without a conscious self that adds up unlikely probabilities. Each event is real, but the consciousness works out a probability only in relation to itself as a centre of events, thus substituting an event with an unlikely probability. Add up many such unlikely probabilities they would look a miracle, hence a 'miracle', a creation of mind, turning a real event into a 'miracle'. This may appear as the diametric opposite of 1). However, the difference is events in 1) are real but non-communicative, those here are fictitious but communicative, as probabilities are coordinative. Personal realities and communicative fictions are connected by a self, which is, on one hand, phenomenological and non-coordinative, on the other, coordinative centred on a centre. The former is the consciousness per se, the latter is the descriptive consciousness, and their relationship is ontologico-notational. 1) and 2) have an interesting connection in that subjective reality and objective fiction are both centred on the self that transmutes between non-coordinative dynamism and coordinative mechanism, and its connective is paradox/tautology that is mutually implicative. This is how we fictionalize/realize a religion of miracle/'miracle'. It is the objective and subjective self that transmutes into each other on the back of common language they are embedded in.

Here paradox/tautology connects the fictitious religion of miracle and the real religion of 'miracle' and breathes life into a fairy tale, making it a true religion, a personal religion. You can create your own religion by finding a fairy tale of miracle/'miracle', by turning a miracle into a 'miracle', and a 'miracle' into a miracle.

3) Rational descriptions of irrational events

This is a world of metaphysical constructs, which one can call 'miracle' in the sense what cannot be seen somehow describe themselves. Logico-mathematical models are exemplary cases. Events here are numerical representations of physical events, which are then logico-mathematically operable in terms of operators/connectives. Events are irrational because numerations are not called for by physical events themselves. We assign numerical values primarily for ourselves so that we can model/understand the physical world for our uses and to our advantages. However, operators/connectives are rational to the extent that resultant numerical outputs are empirically connected to the physical world in the sense they are usefully predictive. Seemingly a priori knowledge of metaphysical constructs coming out of seemingly non-physical entities applied to physical events allows us our sciences and engineering. This interesting affair is natural, not a 'miracle', if we assign an idealistic status to human mind. Here it is our prerogative and privilege to describe and understand the world as it is because we are God-like master of the universe. But, then why not are our maths and physics complete and consistent? Why is it such a struggle to go to a mere scratch beyond the surface of our planet, still by means of chemical propulsion? We do not have any special status like God. What we learnt from our language of maths and sciences is approximations. Our sciences and engineering are based on our maths that is the art/science of approximations based on ∞ density of real numbers. Its validity has an applicable scope and domain that allow us a degree of engineering, by which we can explore the solar system and send manned-missions to the moon, Mars, etc. However, ultimately approximations at our disposal are human approximations and may fail to fully describe the universe as is already the case with quantum probabilities and uncertainty. Our descriptions and understanding are essentially coordinative, and our approximations are coordinative approximations, which may not fit for purposes where things are essentially non-coordinative. There are too many fingers crossed in our pursuits of so-called sciences, thinking our maths is the language of the universe. To assume every event is coordinative is irrational, but we rationally deploy the only means available for our descriptions, that is necessarily coordinative. After rationally accepting the human

inevitability that whatever we describe is necessarily coordinative approximations, we are then dealt with the double whammy of metaphysical constraints needed for schematizations, giving rise to various theories of physics, etc. Here we are performing a ‘miracle’ of human descriptions.

4) Irrational descriptions of rational events

An observable event within the paradigm of coordinative descriptions but defies any known laws of physics is a rational event in the sense of personal empiricity that cannot be meaningfully communicated. Any attempts to go beyond declaratory statements fail to make sense as we have no acceptable theories of science to explain this event. Nevertheless, what is real only to personal senses becomes describable by means of a ‘self’ that assigns a probability, making a superficial statement with no meaningful contents into a numerical statement of an observer. The fact that there are no known physics to describe an observed event is itself an event worth exploring in many aspects, psychology, probability, etc. leading onto an unestablished quasi-physics as after all it is a personal experience like Newton’s apple that kick-starts theoretical investigations. Here the event is a miracle if no valid theory emerges, a ‘miracle’ if substantiated by something logical, meaning it worth constituting an assumption leading to some consequence. Whatever that can be an assumption is onto a rational process, making up descriptions, which then become rational if well-schematized, irrational whilst during on the process of schematization. Since we have no actually complete and consistent theory of everything, even in maths, all our so-called observable events are rational but irrationally described in the sense that such descriptions are essentially incomplete. These rational events are hypothesized along the line of metaphysical constructs such as Newtonian absolute time and space, Einsteinian spacetime and quantum probabilities that constitute a spectrum of events in which there are workable theories within defined domains with their predictabilities, but we have no theory that can define the spectrum itself. Here a same event can be Newtonian as well as Einsteinian, even quantum mechanical at a push, which is strictly speaking irrational. Events outside this spectrum of hypotheticality are ‘miracles’ in the sense that they are something, but we have no theories to analyse or make predictions. They are events that are sequentially correlated (like Newtonian-Einsteinian-QM) to events of known physical laws and probably not miracles of supernatural. There should be workable physics to deal with them if we are clever enough one day.

Of the miracles of 1) - 4) it is 1) and 2) that concerns religions and may have potentials to form an interesting philosophy of religion. Let us assume there are events that can be labelled as miracles, as a tangible event or as a probability. A tangible event that cannot be communicated as purely personal experience, in being so described, is assigned a probability seen from anyone hearing so because then it acquires a centre of coordinate that is someone so hearing who either believe, half-believe or little-believe that person. The probability wavers between 1 and 0, but can never be 1 or 0 because there are ultimately no proof to be completely true or false on the account of mismatched experiences, between one of a direct experience and the other of a judgemental experience taking account of assessments and scientific likelihoods. Thus, either way this event of 'miracle' is entitled to be a hypothesis from which logical consequences are entailed. The schema of logical consequences relies on axioms, which are endorsed with their validity by tautology/paradox in the absence of God or Man as agent of God. Without God or Godlike authority such axioms cannot have any semantic contents and are merely representations of structures that make sense, which are coordinative in human epistemic sense.

We make sense by gauging epistemic relevancies of a hypothesis from a centre of coordinate that is our self, and relevancies are measured by space and time, spacetime or probabilities in sciences. However, in case of a miracle as hypothesis, these numerical axes do not apply because instead of metaphysical constructs of space and time, etc. a miracle is either incommunicable or transmutative with a 'miracle'. Either way a miracle make sense only in the coordinate of the consciousness where relevancies are measured in the strength of the centre in its relation to the coordinate or well-formedness of structure instead of space and time, etc. as without numerical axes a coordinate can only be identical with a centre or its own quasi-centre like structure. Thus, a personal experience matters in its dominance over the consciousness if it is so overriding that it excludes everything else. Here a martyr is born, the logic of illogic. Or to a lesser extent it mimics the whole consciousness by coordinating itself by narrating its experience into a fairy tale in which it dynamically interacts between imagination of reality and reality of imagination, the illogic of logic, where semantic nonsense is made sense by logical storyline of the narrative. Here your real life should interact with your imaginary life by incorporating a fairy tale as essential part of your real life without disturbing reality of your real life.

We have the anthropic principle that endorses the necessity of the consciousness in physical theory of probabilities. A wave function

collapse that turns infinite probabilities into an incident of observational values of reality is to give a coordinative founding to something essentially non-coordinative so that possible worlds become an incidentally real world centred on a coordinate with a centre. The so-called 'observer' forms a centre as the centre. Given a centre, a probability becomes a coordinative measurement from this centre. An 'observer' is the consciousness of a self as the centre from which he measures. This is how a probability acquires a numerical value. It is a 'centre' that makes a 'coincidence' a 'probability'. The consciousness of a universe as proposed by the anthropic principle, more in the sense of Wheeler's participatory universe than Wigner's observer's observer ad infinitum universe, is basically the same as a coordinative describability. The universe of the uncertainty may be really non-coordinative, but for us humans it only makes sense coordinatively. Likewise, a miracle may be really incommunicable, but turned into a 'miracle' it can be coordinated into a fairy tale, which makes sense even if the miracle does not. Where a miracle does not have any descriptive power, turned into a fairy tale it has a narrative power as part of our consciousness. Not only that it even has a probabilistic sense, being coordinative, with a centre that turns a coincidence into a probability, ranging from near 1 for a little girl to near 0 for a scientifically minded grown-up, which, combined with entertainment value, can be just powerful enough to create a spectrum with less and less distance between imagination and reality. When we are in a dream, the dream is a reality, while when we are in a so-called reality, we yearn to escape in a dream. In the sense that the so-called reality is a human reality of our creation of mixtures of our values and their dynamic evolutions, mostly for socio-economic gains and losses. One realises there is not much difference between the reality of dream and the dream of reality, one with the supra-coordinative space of neurons and electrical pulses, jumping across sequential queues of spatio-temporal orders, the other with pseudo-coordinative space of metaphysical constraints socially agreed to observe. On the other hand, space and time in physics are basically mathematical conventions of descriptions essentially pertaining to our coordinative necessity. First our maths may not be the language of the universe, second as we get older and thus dreams and reality having thinner and thinner boundary due to the deterioration of cognitive capacity and less of remaining credit in reality, dreams starts acquiring more of the quality of reality, and reality, more of the quality of dreams. This exacerbates to the final hour, at which, Hurrah, dream and reality come to face and face. Whether you start with the scientific scrutiny of real reality, or with the arty fantasy of imaginary fiction, we all biologically end up with hallucinatory reality of nothingness. In one way or the other there is a certain philosophical

satisfaction to know our sad end. This is a work to guide you to this easier option.

Given the above argument, and accepting some truth in the anthropic principle as with many physicists who cannot help empathising with this view in their failure to disprove otherwise, I assume the consciousness of the universe as human essential necessity of coordinative descriptions, in which I am the observer as a centre of my coordinate. It is not that the existence of the universe depends upon human consciousness as per the narrow interpretation of the anthropic principle, but that the universe has an essential capacity of being coordinative in its structure (hence starting with the 'big bang' as a coordinative centre ?!), whereas human consciousness is our essential necessity of being coordinative in our descriptions through our tools of approximations. What makes my coordinative descriptions meaningfully similar to other coordinative descriptions is our shared language that brings out communicational sense to all coordinates. This is further enhanced if human coordinates intrinsically share the structural essence of the universe in the sense that all coordinates are self-centred with the observer at their centre, making them sharable, assuming that the 'self', the 'centre' and the 'observer' are an internal triangulation of meaning referring to the ontologico-notational formation of self-referential system of coordinates that have a common logical structure, and thus sharable. Maths is often said to be the language of the universe. Human maths has human limitations especially with regard to infinities and the transcendentals, making it only approximately the quasi-language of the universe, but still revealing communal logicity. This is where my fairy tale can have a communicative value within and without. As with the anthropic principle of physics with a tinge of fantasies, but nevertheless with appealing elements of truth, a narrative storyline of fairy tale too can reveal elements of truth spanning across human coordinative descriptions and maybe the universe.

It is the consciousness of the universe and human consciousness as a centre of respective coordinate that have a communal meaning as we can only model the universe through our descriptions. Here the consciousness is neither psychological nor cognitive faculty but a descriptive necessity of being coordinative to make sense of itself within and without. The participatory universe is not that we give rise to the universe through the wave function collapse but that we participate in the universe through being a coordinative centre that allows the observer to realize being the centre of his coordinate is the same as being the centre of his model universe. It is the coordinative relevancies of the centre that describe the self within and without. This is poetically expressed by 'Brahman

≡ Atman' by the philosophers of the Upanishads. Here it is being the centre, the self and the observer that coordinate descriptions of one's universe, which is also the universe, through $(x) > x$ that is a coordinative totality of 'Brahman ≡ Atman'.

The totality of 'Brahman ≡ Atman' incorporates a wholeness that is larger than the sum of parts and empowers parts to form this wholeness, in the sense that Atman (part) becomes Brahman (whole) through its coordinative relevancies as centre of its knowledge, much in the same sense that a whole coordinate make sense within and without through descriptions of its centre in relation to any positions describable by their relations to the centre. Here a centre is part of the coordinate, and yet it is descriptively identical with the coordinate itself. It is descriptive relevancies that are power of parts to form a wholeness larger than their sum. This power to form a totality larger than its parts can be said a miracle as it is invisible to any parts, nor to the wholeness itself, and yet it is intrinsic to our descriptions as such.

Given a narrative of fairy tale one finds a wholeness pertaining to the fairy tale not in the storyline but in its combined totality of the fiction and its readership reality. We may ridicule works of fiction as irrelevant to reality and fail to appreciate its coordinative significance. The so-called reality is human fictions. Even the physical reality in space and time is described differently depending upon metaphysical constraints of descriptive paradigms such as Newtonian, Einsteinian or QM, which respectively make up 3 different descriptions of presumably an identical phenomenological reality that underlines respective physics. Let alone physical reality, which we as yet know of no cohesively definitive descriptive framework, human reality is made up with values, labels, names and perceptions that together conjure random images, one of which is consensually picked up as a quasi-reality sometimes inviting obvious contradictions. It is thus that a war is called upon by a Nazi thug calling for denazification of a peaceful sovereign neighbour (Putin's War). In physics the three different descriptions are parts of a same spectrum, whereas human reality can result in diametrically opposite interpretations of a same situation, turning a reality into a fiction, a dream into an actual, a nominal into a substantial, a news into a fake news, etc. and vice versa. In short human reality has infinite facets with no border with a fiction, in contrast with physical reality with spectrum-bound describability. Change a small part of a parameter a human reality can acquire a radically different hue. This is how we enjoy fictions and arts in general. Fictions are part of human reality as all possible worlds, we happen to choose one fiction as a reality for a convenience of social unity,

communications and sometimes personal gain. Thus, an identical scenario can be painted with a hostile or friendly colour. The constituents of human reality are so fluid, flexible and contentless that easily transmute into each other depending upon perspectives, individually (despotically) or collectively ('democratically'). This aspect of human reality, when philosophically treated, invite endless and meaningless 'discussions' and come up with no conclusions or consequences. Ethics, aesthetics, various philosophies of socio-economic nature are more arts of discourses and eloquences and generally waste of time, assuming we know any better ways of using our time.

Human reality thus has a totality similar to all possible worlds as it is capable of changing its shapes and colours continuously and flexibly not only from one perspective but also from multi-perspectives. Its coordinative whole consists not of physical measurements but of dynamically interchanging and metamorphosing values, labels, names and perceptions of communicative multi-selves. Nevertheless, it is coordinative because the self is positioned as the centre of relevancies from which observational perspectives arise for the preservation and ultimate self-interests of the self, which is intrinsically communicative as the self is not only of himself but also of mutually dependent selves, i.e. social selves, making it ultimately identical for all selves. We live and survive as part of a collective whole, not unlike bees and ants. That is, a human self is the self of interdependency, making all selves existentially identical. Fictions, chosen realities, memories all internally conspire towards a wholeness that is larger than the sum of parts and gives rise to changing pictures of human reality that should be (but not necessarily) consistent with our survival as perspectives are not always consistent due to time lags, false evolutions and multiple selves. We do not have time to play with hindsight. Human reality is not a collection of temporal and spatial incidents as physically perceived but a descriptive whole in which concepts organically intercede each other to come up with meaningfulness of life. This could be something universal, tangible or delusionary. Each and every one of us interacts with one another so that there will be a net total that bears a result but only with time lags. The meaning of life, individually and eventually for our species does not match up with physical reality as concepts lag behind cognitions. It is not reality that matters, but how it is described that brings out meaning for us. In the process even being fake, fictitious or hallucinatory contribute towards a net result through interactions. They are all empowered so as to be part of a whole that comes out as a final meaning.

Even ‘miracles’ that would be written off as derisory by anyone other than the ‘observer’ affects this net total meaning of life individually and collectively. To start with, a ‘miracle’ is a miracle only for a convinced observer, for whom it stays a fact of declaration but without any communicative contents (e.g. science/engineering), and its unlikely probability can have a more and more concentrated probability if combined with other unlikely events of weak probability. That is, while probability per se remains the same, the ‘centre’ from which probabilities are measured increases its descriptive relevancies and acts as oscillator. Otherwise a ‘miracle’ become a narrative storyline that embraces its readers as psyche of human minds. Both the observer and the psyche can propagate their convictions in the form of communications like books, social media and even fake news, which affects the beholder within and without. Within, he is more empowered maybe falsely but stronger nonetheless, without, the society is multi-connected individuals and can be more influenced by individuals of stronger convictions and celebrities. Multiply these individuals by hundreds and thousands, then we have a society where ‘miracles’ and miracles do play a role, which is the case historically where religions, minor or major, not only influenced but sometimes catastrophically decided the fate of a whole society with unpragmatic, inflexible and sacrificial doctrines (e.g. Inca, Maya, etc.), not to mention fanaticism at play in any institutional religions at confluence with politics (remember poor Giordano Bruno, Galileo was lucky only with Medici patronage). To the extent miracles and ‘miracles’ create personalities of influence (i.e. charisma) through strength of conviction rightly or wrongly (but mostly wrongly), they have a place in our history, culture and collective memory.

In our society being honest, intelligent and good do not help much in power structures that finds subservience a most useful commodity. If a hardworking sincere fellow, you are more likely a civil servant than a politician. In our day of social media those in power are just about clever enough not to reveal too much about their private belief system for fear of being taken hostage of or taken advantage of (unless doing so actually bring out more benefits than losses in terms of identity politics), but with or without religions people have beliefs that are often dogmatic and irrational in the sense they are more deductive and hypothetical in nature than inductive. The power of a miracle or a ‘miracle’ is thus the empowerment of personalities through conviction, faulty or not. In this sense both miracle and ‘miracle’ have a power to strengthen relevant personalities. A miracle directly strengthens the observer, while a ‘miracle’ indirectly strengthens believers through psyche of fellowship. Either way so-called charismatic personalities are thus born, to lead than

to be led. They will directly and indirectly influence your social psyche and collective memory even without uttering a word about their miracle or 'miracle'. In fact, many men of influence are odd characters in the ordinary sense of the word, from politics to science. I will not bother to enumerate, but among top echelon of science and art are disproportionate number of autistic, depressive and even schizophrenic personalities as well as being generally of unsocial traits. I do not know nor am I interested to guess belief systems of those individuals. But, intelligence and creativity tend to go hand in hand with being un- or anti-institutional.

As with Gödel's ontological proof the description of a reality is so easily metamorphosed into the imaginability of a possible world where a linguistic reality wears the hat of a physical reality. The description of rationality and the metaphysical paradigm of irrationality go hand in hand to form our world of description. The miracle of Gödel's incompleteness appears to stand on its feet until one remembers Gödel is a madman who starved himself to death. His intelligence did not reach his friend Einstein's that did not allow him to go yonder of quantum insanity. But, then we do not yet know if the universe plays a dice or not. It is here the question of a miracle and 'miracle' rests.

5. Institutions and their In-built Incompetency

<Unifying force unravelled>

Sartre, never a rich man, dignifiedly refused his Nobel Prize on account of his abhorrence of an institution, in contrast to some multi-millionaire pop singer who made a great show (a hazard of popularization) of reluctantly accepting the prize. I here dig a little further in this. Sartre was an existentialist and therefore sees his 'reality' way above a mere description. An institution, especially to become an institution, is to be a label, i.e. representative concept, which denies his fundamental freedom of existence to be anything as he wishes. It restrains one to be within the confine of a label, if not by a will and choice, then by the strength of a label itself. Once you brand yourself, then you make use of the brand as much as the brand is strengthened by you, that is, the brand also uses you. You make yourself a 'Chopin', then it is easier to sell yourself as Chopin the piano composer of melancholy cantabile, that frames yourself and bonds your genius. All his compositions bar one are piano-based by choice. Who knows what would have made him with violin or with full orchestra? He might have created an interesting symphonic style. So, you are a genius of a certain type. Most minor composers of some fame are of this type, except Beethoven, whose genius was so out of the box and at the same time versatile that he did not have to stereotype himself. Likewise, despite his protestation Sartre was no other than an existentialist and a psyche of movements of his age and place, so in the end his label got him with or without the Nobel Prize, of which he would have been too clever not to know that his refusal would make him even more of an institution (but with a style, compared with those flabbergasted with tears of joy). He did not see beyond his rather narrow label, as much as Chopin did not see his potentials beyond piano. In contrast see how Michelangelo the sculptor unexpectedly found himself a master painter of utmost calibre that astonished Goethe (Italian Journey), proving there can be a wider world beyond a narrow label. Sartre, of course, could have taken his prize and gold medal and given it away for his cause like Luigi Pirandello. In the end his Marxist lost to his vanity of added fame by pretence. In the tail end of philosophes Sartre is a half-actor with his smouldering pipe and endless glasses of whatever is nearby. A pity, because our life so short, and the world so interestingly varied. What is the point of an existentialist who cannot see beyond the world of stuporous existentialism like an overgrown student? Surely the point of human existence is to be free of any labels and to unravel himself to any potentials regardless of success or failure with clearest possible mind. It appears Sartre's *être-pour-soi* failed him by his own labeled

existentialism. Once you label yourself the label makes you as much as presumed être-en-soi of Marxism need not be a human label of ism because Marxism, if correct, would have material laws on its side and should bring about its necessity and direction upon us regardless. It should govern us like laws of nature. Sartre thrives on both labels of being an existentialist and Marxist and poses like an actor, but then the labels also define him and make him less of an existentialist. He is supposed to be a free agent indefinable by the material and human world that surrounds him and yet surpasses the both worlds by being aware of his freedom to be anything as he chooses. The labelled existentialism is a contradiction that slaves you to a label and even forms a paradox because so long as we are our languages we cannot help labelling ourselves. The existentialist of the labelled existentialism is thus also the Absurd, like an atheist turning atheism into a religion.

Être-pour-soi and être-en-soi are Sartre's constructs for his narrative of human existence. The two concepts are supposedly on par and in contrast, with their interplays modus vivendi of human self-consciousness that makes incomplete human existence different from and superior to complete inanimate existences. This is a typically defective human arguments in that conclusions are implicit in the hypotheses. Sartre presents être-en-soi like an angler poised for a good catch. It is complete because it is so self-defining with its lack of self-consciousness, that gives it the appearance of infused with the essence, whatever it is, while être-pour-soi with its self-consciousness is necessarily incomplete, because we can only make it complete by disconnecting us from consciousness or filling our mind with conceptual representations, which are labels created by our socio-economic value systems or scientific endeavours with metaphysical voids. That is, être-pour-soi achieves the complete, definable essence by either mental disconnection or tautological fictions or pseudo-science. Besides, être-en-soi can only be derived from être-pour-soi through consciousness, following empiricist line of thinking, without which its existence has no epistemic foundation (besides how do we really know a tree is not conscious of being a tree ?). To extrapolate être-en-soi without être-pour-soi is philosophically juvenile because être-en-soi is a tool to make a case for être-pour-soi in its strive for self-fulfilment. You want to create a good argument, so you create a tool for it from presumed arguments, whereas a good philosophy is the other way around, in that a tool should only be an illustration to highlight your arguments. Even we accept être-en-soi as a fait accompli, our self-consciousness can only be bent about with identities borrowed from sources that we tautologically set upon by ourselves. All identities are socio-economic labels (such as Marxist, liberalist, capitalist, etc.) we self-

gratifyingly experiment for our more or less material existence, except labels of pseudo-scientific origins (such as dualist, materialist, Darwinian evolutionist, anthropic supremacist, etc.). Even then they are incomplete by necessities of description, in that there are always assumptions that have to be taken for granted.

I, on the other hand, hold against any ism and ist. We may or may not be an existentialistic reality of some sort that may or may not transcend a material object. However, once out of reaches of sensory experiences, in time and in space, we are our languages. Regardless of our sensory realities, the reality of time will leave us, if lucky, with the legacy of a set of descriptions, which in our digital days, may be accompanied by recorded images. A set of descriptions is best preserved neutral without being coloured by labels of ism and ist, which are unsubstantiated judgements. I know no 'Sartre' of physical substance. To me he is his ideas as described by him and others, rightly or wrongly, skilfully or amateurishly, alongside some biographical details. This will exacerbate as time goes by. If we have 100 Sartres and Sartre-likes, each Sartre has less descriptions, as we can only cope with a limited amount of information. We are no less and no more than our descriptions. We are as we describe and are described within and beyond our lifetime. We are our descriptions, and the core of our descriptions is our metaphysics that lends us our tools of coordinative descriptions. To think we are more than our descriptions falls down on our inability to prove otherwise, which have to be descriptions to be shared and understood by multiple selves of us, within and without. If there is something that is more than sets of descriptions, say, our mind and soul, God, etc., then it can only be this metaphysics that is the base of our descriptions. It is something that complements x to make it (x) , an organic whole that is larger than the sum of its parts. Some physicists call it the consciousness of the universe, the observer of observers, the intelligent universe, etc., and in my vocabulary in this narrative, a daemon, whatever the name is, it is something that is an extra bit to make a self into a describable self. This inner-self orientates a self with a coordinate to locate itself and measure its relevance in spacetime, probabilities or values in terms of a 'centre'. Unlike Sartre and his institution there is no needs to make a narrative claim for or against anything other than one's self, which, if describable, will show itself up in coherent descriptions intrinsically based on self-description.

The aforementioned metaphysics is not theories, doctrines or beliefs, it is rather what makes descriptions in the widest possible sense meaningful, sharable and understandable, but which cannot be itself in

any descriptions. A tool of descriptions (language) cannot become an object of descriptions (concepts) as much as (x) cannot be part of x, because once you recognize an organic whole larger than the sum of its parts, it can only be represented by the totality of language, more like coordinative orientation. Physics, after centuries of endeavours for deeper and wider spectrum of descriptions, rightly or wrongly, is reduced into the anthropic principle, as we realize no matter how a science may wish to be a detached study of so-called realities, it can only be human descriptions secured by human consciousness of the outer world, with human involvements in measurements. Some physicists detest such a view but cannot rebut it. After all maths that is the language of physics is human maths with the in-built paradox of never being able to prove if it is the language of the universe, because a language cannot detach itself and describe itself as if observed from the outside, while meta-language is all to do with a linguistic community. Likewise, a daemon is what makes a self describable by coordinative orientation. It makes a self descriptively complete by giving rise to coordinative relevance. A daemon is an inner-self from which a self can have its perspective, like a 'centre' from which numbers relate to each other or probabilities acquire numerical values. This is how we describe ourselves in terms of when, where, who, what and how. A daemon is thus a viewpoint with coordinative explanatory power, and finding a daemon is the same as recognizing one's position from which to view the world. If the world is the 4-D world, then a daemon is a supra-physical dimension that allows us physical perspectives.

Not only religious institutions but also institutions in general, they are fundamentally tainted by human necessities, of ego, of biological needs, of social vectors of money, power and sex. Needless to say, an entity called 'institution' is a fiction as much as individual constituents only form a group under a pseudo-identity as a matter of convenience, which is underpinned by socio-economic benefits. There are no essentially natural institutions since socio-economic benefits do not accrue out of nothing. They are created by humans and for humans. Identity and socio-economic benefits interplay to give rise to vectors that can be visualised, quantified and manipulated. An institution that is most natural is a genetically bonded institution, such as a family, a blood relation, etc. and is a most trustable core of any institutions, especially where laws are weak. Legal frameworks, if well-established and strong by tradition and social psyche, can mitigate necessities of biological bonds. This is an important advantage of a so-called advanced society, where the society can be organized without cumbersome blood connections and is more efficient in terms of cross-institutional organizations as they can trust

each other within the paradigm of a legality, not needing winks and nods of biological networks. Still at deeper ends of any societies, advanced or otherwise, natural bonds play unfair and dirty roles through nepotisms, patronages and back-scratchings. Just think of so-called 'establishment', 'old school tie', etc., and at the upper echelon of any establishments, there tend to be blood connections going over generations, creating politics as family businesses, banking as family businesses, even senior militaries as family business, etc.

Aside from these unsavoury connections played in institutions, we have questions of 'identity' as group creator and socio-economic benefits entitlement. Individuals share a group identity ultimately on the expectations of socio-economic benefits. There are not only layers of identity as a group needs a structure in order to be efficient, more or less in proportion to levels of benefits, but also multiple-identities reflecting complicated nature of mind, where it is not impossible to have contradicting identities. Thus, an individual may have e.g. Level 1 identity A + Level 3 identity B + Level 5 identity C, of which the predominance depends on the level and sustainability of each benefit, relationship of benefits as well as psyche, circumstances and comfort level of the individual concerned. These layers and multiple nature of identities make institutions complicated not only internally but also externally. This essentially dynamic nature of an institution makes it analytically incoherent. It is thus that a same institution looks different from a different angle. Typically, a heroic army of a nationalistic nation would be a savage foe consisting of uneducated peasant soldiers, while it is an august institution seen internally. A soldier may see himself as member of this august institution, but a senior officer may see him as not more than obedient animal, and for a subaltern he is a tool for promotion and advancement. The more complicated identities are, the more brittle the institution is. On the other hand, an institution is also liable to labelling, which it makes use of to promote itself, and that tends to lead onto unfounded labels. Noteworthy example would be recent British PM with Oxford badge. Oxford of olden days with no competitors except Cambridge naturally ended up with good many famous names because almost everyone is either Oxford or Cambridge in those days. It was also Oxford or Cambridge of the world considering its imperial legacy. The label of Oxford thus acquires an enviable prestige and privileges. An Oxford degree makes sure you have a reasonable job and income. However, today there are many competitors not only internally but also externally. You end up at Oxford almost accidentally as there are equally good many students at equally good places of learning domestic and abroad. Oxford, however, retains its glorious label that makes its

mediocre students minor celebrities of provincial towns. So, we have PM this and that who, being stupid enough to be tempted to become politicians, cannot be intellectual or intelligent. But the populace gives them benefits of doubts, thinking he/she cannot be that stupid, given their Oxford pedigree. Thus, a mediocre with Oxford badge think of himself unjustly superior, and the society at large goes along with it. We have a long line of recent Oxford PMs, Blair with his illegal war and parliamentary lies (WMD), architect of populist devolutions that promise to undo centuries' political, economic and social evolutions in return for cheap and easy voting popularity, Cameron who was devious enough with failed Brexit referendum and his sudden exit from politics like a dog with a tail between its legs leaving all his problems for the nation to deal with, not to mention his dubious Greensill (bankrupt hedge fund) connection and over-enthused Chinese promotions some of which had to be blocked by US (e.g. Huawei proposal to build new UK telecoms infrastructure). Then comes opportunistic May who promises everything and blatantly achieving nothing. People thought of May as the most incompetent PM ever, and then pops up Johnson who turned out to be a blasé comedian as well as being more incompetent not only in deeds but also in posture, treating his office like a truant schoolboy, lying, partying, showing keen appetites for expensive free holidays and even begging for Downing Street curtains. Now what a surprise, we have yet another Oxford badge (Truss) who managed to unleash a financial mayhem within days of taking the office by unasked-for unfunded tax cuts (especially for the riches), which was since retracted, at the time of astronomical deficits, inviting another bout of inflationary QE and waves of mortgage repricing. Someone with blindingly stupid inflationary ideas ('a noble aim' according to the diplomatic language of her successor Sunak (another Oxford PM with PPE, driven to prove himself, being the first PM of an ethnic origin (but without any charisma qualities as seen in Election Day betting scandal by his inner-circle operatives))), at the time of historic inflation, showing little knowledge of political economy and crafts of power brokerages. The market reaction to huge tax cuts funded by borrowing when the deficit was already sky-high, without any soundings, was a shocking lack of A-level economics that questions any credibility of financial managements. A bad is followed by a worse, is trailed by the worst, is succeeded by the most incompetent of the worst, this is a magic of Oxford legacy. That all these fellows come from Oxford is more than a coincidence and is a hazard of a label that fools its owners and endowers by affording undue confidence as well as ill-placed identity centred on a name that is becoming more and more meaningless. Oxford may still have one or two brilliant students, but most are as mediocre as any other places of leaning. When a label based on a few is overused by

many non-descriptors, then this label is a social toy that is the backside of an identity that turns social ignorance into socio-economic benefits. An institutional label often has such a backside and is willingly utilized by the institution and exploited by untalented social climbers. With a few more terrible PM from Oxford this hazard of institutional labelling and the national psyche of celebrities may start seeing better days. The town of dreamy spires will be known as a nest of self-important opportunists who have unfair expectations and accesses to higher offices, academic posts and prestige on the back of the glory of a name bestowed on a brilliant few of the past. It proves that ‘the best university in the world’ label means nothing if its showpiece products (PM) are as bad as these. They should be despised. Following the legacy of Churchill (born aristocratic, and not intellectually disposed (Oxford related only geographically), but turned out to be a charismatic leader (a product of time)) who made full uses of unfair advantages, connections, money and privileges unavailable to the ordinary public, the Oxford name is, in a smaller way, a licence for unearned privileges inherited and bestowed through the culture of celebrities, an anti-intellectual weakness of categorical bundling, which, if analysed, shows a lazy mind resting on status quos of uneducated social impetuses. Our Oxford and Cambridge have many cousins across many nations. These institutional legacies are social malaises that lead to unfairness’s, which eventually accumulate enough to trigger bigger social downfalls. With all those incompetent PMs UK is a good example of once excellent nation going to pieces (with Blairish devolutions literally) with cheap and pandering populist social cultures. The steady decline of UK is underwritten by politicians with a small brain, a big mouth, above all an Oxford badge, together with contemptuous and greedy mind. There are many cousins of similar traits across the world, ensuring steady erosions of the democracy.

Intelligence and intellect are two different things. There is intelligence without intellect, such as daring ingenious criminality or unscrupulous business acumen. There is also intellect without intelligence, such as fondness for a label like ‘Oxford, the best university’ or tendency for grovelling to power. Intelligence without intellect is opportunistic, whereas intellect without intelligence is insubstantial. As it happens both intelligence and intellect tend to come baked halfway, infused with imagination of reality and reality of imagination. The empty part of intelligence and intellect augments itself by unsupported fantasies and together they create totalities that are filled with bubbles and lack solidity, but, nevertheless they constitute bodies that fills our reality of halfway house of insufficient intelligence and intellect, sometimes fuelled by imaginations conjured from popular novels like ‘Testament of Youth’,

‘Brideshead Revisited’ or even M.R. James ghost stories. It is thus that when the supposed man of intellect notices he really is not that intelligent, he often augments his deficiencies with labels, which have accepted social values. Most Oxbridge dons of mediocrity do not forget to emphasize their labels to boost their standings in intellectual hierarchy, an oxymoron. Between two mediocrities one with a better label (e.g. Oxford PhD vs Redbrick or ex-polytechnic PhD) tends to win not only more attentions but also a job, while mediocrities are mediocrities regardless whereabouts. Without substances in ideas mediocrities rely more and more on labels as you find in many teachers of philosophy. That is why people care for their CV before listening to them. Likewise, medical professions are unintellectually hierarchical as their technical knowledge often does not fully extend to be intellectual.

One often thought the meaning of a word is the object of its reference as if objects per se would be able to display a wider structure without intellectual probes. Here we assume a certain level of intellect at play that can afford us a schematic positioning of word within an epistemic paradigm. However, in our half-baked house of intelligence/intellect names (a less abstract type of words) acquire a world of their own in which they have a meaning of their own away from objects of strict reference. That is a world of imagination infused with relations of names and conjuries of fictional aspirations. This is where Oxford becomes ‘the best university’ with the help of imaginations associated with ‘dreaming spires’ and vainglorious self-conscious praises of second-rate novelists and poets. Once acquired such an imaginary meaning it feeds upon itself as there is nothing better than a free fame without hardworking or advertisements on the back of illusions. Thus, a name is like a cloud of fictional and real associations centred on an object of reference, and denuded of such a cloud some of names could become phenomenological nightmares of indefinable half-experiences. It is partly to avoid easy associations and contaminations baked in imaginations that some religion still deliberately uses a dead language as an official language especially in theological narratives, so that the only contamination is confined to internal manipulations, whereas words in a live language can be uncontrollably associative.

In thinking about the nature of an institution, universities are benign institutions with no aggressive numerical goals unlike companies or political institutions. They, however, have a tendency for identity groupings that promote self-esteems and mutual helps, a way of encouraging the society with identity politics, where the democracy implodes with lack of external stimuli and seeks way to make powers

more easily bundled and operative. With more explicit external stimuli such as the current Ukraine crisis identity politics tends to wane. Universities are one of easiest identifiers of group orientations and is the same as 'old school tie'. It is worthwhile to think why Oxford, voted consecutively the best university in the world, produces such unlikely incompetent PMs year after year. First of all, those who are excellent in their chosen field already have marked destiny, be it academia, the civil service or finance/business. Politics with its willy-nilly risk/reward and murky credentials is not a career for someone with already proven excellence. Like the police and the military politics tends to attract certain mediocre individuals with misconceived ideas of power not always aligned to their ability. Among those predisposed to social weakness for pretensions, titles and privileges an Oxford badge is a useful asset to shine, starting with local councillors, provided you keep a low profile. Here you can finally make use of a university credential, which is, otherwise, not useful below 2.1 in a more competitive environment crammed with professors' favourites and Scholars and Exhibitioners (Cameron being an exception, going into the main stream politics with his 1st class honours in PPE (academic nether region of doing everything but knowing nothing)). The society affords and allows indulgence to an Oxford graduate as per tradition over centuries especially among plebs of local councillors. This unearned advantage is thoroughly and effortlessly utilised rung after rung, which after some level attracts patronage of the Oxbridge identity circle seeing promises and uses in such advancements. In short mediocre Oxford graduates are pampered beyond their credentials reflecting social attitudes and allow them to be bold and cavalier, which, if unaccompanied by genuine ability, tends to be more harmful. This is the pitfall of Oxford PMs who make decisions that they are not able to carry though (Cameron → May → Johnson → Truss → Sunak). Their label makes them think of themselves beyond their reality. The only Oxford PM worthy of her label was Thatcher, and that was 40 years ago. There are some genuinely talented people (mostly in sciences), but most are fooled by their own label, especially at cheap ends of academics in humanities, who are nothing if not Oxon. One should also note that this weakness for label is part of the culture of celebrities that promotes pomp and romp.

When I see Oxford is voted the best university in the world (Times Higher Education 2023), and that there are 3 UK universities among top 10, just consider the size of UK population (70m) against that of China (×20) or India (×20). One wonders how come UK has so many top universities with mediocre numeracy and literacy at best, with hardly any indigenous manufacturing capacities left. Remember also China and

many Asian countries have highest numeracy and literacy skills together with innovative industries. You wonder to what degree this league table is skewed towards celebrity creation or even doctored by advantageous parameters, or may even unconsciously factor in attractive images (of dreamy spires and ancient names). But, when they come out via respectable media, a fiction tends to become a reality. One almost believes those dreamy spires are signs of unbelievable intelligence (there is the undeniable connotation that the higher in the league table, the more intellectually capable a university is, a fallacy promoted by not being denied). Alas, be it UK, China or India, human intelligence permeates more or less equally, and there are just as much intelligence per population as anywhere across the world, especially in our age of commodified knowledge. One cannot equate the intellectual environments (universities) with the achievements of intelligence, but labelling is contra-indicative of intellectualism as it defies individual achievements and judgements. It is often creativity that is indefinable in terms of intellectual environments combined with a level of intelligence that produces an achievement of intelligence. The league table shows little in terms of creativity except numbers of Nobel laureates in the past when there were little competitions. Thus, if you believe in such a league table and think yourself extra intelligent because of your label, then that is a fool's paradise. In 50 years' time most and many of UK and US institutions will be replaced by China and India as per sheer numerical advantages of intelligence pool and as they start caring more about celebrity psyche, rather than being passive exploiter of Western show-offs. The problem of labelling as per the league table is that those who like a label become a label as the fiction of a label becomes the reality of the benefits of a label. You think you are only dancing with a label in front of fools who take labels seriously, but, then, without creative something behind a label a label becomes you. On the other hand, if you have this something, then you are hardly likely needing such a label. The more conservative a society is, the more label conscious they are, as a social order has to be woven out of mediocrity, which also makes a society more conservative, given the relative lack of creativity and originality.

UK and US are generations behind in terms of a label driven consensus society as they always had a culture of influx driven and bottom-up democratic structure that ensured a certain level of anti-status quos and out of box creativity. Here money defines a class, not a class per se as of lineage. Money is worshipped because it is the most basic entry requirement into a class society. 'Oxford' is a good label not solely because of educational par excellence but more because of its affiliation

(implied or real) with a certain level of affluence cultivated alongside imperial legacies. In UK affluence literally buys aristocracy as with the tradition of Jewish nobility and gentry. Thus, labels are augmented by their practical social usages, giving rise to pragmatism. Whereas there are places where labels have more of their own life as it were and are idealistically distanced from real reality with a tinge of fiction of imagination. This is where labels drift away from pragmatic reality as time goes on and become more and more damaging to a society. A label is a catalyst that turns nothing (of reality) into something (of imagination) and dies without continual efforts. I can think of Japan as a label driven society that is being stifled by labels. Corporates, academia and the civil service became too rigid with label-driven thinking as labels helped build a reasonably successful economy and society, without working out detailed analyses of social cogwheels. Certain universities (especially Tokyo, once a well-regarded research institute, but now more like an intellectual kindergarten with little originality) and corporates that supported post-war prosperity (many good names disappeared (e.g. Zaibatsu originated banks, manufacturing bodies like Toshiba, Sanyo, Sharp, etc)) carried weight in men's careers (women still largely excluded), and labels as such rather than individual abilities guaranteed certain social standings. Eventually labels became yardsticks of quality in everything. Once you acquire a label, it made your life easier in the sense of predictability in expectations, consequences and achievements. In short you become a label and stay that label. Individually and corporately life is easier with labels as labels define likely courses of social outcomes. Such an indulgent intellectual climate generally discourages individualism and diminishes creativity. Instead of being Mr so and so, you become, say, a Mitsubishi man from Tokyo University. Imagine a society made up of millions of such salarymen, academics and civil servants, it is a heaven of automatons and a hell of experimental dynamism. Labels set a safe and secure rail that gradually but steadily goes downhill. This is how many corporates, once famous and well-regarded, lost their footholds in the world market, universities, in the world ranking, creativity, good at hardware but non-existent in software. This is labels at work. What happened in Japan happens anywhere as labels grip our thought processes, which, I predict, is happening in China. Labels can kill a society. I see it in British politics plagued by 'Oxford, the best university in the world' that allows undue confidences in mediocrities, Dutch industries that went through a crisis point due to the loss of dynamism caused by 'old school ties' (I remember a Philips crisis in 1990's), French intelligentsia dominated by grandes écoles (most notably École Normale Supérieure, a bastion of state elitism) that seems to have less and less relevancies to wider, global intellectual life, so unlike Francophile

fashion of 60 - 70's when France inspired the world not only in intellectual life but also in wider cultures, including cinemas, even chansons. Both Sartre and Foucault, two notable French thinkers, are alumni of École Normale, who also turned out to be recalcitrant in their traits. Elitism, especially state sponsored elitism, belongs to the lowest rung of intellectualism, in that originality does not go along with group mentality of superiority. Originality puts one aside of any groups, superior or otherwise, as it simply wishes to ignore, or be ignored by, any collective norms. Thus, the two most notable products of École Normale are ironically both anti-institutions and anti-authority. Foucault even made a philosophy out of it. Presumably they had enough of institutional elitism and repelled by it. In general, institutional elitism and hierarchical mentality fail to foster creativity and only produce technically clever dons and engineer-like scientists. That is why Oxford only produces philosophy teachers dominating teaching posts of red bricks, but no bona fide original philosophers. Even (Sir Prof, as he used to be so proud of being addressed) A.J. Ayer (the best known of so-called Oxford analytic philosophy) acknowledges himself only as one of the bests of 2nd class philosophers in a radio interview, a man not known for self-deprecation. It is interesting to note Heidegger Ayer despised so much is more of a philosopher, while Ayer is more of a self-publicist and celebrity philosophy teacher obsessed with titles. The difference is, apart from a philosophical taste, Heidegger had metaphysical parameters to work on concepts, while Ayer only played with concepts, mirroring the difference between pragmatic British empiricism and continental idealism of seeking beyond concepts, and also reflecting on their lifestyle. This made Heidegger a philosophical poet, Ayer, a critic. Considering that beneath Ayer's attempts to reduce philosophy into physics and logic is an unverifiable principle that our language is the language of the universe, and that we are the manipulative master of that language (and not the other way around), Ayer simply was too superficial to be aware of his own unconscious assumption. As a user of a language we cannot see that language from within as well as its evolutionary totality. I do not like Heidegger but can see he was far superior to Ayer as a philosopher.

Also, out of elitist universities of China and their state doctrines come no original scientists, let alone, philosophers, I predict. Denied accesses to freer traditions of Western intellectual life their confrontational policies will eventually lead them to poverty of ideas and innovations, especially in prolonged war-like situations. Japan had layers of labels (universities, feudal legacies, corporate names, family bonds, etc.) that formed its conservative structure and provided job securities for life and vertical hierarchy pockmarked with identity politics. The loss of

dynamism and the resultant ex-growth factors were more to do with social stifling rather than the rise of China. In fact, it is because of the anticipated social rigor mortis Japan mistakenly saw growth potential in China and enthusiastically transferred technologies, manufacturing and management knowhow as it saw a blank blackboard in a new label-free China. But instead of becoming dependent on Japan, China had an independent agenda of 3 stage development ; borrow with smile, take by coercion and lead by force, which is Deng Xiaoping's black cat-white cat pragmatism newly translated by Xi Jinping, thinking the critical mass for going own way not only socio-economically but also in terms of science and technology is rife, and the current supply line cut-off on the excuse of Corvid is a testing ground for an economic model less reliant on cheap trades at the mercy of Western consumption. Instead of China becoming dependent on Japan, it was Japan that is becoming reliant on China even for foods, reflecting the respective size of each other's domestic market. China with its vast domestic market and import controls can afford to develop products, which others would hesitate unsure of needs or demands. Thus, instead of becoming a new springboard of label-stifled Japanese growth, China skilfully concealed an even bigger label of political agenda of reclaiming 'the centre of the world', their historic self-reference (中華). Petty Japanese labels of no global relevancies pose no threats to the status quo of world hegemony, but given the population, the growth potential and its mastery of technologies and resources (especially rare earths) their almost unconscious agenda hidden behind the label of communism could have far-reaching consequences for our near future. The only snag is the autocratic controls over freedom of mind, conscious and unconscious, weaken creative capacities needed for scientific evolutions that directly correlates with its still developing military might. You can steal and transplant up-to-date technologies and scientific researches by sending out PhD students to best Western universities (which is being made more difficult especially in US), together with cyber stealth. However, you cannot transplant intellectual environments of creativity unless you loosen your totalitarian mentality, but then China will not be China. It is in fact when Taiwan controls China (mentality-wise), China will surpass US and become the centre of the world with our blessings. Till then US has no fears of China as it will keep dominating the world with basic researches, and any knowledge China now possesses will become obsolete in any protracted war situations, which is at least partially the reason why US and UK had advantages over control-freak nations in previous major wars. Take WW II and remember the advantages of better planning and executions of tactical operations for the axis powers were quickly lost as the war went on and new inventions came on stream, not to mention radars, atomic bombs, prototype

computers and codes breakings, against which the axis had no clear leads, even the jets were eventually more than matched. Democracy has many faults but benefits from freer minds that are more creative.

Institutions and labels go hand in hand as labelling can be advantageous for institutions for their image promotions and socio-economic self-interests, assuming labels are good for their purposes. Thus, they first promote a label that tends to exaggerate their realities. That is why there are only good and useful labels as there is no reasons to use bad labels. It is a fiction and disinformation for the purpose of self-promotions, and bad labels will be conveniently ignored. Taking the previous example, the label 'Oxford' therefore exaggerates the dreamy spires and past glory and make you think you are part of this glory, which you take more literally than healthy and unfortunately contribute to produce boisterous PMs, over-confident dons and vainglorious students. This label helps Oxford to attract students some of which are deserving of the label 'Oxford' and without which Oxford will run out of its glory. Besides there are practical benefits of funding and endowments that help Oxford run 'Oxford' with its more mediocre dons and high-maintenance architectures. So, the university benefits practically from its superb label, and students, especially run-of-the-mill types, who aspire to be a PM, benefits from the social imagery of the label, which they try to make full use of. Oxford and 'Oxford' are bonded for the self-interests of fooling onlookers directly (money) and indirectly (fame) so that Oxford as an institution prospers as a business and benefits label users and the label owner in a bliss of mutual delusions that must end up a net positive sum, where losers are those who dance to the tunes of merrymaking label 'Oxford', e.g. keen parents who want to furnish their imbecile with the label 'Oxford'. On the other hand the institution Oxford is obliged to the label 'Oxford' for its reasonable maintenance not to acquire negative elements (such as the sorry saga of PM after PM who become laughing stocks of the world (what can be done about it I wonder ?)). Labels, good or bad, inevitably become tainted through complacency and should be on a constant review.

Likewise, institutions in a misguided effort of keeping its label clean even commits a crime, making its label even more tainted, such as Catholic Church and its cover-ups of paedophile priests going up all the way to the uppermost echelon of its hierarchy, or the police and its rogue officers, or the City and its ingenious money launderings, NHS and its traditional disinclinations of admitting scandals, Post Office and its sorry saga, etc. Whenever there are institutions, there are inevitably labels, and whenever there are labels, there are manipulations. There are no labels

that can linearly represent an institution, a complex human organization with layered dimensions and criss-crossed purposes that interface with many different organizations with often contradictory objectives. Labels are used by institutions for their own socio-economic benefits with differing audiences and are designed and manipulated specifically for that purpose. Even in such a precise and simple subject as physics mathematical labels that stand for physical states need a well-defined space in order to be meaningfully operative. In the world of labels there are no such space of modality where labels can be related and evaluated consistently. Labels float around with little coordinative relevancies. They are products of mind as well as linguistic conveniences, each manipulated with socio-economic benefits for that institution and used by eligible, sometimes non-eligible, bearers for their own purposes and consequences. Linguistically labels save us a certain amount of time to check unnecessary details. Thus, instead of making detailed inquiries individually we can make rough evaluations based on labels. Here e.g. 'Oxford' is a useful but misleading label, meaning the bearer is probably not stupid, if touch disproportionately arrogant, although it does not guarantee any par excellence qualities as we saw from our PMs. I would not see any more than that, but the society is accustomed and even expected to see something much more than that. This is how Oxford finds 'Oxford' useful and make use of it for its promotions for funding, for securing more and more posts, academic or otherwise, via its domineering contacts and influences. However, since labels tend to be more of exaggerated realities for the socio-economic benefits of label owners, if a social mechanism is more label-orientated, then frictions arise and accumulate as such a system tends not to reflect its true value as much as a company balance sheet become too creative

One extreme of labelling is a brand, which is a commercially manipulated label that socially and legally allows fraudulent benefits by overvalued qualities. After some groundworks to start with, products accumulate good reputations, which are turned into a commercial brand where a quality is exaggerated into a fictional quality guarantee with the help of advertisements. Brands sometimes acquire enormous off- and on-sheet values and become almost synonymous with a corporate name that takes up so much of management resources to promote and defend. Think of many famous products and cooperates across the world, you will come across brands that occupy your mind and stimulate your desires to show off. A large proportion of a brand value is due to advertisements, so you are paying for your own brainwashing. As much as a brand does not represent a true value of product with an imaginary value comprising its high margin, labels have similar effects with lessor margins but more

widely spread. Here is the original sin of your society warped by our inability to make individual assessments, relying so much on cheap and easy labels to shortcut detailed analyses and even interface with other labels that are ordinarily not meant to surface. It is weakness of our mind as well as conveniences of our linguistic tools that promote a label-stifled society where status-quo and institutional self-interests govern, distort and eventually fail to adjust to needs of new social dynamics. The longer a system can persevere, the bigger potential needs for change. Certain social and cultural psyches (such as legacy of Confucius traditions), superficial bottom-up democracies, devious and crafty political traditions, they all contribute to prolong the life of a system by enduring its stresses, inconsistencies and widening gaps between interpretational fictions and pragmatic realities. We used to have little and large wars every now and then to allow for such adjustments, like volcanic activities and earthquakes to adjust for tectonic stresses, which, however, with our nuclear arsenals and socio-economic entanglements, are becoming too costly a method for adjustments. We do not appear to have any useful mechanisms to cater for needs for such adjustments, with practically useless UN Security Council and general UN functions tainted by self-interests of influential states that allow many unreasonable behaviours with impunity.

Be it a university or a nation, labelling is a highly distorting factor that in the long run diverges reality from its models as reality evolves faster than labels. We need labels as institutions or organizations have no actual substances other than our value system that evaluate structures, purposes, relevancies and efficiencies of our institutions. Labels are necessary tools of language that allow our mind to depict and measure all these invisible creations of human mind. Thus, we label every working part of an institution and come up with the end product that is our final evaluation, which is an image of that institution. Here lies the best university 'Oxford' that helps Oxford and its badge bearers, who would have no incentives to correct such an advantageous image that is so useful. However, as real Oxford has just as many substandard constituents (dons and students) unworthy of the name 'Oxford' derived and accumulated over centuries of bona fide achievements by a few, but nevertheless more than willing to make use of this convenient image, the label does more harms (to the society) than benefits (to the institution and badge bearers) out of its necessary existence. This applies to any human institutions including nations, and the more our thinking is label orientated, the more stifling and misguiding our modelling is. Labels can kill our society if we are slack and lazy to let labels float around without timely efforts of aligning them more closely to reality. Look at all these Oxford PMs that

are so wasteful of time and resources, who manage to run down what they all call 'this great nation' to an almost laughing stock, this is the work of labelling. There are nations where labelling is predominant yardstick of modelling and value judgements. They should take heed of harms of labels. It is label-orientated mentalities that are the cause of institutional disfunctions of our democracies. However, as much as categorizations are an essential tool of conceptual thinking, labelling is a fundamental tool of language that saves time and space of linguistic analyses. The problem is whether we have a social and psychological aptitude to review constantly the appropriateness of labelling. I fear we do not because labelling would then be less of labelling then and lead to its own self-denial. However, the future of human society could face an existential crisis as we now see in the current state of our democracy. Who would have thought a convicted criminal could run for the most powerful office of the most powerful nation ? We should all remember Hitler came out of the democracy of the Weimar Republic.

These bad traits are more obvious in autocracy as powers are more concentrated, but they are also still there in democracy in more dubious ways. Not only power corruptions are endemic in small scales, but also insidiously protected as the social sense of justice is made dull and blind in the name of institutionalization. It is more nuanced and sophisticated than primitive and crude misuses of autocratic powers, in that the interplays between money, fames and influences buy consensus that legalise unfair and illicit practices and bring about benefits indirectly and directly for those consensus builders. Here instead of illicitly acquired \$ billions backscratching among the top echelon ensures nepotistic mutual protections and politico-economical prosperities somehow within the boundaries of the law. Political dynasties (e.g. in Japan), connections fostered in public schools and Oxbridge, backscratching among European elites, etc. are but a few examples. No laws are broken because laws are surreptitiously designed to incorporate benefits into institutions. When and if something untoward happens, then of course clever lawyers and lobbyists stand by for fees. Every time laws show signs of decoherence and fatigues lawyers and lobbyists benefit, so they quite like making use of laws to set about institutionalisations. It is their livelihoods, so they encourage it. This is democracy translated in the language of the law. It has the sound of legitimacy, but in longer time it corrupts the whole society, which blindly thinks that being legal equals to being democratic. This is how UK, an apparent democratic paragon, became the laundering capital of dirty money not only from Russia but from all over the world, with not unwillingly incompetent or deliberately under-resourced Company House at the centre, where the ultimate beneficiaries of

company ownerships were practically untraceable with many-layered trust ownerships going across many jurisdictions often of offshore tax havens. In order to unravel such complicated chains of ownerships one would have to waste large resources disproportionate to potential benefits. The City made money, the government benefited from the tax, many lucrative professions depended on not stirring a storm in a tea cup, politicians served lip services of scornful remarks but were too ready to sweep under the carpet as soon as the media storms were blown off. Then Putin miscalculated this 2nd Ukraine saga after the feeble US handling of Afghanistan. US, UK and other G7 confiscated Russian wealth and sent help to Ukraine. But the underling social psyche is still there with politicians, accountants, lawyers, ready to cajole the next willing corruptions. This is the ultimate service sector economy, producing services to itself with merry-go-round interplays between lawyers, accountants, estate agents, politicians and eventually the whole society, all in the name of parliamentary democracy. With little to manufacture they manufacture services to themselves. Laws are there to encourage services including ones for themselves unless explicitly forbidden, which is rare with their case law. Putin failed to see this essence of Anglo-Saxon democracy, although tried hard with oligarchy extravaganzas and Tory donations as well as a helping hand to Trump. Here the law is on the side of easy but democratic moneymaking. Authoritarian confiscations and strong hand tactics are viewed too crude. Ukraine and Taiwan belong to everyone, not to the exclusive benefits of dictators (Ukraine ! be careful not to go dictators way after the victory). So long as benefits are reasonably democratic, proceeds and processes are legalised and institutionalized and made available to willing risk takers. This is how slavery, colonisations, offshore money centres, etc. are instigated and contributed to the prosperity of a wider society with gentlemanly professions at the spearhead of capital flows. Politicians here are a sleazy lot who would rather not stir things and quietly enjoy perks and privileges. Remember billions lost in PPE contracts and furlough schemes as well as more than half-knowingly enjoying the benefits of money launderings for unscrupulous Russian politicians/oligarchies, despite this country is rated as one of least corrupted nations. These ugly undersides used to be hidden from public views with less media outlets, kept secrets in the name of decorum and under general moratorium of controlled decency.

In olden days when there was a working pretence for an effective authority, an institutional religion could have been a useful base for a sharable coordinate with common values to measure events and place those measurements in the order of moral importance and social

preferences. It is not an institutional religion per se that provides us with a sharable coordinate of values, but an aura of structural authority that forces us at least to pretend there is such a coordinate for the sake of social conveniences, as judgements and decisions have to be somehow made. Regardless of participants of various labels of faiths this social needs of pretence worked until institutional religions lost credibility of practical governances as our society's working mechanism became too complicated with social units moving down scales to individuals, political empowerments stepping out of the class and gender confinement and more open wealth creations combined with wider benefits entitlements. It is not belief in God that empowers institutional religions but practical capacities of dealing with macro as well as micro socio-economic coherences that make institutional religions tools of governance, which could also coincidentally cater for our mental welfares for those in such needs. Even centuries ago we were happily secular or religious as suited us. Remember Renaissance popes, cardinals and bishops with the art of poisonings and excessive carnalities, liberal uses of Indulgence on one hand, and a couple of centuries later Isaac Newton still applying his ailing intelligence on Biblical chronology and alchemy on the other. It is too simplistic to describe the world in terms of dichotomy of faith, institutional or personal. We are all practical and change, interpret and adjust applications of faith, bend and unbend our rules of laws as well as moral and ethical standards for the sake of utilitarian governances, institutional or personal. Those who are unbending even in the face of death are extremely rare and are more cases of limited intellectual capacities, mental illnesses or misguided want of glory and fame (with Giordano Bruno as a most notable exception). Institutional religions declined not because we lost our faith in God or became more scientific or rational, but because it could not attract capable human resources who could understand how the wider society works and create opportunities for powers and money in tandem with religious pretences for themselves, their entourages and eventually wider community. Instead they suffered from the vicious circle of declining explanatory power (poor metaphysics) on the back of more enlightened society with higher and wider scientific achievements, waning power base (socio-economic clumsiness) and less and less capable practitioners combined with attracting more and more undesirables of dubious and devious intents, ending up with paedophilias from the top to the bottom. This more or less applies to any institutions, where their declines coincide with organizational failures to capitalize on socio-economic benefits, leading to reduced attractiveness for the talented, culminating in collective downgrades, attracting devious characters and untalented. Schools, social services, police, military, and politics in general are in large parts thus

explained. Where wealth is more and more unevenly divided, this tends to be symptoms of institutional failures.

In our days when institutional religions are more or less discredited due to social irrelevances and scandals, vanished from meaningful power structures (save for some emotional influences) and replaced with secular social orders, we hope to be able to trust our political systems of liberal democracy. Institutional religions are still there as historical, cultural legacies. Those who enter such institutions are misguided individuals with more psychological needs rather than metaphysical desires. Institutions are tainted and fatigued, starved with funds and lack of authorities. In general things sacred and holy do not go along with things human, like the abstract universal and the concrete particular, with the former being aesthetical distillation of the latter rather than the latter being constructive part of the former. We no longer seek religious values in institutions, and institutions are best kept as unobtrusive, quiet and dark place of contemplation, museum-like, if that can be afforded. In fact, many churches are now turned into cafes or flats in London. Those who are in charge of such institutions are best advised to stay apolitical and keep their head down to avoid unsolicited attentions and unnecessary controversies, remembering the priesthood is more associated with the paedophile and incompetency, not piety or charity. Religious labels, large and small, have little substances in representative terms as they are unable to focus, let alone, agree on doctrines that define a belief system. Unlike their medieval or even relatively modern cousins, they are largely devoid of means of enforcements due to secularizations and consequential loss of economic power, except in some backward Islamic nations. They are too fashion-conscious and keen to go along moods of the day. Petty minority issues such as LGBT marriages, abortions and contraception, political alignments (e.g. Northern Ireland), etc. or gender issues like social and dress codes for women (mostly Islamic concerns) disproportionately affect their agendas, cause geopolitical frictions and alienate simple requirements (trust, compassion and charity) of the majority. They rely on customs, stigmas and political climates to enforce their views or else play identity politics mingled with hierarchical orientations. These are institutional failures saturated with label-stifled thought processes that narrow exit strategies and flexibility of mind. Institutional religions thus corner themselves into creating more miseries for those desperate for good guidance instead of salvaging them from social confusions by restricting freedom of mind.

Now with explosions of social media and exacerbated public curiosities exposés are the norm of our social life, affecting royals, politicians,

celebrities and anyone with public standings. Authorities are difficult to maintain and crumbles all too easily, combined with our innate dislikes of unwarranted hierarchies. Recalcitrant traits come naturally with democracy. Labels that are the unifying force of an institution depend on a level of trust in order to function usefully because there has to be reasonably relevant correlation between a label and its labelled object. 'Oxford' and Oxford work in tandem as we connect them with a level of coherence. Like too many incompetent PM in succession things in reality can tarnish the label 'Oxford', and 'Oxford' may become less useful for Oxford. Floods of information and disinformation affect labels, and our label-orientated social understandings suffer to the extent that reality and its epistemic contents decohere so disturbingly that our social models start to fail. This is happening right now in front of our nose. Our political, economic and social models are lagging behind reality changes and showing sign of wears. On the other hand, realities are changing too fast with AI, social medias, etc. to accommodate usefully authoritative new frames of reference on human activities.

New social values given out by our politicians, central bankers, judiciaries, etc. are outpaced and outmoded by the speed and quantities of information accompanied with mountains of imageries through internet and social medias. Be they climate, environments, autocracy vs democracy, economic growth, wealth distribution, gender equality, etc., the problem is in-built complacencies of our political establishment with pseudo-hereditary tendencies attracting nepotism. Politicians are seen to be more of a necessary evil than doers of public goods. Since their incompetence is largely unaccounted for, tendency to attract wrong people for the job has an acquired momentum. This is why we smell something rotten even in our democratic system. I remember one recent British PM who was keen to equip London underground system with Huawei mobile network (for what returns I wonder) and lobbied his colleagues for hedge fund millions (which literally turned out to be the case). Not one, but one after another, all Eaton-Oxford characters or similar with uncommonly keen tendency for money-grubbing. This is how democratic leaders are looked down on by autocratic rulers, for whom money, power, nepotism are unpretentiously natural currencies of trade. See how oligarchies or charity lawyers were used to make political inroads into our societies. Although the current Ukrainian issue dramatically contrasts the evil of autocratic egoism against a relatively benign incompetency of democratic values, in that at least there is no democratic leader who could unleash such an unreasonable violence to a non-aggressive neighbour, once the situation goes stalemate, the current uncommonly united front will start showing signs of disarrays, with

Ukraine by no means an exemplary democracy and ensuring complicated power grubbing in-fights together with the Western alliance resuming their own self-interests on the back of stagflation. We probably have the last chance to stand up collectively to the autocratic rulings. The current united Western front is not only against the natural unjust of unprovoked violence but also from the fear of moving onto the united front on their side (i.e. Xi + Putin (or their likes)). The failure to remove Putin from power will result in the united partnership of Xi and Putin, with Putin as a violent deranged little brother. Besides, once the West have shown their hand in dealing with Putin, Xi has learned a few tricks not to repeat similar mistakes, e.g. central bank assets deposited with potential foes, supply line disruptions, personal wealth kept in hostile jurisdictions, etc. If the West is serious with dealing with the autocratic regime, they should start withdrawing investments from China and stop trading altogether. If Putin manages to stay on and forms a stronger tie with Xi, this will be the beginning of the end for so-called Western liberal democracy. Only with Putin removed, we still have a chance of overcoming Chinese aggressions. With Putin in stalemate and another decade of Chinese strength, combined with ever feeble US and the West generally weakened by stagflation, we have a repeat of the Peloponnesian War, which saw the Spartan victory, eroded by internal mismanagements and the eventual engulfment by bigger and bigger imperial powers (Persia, Macedonians, Rome) that ended with fragmentations of the classical world alongside familial dynasties, personal greed cum corruptions and structural fatigues that saw the rise of mercenaries. On the back of political disillusionments and disorders comes the rise of religious identities alongside Hellenized values divided into the east (Orthodoxy) and the west (Catholicism), with pre-Hellenic values of the Old Testament resuscitated (Islam) and invigorated (Judaism). Politics and religions tend to go hand in hand as religions provides useful group identities that can be politically useful (see how Putin makes use of the Orthodox church). If and when a religious identity come to dominate a group identity, then the religion becomes politicized and ends up as self-negating political entity consumed by worldly infights. See how the religious empires of the Vatican and the Byzantine ended up with corruptions and murders. Given politics and religions, politics always has an upper hand because politics deals with socio-economic necessities that are the necessary conditions of human existence, whereas religions are more to do with mental welfares that come after material fulfilments and are rather of the nature of a sufficient condition of human existence. We all need foods before indulging in prayers. Those who would think otherwise are an absolute minority and are probably a political irrelevance today (or always have been).

Institutional religions are tainted within and without. In olden days they used to be a career option for those well-connected, earning social respectability together with some creature comforts, like a vicar relative of a gentleman landowner. Today, given much wider choices they probably attract psychologically misguided individuals (like disgraced politicians) who still see shadows of power that is little or no more, or intent on something undesirable (we all remember paedophiles). With limited career opportunities within and combined with dwindling followers and financial resources they seek revival chances by politico-social meddling, which are easy with our social-medias and cheap politics, ranging from LGTB, gender and ethnic issues to refuges and terrorism issues.

An institutional religion survives in two formats : it can be a source of group identity for those who seek something deeper than themselves. This happens because of a guilty conscience of drives for achievements. Stereotypically speaking (exceptions abound), for many women having a family of her own is deemed an achievement, and that could more readily satisfy her needs for achievements. Whether such a view is archaic or not, we are still in the middle of social evolution to be conclusive as domesticity is not yet equally divided. Men are biologically instilled with competitive needs to come on top of the game. Although we now have too many games to diversify disappointments, there are always those who see themselves as a failure. For them a religion is an easy and ready alternative as an accepted membership of well-established group identity is superficially an achievement of some sort that used to lead onto a career and an illusion of power. This is no longer much of the case, but we still have legacy of this psyche. The snag is a group identity, even an illusionary one, seeks a reward of socio-economic nature. Otherwise, what is the point of being a member, with its associated costs and inconveniences ? Unlike their more powerful ancestors most respectable institutional religions of today no longer possess enough sources of power to distribute satisfactory benefits save for the very top echelon of group. This expectation of benefits and unlikely reaches of their power to our more secular societies make managements of an institutional religion difficult and dubious like any institutions with limited funding and can cause reputational damages. Money is lubricant of institutional cogwheels; the lack thereof makes them squeak and malfunction. Remember the sad end of a relatively well-known Japanese prime minister tangled with freerides of religious benefits or the current saga of SNP. Be them paedophilic priests or politicians riding on free benefits, group identity will eventually demand payments unless it possesses a

money-growing tree, which is a preserve of central banks. On the other hand, for those who are happy with less than strenuous group identity, such as mere psychological solace of imagined spirituality, religion as a personal fairy tale works like a narrative story for little girls to indulge before a siesta. It is a brief escape into imagined worlds of scriptural stories, which temporarily relieves secular boredom with pepped-up religious excitements without costs of group identity. Talking about institutional religions, stereotypically men go for group identity, while women are happy with superficial sense of belongings (exceptions abound).

For administrative as well as socio-economic reasons a social unit moved down from a village to a family, and now with the advent of IT, to an individual. The same engine in the form of AI also allows more and more time to individuals. With waning institutions and family values individuals seek anchors of value for renewed orientations. Identity politics takes advantage of this void to create power structures to suit cheap politicians of greed and pretensions. In short, we are drifting directionless in the sea of chaos created by growthless economy of unwanted and unnecessary population expansion on the back of climatic crises exacerbated by weak politics. I intend to write how to remedy this impotent situation (my next work), but meanwhile I see more and more people seeking solace in the company of pets, disillusioned by the society, the future and cheap and nasty politics. We even avoid human pets in fear of legal complications and resultant miseries, i.e. a brief happiness encumbered by plateau of boredom and a long spell of self-enforced slavery. Our feline and canine friends are cheaper to maintain, more genuine in their affections and less calculating in their behaviours. No wonder they are moving inwards in our psyche and altogether contribute more for our happiness in this transitory world of ours.

But their life is shorter than ours, and happiness doubles back as bigger lamentation. So why not turn their happy memory into a fairy tale, in which we also take part and keep a role to play. This is better than any institutional religions, which are after all fictions of passive modes. They keep all narratives and you only have a passive role of believing and keeping to their rituals, and your sincerity is eventually measured in your financial contributions. The only snag is you do need a creative ability to construct a good narrative of make-believe. Spend your time happily thinking how to make your pet come alive again. There is a possible world out there in which your imaginary pet is real, and your real self is imaginary, playing together to create the world of daemon, where imagination and reality merge into a creative river of dreams. A daemon

is your inner-self that seeks existence in descriptions. You as biological entity is a phenomenological non-entity unless described. You become described if all biological processes are known and fully described. This is a scientific process and is yet far from completion. Alternatively, you may prefer internal descriptions. This is a philosophical process, but so long as you have a daemon that you think you can describe, that is your philosophy. A daemon is connected with the world through the inner-self in the anthropic sense that our descriptions are contained in necessities of our tool, the language. It is not us who dictate the language, but the language predetermines what we can describe. We have freedom of a topic and how best to put it in words, but cannot think beyond the domain of our language. The language, our conceptual heritage, makes you, and only then you can make your own language, if clever enough. The language also sets out the metaphysical constraints of our descriptive coordinate. We and our language grow together, but my individual self only gains purchases of thought processes through the legacy of our language, which also connects with the collective psyche of the human mind.

Thus, if you can bring out the metaphysical essence out of your descriptions of daemon, then it can also be said to connect with the essence of the whole universe. 'Atman \equiv Brahman' of the Upanishads means the inner-self is the same whether by itself or through layers of diversity if described well. Imagination and reality amalgamate into something larger through representations of the metaphysical structure that is the narrative common denominator of all descriptions. Imagination and reality are both necessary ingredients of mind. Reality cannot be described without imagination, and imagination makes reality human reality of cognition. In between is the narrative essence of conceptual representations. Our world is a totality of images and data, which together create layers of human world, ranging from mathematico-physical worlds of data and connectives to arty worlds of freely drawn images and structural meaning, with each and every layer contributing to the wholistic understanding and description of the underlain ontological basis. In the world of $(x) > x$ () stands for layered representations of x , which, in case of a religion, refers to mind that changes its colour depending on how it is filled. If enough fake news pervades our consciousness, then the fake world becomes our world, we would not even know it is filled with fake news. Only in the context of wholistic layers the fake world is merely one possible world of imagination made real by the stimuli of fake news that overwhelms an aspect of mind. Our consciousness is layered and becomes alive by raw stimuli for the sake of biological bookkeeping and contributes to signal processing and primitive

conceptual understandings through memories on one hand. On the other hand, it also reacts to conceptual stimuli, resulting in higher order understandings of recorded concepts, their refinements and structural relationships, in which case imagination and reality share a thin border of schematic applicability.

Here we are not looking for connectives that makes a totality out of x but a totality that encompasses every x , so that each and every x can be shown one and the same totality made out of imagination and reality. A mathematico-physical totality made up with a coordinate of space and time, variables and conventionally perceived laws of numbers and macro nature, say the Newtonian physics, claims its validity insofar as its predictive usefulness on one hand, on the other a literary totality of the world of fictions is also meaningful in the sense that it contributes to the layered totality of mind alongside more scientific frameworks. Together they enrich our mind with versatility and depth and allow us degrees of freedom and objectivity. Thus, our mind is filled with many world views with varying degrees of combinations of imagination and reality, neither of which can do without the other, even in the purest of pure sciences. Each and every world view is a possible world that constitutes our mind that feeds on both imagination and reality, giving rise to a balanced totality of subjectivity and objectivity. This is the world of (x) .

Scientific descriptions are coordinative with a centre from which is measured numerical relevancies based on dimensions. Quantum-mechanically the collapsed wave function is a centre of probabilistic relevancies. Here reality is data, and imagination is coordinative constructs, which together give rise to schematic descriptions of events generalised for engineering adaptability in tandem with human values. The 'centre', a self, sees itself in materialised coordinates of human values, thus making sciences useful in our seeing ourselves for physical achievements of material translations of our values, be it seeking immortality beyond cosmic constraints or finding the ultimate ontological answer to life, the universe and everything. One can say the 'centre' sees itself by externalising itself as coordinate that allows such translations of values. Whereas artistic descriptions are layers of internalising self, the outermost of which is scientific coordinates, and the innermost of which is fairy tales, in which reality is the inner-self, and imagination is concepts.

The self consists in the centre that externalises as coordinates on one hand and internalises as layers on the other. This internalising centre transmutes into many actions in our daily life of actuality arisen and

fabricated from human values. The centre and the collection of actions have mismatches due to circumstances of decision making as we can only be part of events that have many factors beyond our control. The centre of subjectivity is but a centre of objectivity that makes up a human world out of individual controls. The centre of subjectivity makes many decisions that translate into actions of consequences to best suit circumstances.

So how would a fairy tale contribute to this wholistic mind? Mind is a layered consciousness ranging from biological reactions to physical stimuli to metacognitive awareness of conscious self. A fairy tale as religion picks out the equilibrium constant of mind in which imagination and reality swirl around seeking stability and psychological bookkeeping expressed as the inner self of daemon. Daemon should be understood as unchanging and underlain bottom layer of mind, a product of infant psychology as well as of genetic makeup. There may or may not be a metaphysical aspect, but that becomes relevant only as part of a fairy tale, not part of objective arguments presented to the audience as it eventually boils down to a subjective matter. In contrast top layers of mind are constantly subjected to circumstantial decisions and emotional involvements, and thus creating unceasing frictions with daemon, which is of course different from a mind to a mind, ranging from a naturally evil daemon to an unusually well-tempered one, but most are mediocre, sharing a certain spectrum of commonsensical moral and ethical values, dividing actions from good to bad with differing levels of tolerance. In between daemon and practical and pragmatic mind of daily necessities is our fairy tales to balance the books, turning imagination into reality, reality into imagination.

Most human things are values translations and interpretations resulting in actions and reactions, and creating histories in the process. In this human world reality and imagination are labels of convenience to make up historical books. Against Putin's physical war of savagery, we wage war of imagination anticipating a victory, sending weaponries and monies. At any time in the process what is happening is neither reality nor imagination, but actions/reactions of reality and imagination, and even a conclusion of war is nothing but a temporary cessation leading onto a further stage with more imagination than reality eventually invoking more reality than imagination. This is a never-ending historical process of human existence, now more so as we are more interconnected. Our fairy tales thus bring in both reality and imagination to make up stories, which meanwhile contribute to balance daemon and actualities for peace of wholistic mind, and eventually bringing together all stories, past,

present and future, to conclude human histories of reality and imagination to literally mindless state of merged reality and imagination.

Most human concepts are value-orientated and even so-called scientific concepts are hinged with metaphysical parameters that cannot be observed. Many quantum-mechanical concepts are not only counter-intuitive but also unhinged with such parameters that they often end up as mathematical constructs. Concepts swim in a sea of totality in which they loop, and only together come close to revealing values that connect them. Very few concepts actually refer to detached realities, and even then, they make sense within an interpretational space that aligns and sharpens concepts to fit into a metaphysical framework that is not itself a reality. Likewise, ordinary concepts seek a totality of its own world that is a narrative and its conceptual consistency.

Thus, a little girl carrying a stuffed toy bunny is not carrying something that resembles a bunny, which she fantasizes being her pet/friend. This toy is rather her inner-self, 'daemon' that she partially or wholly identifies with herself, which she externalises and sees in it an idealised self to be protected and cherished. She and this toy are together creating a world of their own parallel to our communal world. This toy lives in its own space and time and relates to the so-called reality through the narrative dynamics of imaginative perfection that counterbalances her imperfect reality. She generally drifts apart from this toy world when the gap between the perfect unreality and the imperfect reality becomes unbridgeable as she is more and more tied with our world of rules and necessities. She sadly 'grows up' to accept the society in which she is but a very small part, inevitably subjugated to wills of many other people and wider constraints in the name of norms, stigmas and labels that are tools of a functioning society. If you are privileged enough to be more isolated from the nitty gritty of cheap and nasty sides of social necessities, then you may hold onto Aloysius the teddy bear to prolong your imaged perfection, which eventually catches up with the imperfect reality with the bigger costs. However, this unfortunate gap between the perfect unreality and the imperfect reality can be permanently filled in the solipsistic world by cutting off the imperfect reality or by protecting the self with the misanthropic wall. This is becoming easier with the practical inroad the internet is making into our daily life in terms of the so-called reality that is having more and more blurred edges with the digital reality, moreover allowing us even to make money out of this. When the so-called reality was the only reality in which one has to make a living, the perfect unreality had to be compromised in order to share the time and space that create socio-economic conveniences including money.

Between the perfect unreality and the imperfect reality is no longer an unbridgeable schism as they are being connected through digital reality/unreality that allows social constructs of human values to lose their edges. Here realities and fantasies are ever coming closer in which the stuffed toy bunnies and Aloysius are allowed to live longer and even create their own kingdoms in which we are to be invited guests, if well-behaved, not privileged fantasies for little girls of certain ages.

Thus, we and our daemons complement each other in order to insulate from the world we are unfortunately in for social necessities and conventions. This tends to exacerbate as we alienate ourselves more and more from the conventional world. Daemons' world strengthens in proportion to our natural disinclinations to be part of the wider human world. The way we relentlessly destroy the natural world for temporary human conveniences, the greedy and self-placatory political leaderships of double standards here and there are steadily driving us towards the existential crises, with neither tamed powers of democracies nor dynastic primitiveness of autocratic powers having conscience of the planetary wellbeing for all life forms with humans in charge. We are too preoccupied with individual human wellbeing at the expense of not only other humans but also any other life forms. All our socio-economic principles are for humans, with implicit provisos of recognizing individual merits and rewards, disproportionately skewed towards upper echelons of a few. So, we primarily live and work for ourselves for our individual comforts and enjoyments at the detriments of anyone, anything else. This is a contradiction with the ultimate price tag of our extinction.

6. Personal Fairy Tale as a Religion

<Daemons' universe>

In contrast to a religion as a personal fairy tale, a personal fairy tale as a religion is a way of knowingly adopting a fairy tale as a tool towards a predictive whole out of the self and the inner self. Both the self and the inner self tautologically refer to an identical physical self and do not make descriptive contributions towards any higher or deeper understandings of the combined self. The inner self, if any, is more like a direction of the self to fulfil $(x) > x$ so that while it remains a same x , it empowers x to more fully describe itself by allowing it to see itself. Thus, x can be just x , but the inner self makes it possible to step out of its coordinative self and make phenomenological observations of itself, which are extra-coordinative and unbound by the norms of descriptive conventions such as space, time, socio-economic values, etc.

In order to make sense we describe coordinatively, and daemons are of coordinative orientation. We need an inner-self in order to anchor our multi-selves so that coordinates make sense and become sharable. If we each have our own coordinate centred on our self, then although we might make sense of our world in our own way, making sense does not address any useful solutions. This will be like each of us having a different physics to describe and understand the world, some with interesting views, some mired in inconsistency, but with no common engineering, with each and every one of us residing in a different possible world as it were. Solipsism is self-contradictory with regard to its existence so long as an existence is a relationship with something and anything other than this something. A solipsistic coordinate is a paradox because something is a coordinate on the assumption it is to be shared. An unsharable coordinate has no inherent needs to be itself as such. Thus, human descriptions are coordinative on the assumption that they are to be shared. This is why selves must have an inner-self so that they become sharable. Not all inner-selves may not be identical, but at least they provide a basis for a merger of selves based on coordinative descriptions. In maths generally-accepted rules make its coordinates sharable by definition. Our ordinary language is so multi-layered and multi-faceted that rules are too murky. We discourse within a paradigm provided by our coordinative orientations. Our views vary depending on our grasp of language, education, intelligence, temperaments, backgrounds, interests, etc., but they are all alongside axes of our coordinate that emanate from a self (centre) to form perspectives of value measurements. We discourse in order to narrow down our differences so that we share a common

acceptable ground. For this reason, the inner self is always much less in number than the self. Each and every one of us has a self, maybe selves as the self changes and evolves with time. Selves are similar or even identical when immature, more towards animalistic needs. They could again be similar or even identical when highly mature, more towards intellectual necessities, which are limited in range. They are most numerous when halfway between life and death immersed in multitudes of social values with half cooked intelligence and information to digest such values and their interactions. Whereas the inner self tends to reflect more intrinsic nature of intelligence, psychological profiles and personal propensities, which can also evolve but within more restricted spectra. The world of selves is more like an unbound state of plasma, while that of inner selves is a field that gives a direction of collective behaviour. Likewise, a fairy tale makes no sense if solipsistic. It is there on the assumption that it is sharable, even if it is personal. A personal fairy tale derives its life by assuming it is implantable to mind of readers so its daemon can resonate with and assimilate similar daemons.

We are a community, not a collection of solipsistic little worlds. We might measure relevancies of events from our own perspective, but without sharable coherence we cannot work out ways to sort and order in terms of cumulative social efforts. After all everything human is directly and indirectly to do with each other. Even sciences are based on agreed definitions, rules and metaphysical frameworks, let alone social values and economic measurements. For example, just think how impossible it is to spend our money without affecting each other directly and indirectly. There is so little one can do and achieve purely individually. It is thus that a self as a centre of a coordinate is not enough of a description as it results in multiple coordinates with little coordination. Without the inner-self of daemons we will be blown apart and make no sense of existence, individually and collectively. Daemons are the centripetal force that is the coordinate of coordinates, as it were. There may have been clever sounding names for it like the categorical imperative, but in our godless days we have no frame of reference with the absolute external authority, lending us some pretentious moral authority.

The self is a centre of our cognitive coordinate from which we measure relevancies of values and interactions in relation to a self-interest and provides us with perspectives of a self-centred world. This, however, is not usefully functional as you only know your own narrow world. The inner self, being more like a coordinate of coordinates centred on a more intrinsic nature of the self, gives us a wider perspective that can allow us to view the narrow perspectives of the self from many angles including

those of other selves centred on a similar inner self. Thus, while the self allows you to see yourself, the inner self allows you to see yourself looking at yourself, like 'Spiegel im Spiegel' with a reflective perspective of multi-angles. The ability to see yourself reflectively makes it possible to choose from wider options. The inner self allows you to take decisions different from the self, putting you on course for a better outcome chosen from multi-perspectives rather than from a forced perspective derived from a single viewpoint. The inner self relates to the self by forming a predictive self that is a directional self of a vector derived from multiple perspectives of the self seen from the inner self. Although the self and the inner self both refer to a same self of physicality, the predictive self positions the self on a course desired by the inner self and, by doing so, brings out psychosomatic benefits, which enhance mind/body duality not always explainable on material terms.

This is somewhat counter-intuitive. You would think the inner self is a narrower and more focused self, something of more animalistic and instinctive self as envisaged by Leonardo's ermine. However, it is not the inner self per se that matters as if it is a true self behind the self. It is more the relationship between the inner self and the self that bring out a better understanding of the inner self. The self gives rise to the inner self as a pivot of perspectives arising within its coordinate of relevancies. The inner self is there for the self to be reflective so that it can opt for a best possible choice. The self is always there in various evolutionary stages, but the inner self can only arise after being nurtured through experiences of trial and error and consequences of this self and that self. This is Socrates' daemon. It allows for a judgemental, directional and predictive self based on intelligence and experiences as well as a finer balance of relevancies. A daemon on one's shoulder gives one depth of space with an extra pair of eyes that allows one with a better perspective metaphorically speaking.

It is here a fairy tale can rationally replace a religion by giving a narrative role to a daemon, an inner self narratively adapted often in the guise of an animal, figurative, imaginative or real. This is useful as we are most observant of an animal close by, usually a pet, and even provide good sources of 'miracles', which are the most vital ingredient of a fairy tale. Coincidences with unlikely probabilities do occur. The more observed, the more likely for us to come across unusual coincidences. It is not likely we will come across something that goes against laws of known physics, but coincidences do happen, and a set of closely observed coincidences can persuade us of something unusual with regard to coordinative perceptions of the self and its relevancies. Such a persuasion

can even bring about psychosomatic benefits. That is, it is not events themselves but our interpretations of events that are sources of our 'miracles'. Events follow laws of physics as generally known, whereas interpretations are products of mind that observes and evaluates according to its coordinative relevancies with the self as the centre. Once we incorporate a 'miracle' into our narratives, then it becomes a concept with supra-logical connectives that obey not commonsensical rules of the ordinary language incorporating generally accepted sciences but structures of narratives with coordinative relevancies of the self. This is what we call 'magic', excepting where there may or may not be unknown physical causalities such as quantum-mechanical extensions beyond sub-atomic world.

A daemon acquires a dynamic free world of its own through its characterizations, stories and interactions (imaginary or real through 'miracles', including psychosomatic benefits). Unlike a religion with scriptural constraints, a fairy tale can be tailor-made ad hoc and dynamically flexible to suit requirements (religious, psychological or even entertainable) of the author. The former is a ready-made religion that propagates through rewards (socio-economic (thus making propagations essential), psychological as well as pseudo-metaphysical), blind faiths, coercions, stigma, punishments (so many deaths incurred, including Giordano Bruno and many nameless similar and nonconforming outcasts/eccentrics often in the name of witches), etc. and saves troubles and time of founding one, but, like any lazy solutions, never satisfies complete personal requirements. An institutional religion has a life of its own that consumes those who mistakenly assume its superficial benevolence as an essential feature of religion, whereas it only serves itself once implanted in the politico-economic power structure (remember the behaviours of the Russian Orthodox in the current Ukrainian war). It is the destiny of an institution born out of a group identity to end up as a behemoth like a pyramid scheme as a group identity feeds on socio-economic benefits.

Whether institutional or personal, a religion is a fairy tale to the extent that it feeds on narrative-based imaginations. It is distinct from science or philosophy in the sense that it is referenceless, whereas science feeds on data even though data may be processed by metaphysical extrapolations through time, space, numbers and probabilities, and at least parts of its roots are somehow essentially observable and measurable. While philosophy is a self-reflective exercise of mind through conceptual analyses. A religion has no base in observable data, and if tried to be self-reflective it destroys itself as faith cannot afford to be a philosophy.

Institutions are fundamentally tainted as they only serve themselves in pursuit of powers in order to survive in our world of socio-economic benefits. The *raison d'être* of an institutional religion is its structural organization without which it is socio-economically defunct and where hierarchical orders confer quasi-personalities to maintenance workers of its organization, not well-beings of believers, who are nothing but tools of its organization. This leaves only personal religions as reasonably pure and clean. A personal religion is only there for personal benefits of self-satisfactions unless it coincidentally attracts curious bystanders. Self-satisfactions are necessary first of all for the predictive self arising from the unskewed relationship between the inner self and the self, secondly for organizing mind/body duality with permeative fullness of totality where mind and body dynamically influence each other with evolutionary layers.

How a fairy tale can be best made a personal religion ? There are many narrative characteristics that are essential and useful in constructing a fairy tale with its incidental use as a personal religion, but any fairy tales can be a personal religion if they contain extensions of the author's personal life in the atoning form of personification in imaginary objects/events. You can say a fairy tale is a personal atonement for things that could have been otherwise so that you have a more balanced self that brings about a better predictive self. In our commonsensical real world things move from a moment to another in the disjunctive form, not allowing for multiple identities. You are always in one identity at a time resulting in a consequential identity at a subsequent moment, like a sequence of wave functional collapses that form sequential reality under discrete observations. We cannot go back in time to rectify a sequence of realities that we regret with hindsight. However, like real numbers accompanied with imaginary part that can flip around positive/negative if squared, our real sequence of events is accompanied with fictional part that flips around so-called reality for an overall more balanced self. This is the source of a fairy tale. A good fairy tale is there for you to fantasize a reality that could be otherwise. Often best children's books are extensions of the author's personal life that augment reality with imagination so that the author can fantasize a life that could have been otherwise. In this sense a fairy tale is working as a personal religion (the parallel universe of an alter ego) for the author with or without being consciously aware. Best children's author such as Roald Dahl, J. M. Barrie and Lewis Carroll (some biographers and psychologists suggest that he was a repressed paedophile), etc. are often themselves twisted and complicated characters, far from the image of a happy-go-lucky avuncular personality (happy people are generally not creative), who used

their fictions like an escape artist. Their fairy tales may have started off as a personal religion, but as soon as they became public properties due to popularity, that severs the personal elements by removing the author's rights to be organic part of the fairy tale. Here Alice is no longer Dodgson's Alice, but Alice of popular image with her own independent life engaged in the given storyline. Here a fairy tale stops being a religion, and it becomes a fiction of entertainment owned by many. The same goes for Peter Pan, and Charlie even becomes Willy Wonka, with little personal affiliations with Roald Dahl. For those who seek a religion in a fairy tale, it is important to remember to keep the fairy tale a personal property which you can personally relate to and hopefully dynamically incorporate into your life or be incorporated into the fairy tale. If Dodgson had a secret version of Alice, then he must have kept her to himself, which we are not to know. A fairy tale that becomes a public property is a step closer towards becoming institutional and makes it proportionally difficult to be a genuine personal religion.

Apart from being solipsistic the second most important feature is elements of 'magic' without which a fairy tale is a dry fiction of tasteless fantasies. We have no ostensive 'magic' in science and philosophy in any formulaic manners, in that you cannot insert a symbol for God in equations of physics or use the word in philosophical discourses with non-reflective assertiveness, although it does materialise in the guise of metaphysical parameters such as the absolute space and time or 'god' of definiendum (Einstein's 'Old One'). Here 'magic' quickly loses its vivid colour of imagination as meaningless linguistic inquiries expands into theological nonsense. In a narrative 'magic' can be a given, but to convince oneself of it as religiously relevant it must connect with reality. It is therefore not wise to go against known laws of physics unless you can make a direct observation that can convince yourself and hopefully others as added strength of observation. Otherwise, it arises out of coincidences that are physically uncontroversial but confer coordinative privilege of being uniquely at the centre. This occurs because you are naturally at the centre of your own coordinate from which you measure your own relevancies. First of all, coincidences are there if only you notice, and you notice better as your body/mind coordination is at its prime, making you notice things that would have been non-events if not attuned to your coordinative surroundings. This ability to notice is enhanced by the predictive totality out of the harmonized inner self and the self that are cultivated from experiences and knowledge. Into this predictive totality comes the help of synchronized awareness that sharpens remarkable concurrences into miraculous coincidences, which are within laws of physics but are made out to be coordinatively

unthinkable. Suppose you can combine three such coincidences, then you have something physically still possible but probabilistically unimaginable. This is a miracle of body/mind duality that is attuned to maximum and is attained by the predictive totality out of the inner self and the self with symbiotic psychosomatic benefits. Here you are like a most sensitive observational instrument who can see coordinative miracles. What if animals/pets have an uncanny intuition to detect such well-coordinated sensitivity and play along with it, then that should explain their appearances in our observations of miracles. On the other hand, if you are a scatter-brained busybody, not only are you less coordinative but also less observant of any coincidences. Many people are of this type.

Thus, given solipsistic mindset and highly attuned body/mind totality, you then need a gift of linguistic manoeuvrability to convince yourself of descriptions of a miracle. A miracle, be it a coordinative miracle of coincidence or an unlikely miracle of physicality, if exists, must be descriptively presentable, i.e. communicable within and without, and this is done narratively as we would have no closed domains of equations within which an event linearly correlates with other events in watertight relationships. That is a contradiction in terms as there would have to be a schematic theory of everything that can account for miracles. But, then miracles would be rationally explainable with causality, and hence would cease to be as such. Without such a scheme we can only depend upon narrative descriptions that are more than simple affirmative statements of make-believe, which are entirely based on trustworthiness of statement makers and end up a sleuth game of psychology. Narrative descriptions of a miracle without depending on any trustworthiness can rely on techniques of wordsmithing or a storyline that resonates with the predictive totality out of the inner self and the self. The former is more of descriptive trickery in which the author goes in and out of the storyline through the switchable sentential subject 'I' of the author, the protagonist or even the narration itself through multiple players. This would derive miracles of a sort, set and change the endgame somewhat miraculously, but like any trickeries allows itself to semantico-syntactical analyses and then easily becomes copiable and ceases to be a miracle. This is more of magical effects when you weave a 4-D storyline out of 1-D compositions. Some fiction writers like Agatha Christie (*The Murder of Roger Ackroyd*), Ian McEwan (*Atonement*), etc. adopt literary techniques to such effects, which can be more refined and elaborated to produce Escher-like effects in fictions by introducing evolving and interweaving imaginations of the author, the reader and the protagonist. We might dismiss such descriptions as advanced literary techniques, but as we can

understand only through descriptions, there might be a case for descriptive miracles, which share greyer and greyer borders with coordinative miracles and physical miracles (if any).

Although you may argue a miracle and the descriptions of a miracle are two different things and should not to be confused. However, when you know no actual miracles or doubt their authenticity anyway, but agree that there is the concept of a miracle regardless of lack of any physical references, the presentation of such a concept and its descriptions are synonymous as they are both nothing but images in mind, which can exist given a meaningful context, be it a scripture, fairy tale or personal experience. If there are competent descriptions, there are miracles at least to the extent of a relevant mental world. Since it disregards any physical references, here its existence can only be challenged by internal inconsistencies. Given lack of physical theories as we have no complete theory of everything with absolute mathematical rigors, such inconsistencies do not arise semantically. Remember our known laws of physics only apply within certain spectrums of coupling constants beyond which are singularities, not to mention essential quantum uncertainty as well as not knowing to what degree our maths is the language of the universe. If they are of syntactical nature, then they can only be bad grammars and easily amenable as no contexts can be complete in a logical sense. Unlike a simplified schematic representation of certain linguistic aspects, our ordinary language is far too rich and complex and is beyond over-simplified logical analyses. Thus, descriptions of miracles can escape semantic and syntactical scrutinises and entrench themselves in our mind. That is why I even touched upon aspects of literary techniques. Aside from the matter of advanced literary techniques of miracle presentation/production, it is only resonating storylines of good old fairy tales that are left to deal with descriptions of miracles.

We can only understand through descriptions. Since schematic descriptions of science cannot apply to miracles as there cannot be any meaningful symbols for referenceless events/objects with no well-defined epistemic boundaries of relationships. Descriptions of a miracle refer to states of mind that desire such a miracle as its own component of various conceptual relationships necessary for interactions towards its wholeness. Thus, moved away from analytical descriptions, descriptions of a miracle are tautologically referring to necessities of a miracle for the beholder to keep balance of itself within net totality of reasonable self. This is why for those who seek miracles coincidences are a better and healthier tool of sanity than delusionary physical miracles, which are for those unhinged. Coincidences are rationally explainable and are a narrative gateway to the

concept of magic that kick-starts fairy tales in which miracles are not of our physical space and time but of narrative space and time, and hence mingle with storylines.

Resonating storylines work by allowing you to create your own world that allows alter egos, which rectify past regrets, readjust the present and predict an ideal future. We are rightly or wrongly fixated in our present through momenta of the past via interactions of deeds and values, which set courses for the future not necessarily desirable. There are things that are still remediable for the better, but there are things that are too late for any changes. A fairy tale resonates with you as it can afford you a future that cannot be envisaged from your present. This is also a miracle of a sort. This is also a philosophical question of reality through imagination and imagination through reality. It can be argued that reality is a creation of mind through interpretations and conceptualizations based on value systems. My so-called 'reality' based on my currently accepted norms of values (e.g. knowledge, intellectual satisfactions, economic welfares, reasonable physical comforts, etc.) may well be completely different from a possible 'reality' under a feudal socio-economic system of values (e.g. honour, shame, heirs, family legacy, strategic marriage, etc.), even given a very similar circumstances, although we have to allow such circumstances are already creations of striven efforts under certain value preferences. At the great Crash of 1929 men fixated with money would commit suicide when lost many millions even if there still left with a few thousands \$, which is more than most people's saving. It is not reality per se but interpretations of reality that drives people into actions of remedy (suicide included). If one is to evaluate reality in terms of net sum of emotional transactions, then a blissed happiness under one system can easily equate a complete disaster under another. An intellectual satisfaction under poverty can easily be turned upside down to a delusionary self-indulgence that invites no jobs, depending on if one's priority is epistemic pursuits or money. A same situation with opposing interpretations. Similarly, a same state of mind called loneliness can be the source of a happiness for some but equally a misery for another. If reality is a creation of mind, and if a fairy tale can resonate with mind towards imaginary reality that draws happier interpretations, then one may prefer this imaginary world of happiness, especially if real reality and imaginary reality are a matter of interpretations when concerned with states of mind.

Historically there are even cases of an imaginary story actually creating a real kingdom. For example, see how a scriptural fairy tale of Christ giving a conceptual foundation for the Middle Ages empires and

kingdoms of the Christendom together with other socio-economic impetuses. To what extents fairy tales played a role of kingdom buildings is a matter of speculations and anthropological inquiries and vary from the Inca Empire to little Muhammadan kingdoms of presumed descendants of the Prophet. However, religions are often tools of power managements, creating alliances, isolations and pretences. The threats of excommunications used to be a great tool of political managements in the Middle Ages Europe. Fairy tales not only resonate with individual minds but also influence psyches of kingdoms, empires and even so-called modern nations. See how the Aryan myth and Shintoism were used to cement nationalistic foundations of war-ready Germany and Japan. In short, our mind not only processes data reactively but is also predictive based on paradigmatic belief structures that reflect psyches, cultures, temperaments, desires, etc., which are extra-sensory parameters. This is where fairy tales contribute in influencing our interpretations of so-called reality. Likewise, in science we process observational data coordinatively based on metaphysical parameters, such as time, space, sequential numbers, etc., where reality of data is as essential as imagination of parametrical axes. Fairy tales are, in this sense, narrative extrapolations of our parametrical reality processors that direct conceptual syntheses, the iroha of predictive mental process, so to speak, that mixes reality and imagination towards a balanced predictive totality.

A good fairy tale thus combines all the basic components of predictive functions such as remedial, retributinal and restititional power of magic that can assume otherwise to any given reality without recourse to physical resources, i.e. ignoring commonsensical laws of physics, so that we may have a possible imaginary outcome contrary to predictive reality ordinarily linear to existing conditions. This is important because predictivity is always a most likely option that naturally also assumes unlikely options as well, among which is one you may unattainably favour. Being predictive means various possible consequences out of various possible realities, real or imaginative. We always have an option that is otherwise to reality as a same reality can be interpreted otherwise. Values are not absolute but only relative once you allow solipsism. It is not the number of followers of a certain value that decides the validity of this value, but how it fits in with an overall picture together with many other values, although this picture will not be available until the end of our history. A good fairy tale is capable of stirring this pot of predictive soup that conjures many different consequences so that tools of interpretation get refined and win over rough and tumble number games. If we are solipsistic but nevertheless have to live with other minds, equally solipsistic or otherwise, together with whom we have to explore

our final picture, then we need a method of interpretation that does not depend on a decidability based on numbers. Fairy tales are a way to drive many different minds towards a collective picture based on a narrative strength. A scriptural authority that coerces religious feelings is not a way forward as we seek not a collective mind but a collective picture. AI of the future may have a collective mind, but biological beings have their strength in variety and creativity, and we work together towards a collective picture that can unite our minds. A fairy tale without a scriptural force only relies on a narrative strength. This is achieved by resonating with the reader's mind, i.e. by being personalised.

A scriptural authority is the strength of a fairy tale based on a number decidability and its social enforceability by persuasion, coercion and stigma, sometimes by punishments as often happened once it becomes a political force. It tries to complement its narrative weakness with a social structure that incorporates the storyline in legal frameworks in terms of blasphemy, etc. and psychologically encourages normative behaviours by use of visible effects such as architectures, imageries, dress cords, stereotypical mannerisms, etc. In short, a scriptural authority aims not for epistemic meanings of a fairy tale but for practical uses of a fairy tale as a social construct. Fairy tales here become tools of power managements as a litmus test of social conformity. On the other hand, a personalised fairy tale is to bring out a balanced whole out of socially and psychologically distorted concoctions of reconstituted whole immersed in artificial and fictitious values of premeditated social constructions.

What was originally simple and untainted natural self is transformed into a social self through value systems of educations, cultures and socio-economic structures. Not only value systems inconsistent and incomplete externally, but also internally there are conceptual mismatches and deficiencies, especially when they become intermingled through multiculturalism, political immaturities, power plays and conflicts of personal vs public. Here some social selves become damaged and discoloured by being moulded into social norms. Unlike a fairy tale of scriptural authority that tries to mould, a fairy tale of narrative resonance is an effective and empathetic participatory fairy tale that represents a predictive totality and, as such, allows you to demould damaged selves by giving you an imaginary space in which you can conceptually manipulate so-called reality. Reality is processed by conceptualization that makes interpretational sense through value systems of socio-economic necessities/conveniences and normative conventions or through metaphysical parameters. An imaginary space is a meta-space that operates on concepts, be them of values or of physicality (this is how quantum-mechanical concepts fascinate us as they seem to border

between commonsensical reality and fantasies, yet within the laws of physics), and allows you to reformulate reality into secondary reality of fantasies, of which primary functions are to restore your untainted natural self through conceptual adjustments. This space, being a secondary space of base concepts, only follows laws of logic that manifest as semantico-syntactical picture rules, not physical laws or value calculi. Concepts are there to allow you to reposition yourself for a better predictive self that transcends mere reality and imagination. You are your own painter of and in this imaginary space. Without laws of physics and constrictive value norms you have a free hand to repaint your self. Unlike scriptural fairy tales fairy tales of resonance do not care for a collective meaning, they are only there to be prescriptive of an ideal self, free from the irretrievable past and the tainted present. This is where you could be just a phenomenological self without any conditionalization. A good fairy tale provides an imaginary real space in which you are the norm of everything, a king of your own kingdom, as it were. Here a solipsistic exit becomes a solipsistic heaven and replaces the so-called real world.

We make realities by processing states/objects through our value systems so that we have structured understandings of our life, which make it predictable and efficient. That is how we construct our society in which we are encouraged/discouraged in certain behaviours, make us dependent on each other, and evaluate and plan for the future through various social commodities such as money, stigma, status, etc. In short power is created by our social needs of following norms of structured interpretations of otherwise phenomenologically meaningless events. Against this phenomenological reality we create an epistemic reality for the necessities/ease of conceptual housekeeping. This is how an object becomes a tool, which is designed and made ad hoc for our uses, and a state becomes a social event, which is organised for human purposes. A strange phenomenological object is thus described as e.g. 'desk', and a biological state of hormonal attractions may be termed 'courting'. However, epistemic dressings are of human makings for human conveniences and may peel off or go out of fashion, demanding realignments. While phenomenological realities are essentially non-conceptual and are subject to interpretations through value systems or metaphysical parameters in case of science, epistemic realities are conceptual and are subject to conceptual schematizations. Problems are thus in and of our makings, in that we sometimes fail to spot conceptual malalignments due to the lack of diligent understandings or even essential incompleteness, of our conceptual paradigms.

This is where fairy tales have an advantage over conventional narratives or quasi-scientific descriptions, in the sense they are out of rigid conceptual frameworks and have a free hand (except bad grammars) in story makings, with its sole purpose of attaining a predictive totality for solipsistic benefits. They are not there to advocate value systems or to confirm righteous virtues of parametrical coordinates. They are there for you to re-establish your self in the reality of an imaginary space and/or in the metaphysics of a real space. Here you can go faster than the speed of light, step over a dimension and/or disregard the inconvenience of the orderly space and time. Miracles are everywhere because fairy tales are products of miraculous imaginations, which are to serve to reunite your solipsistic self through past, present and future. Any misdemeanours forgiven, any inconveniences forgotten, any unlikeliness oversights, and stigmas, judgements and prejudices suspended, you are just your free self as if on your own desert island. Unlike a scientific schema, which ideally has a well-defined domain, the world of a fairy tale only has a loosely connected boundary of multi-faceted and -layered concepts, in which you can redefine and realign concepts without rigid constitutions. If the purpose of a scientific schema is to explain and predict states/events in the world of observable data with use of mathematical correspondences, the purpose of the world of a fairy tale is to allow you to realign your self with inner self so that you have a predictive whole intermediated by a fantastical world that disregards norms of values, commonsensical laws of physics, etc. In short you only have a phenomenological self untainted by values, passages of time, accidental locations, etc., which would have a cleaner and clearer predictive destiny, considering we are unavoidably tainted by our own perceptions of ourselves through incidental value systems. A good fairy tale disconnects you from your incidental value systems and reunites you with your non-incidental inner self.

Then how do you start a good fairy tale ? First and foremost, you need to convince yourself with an impeccable miracle that allows you a detachment from the so-called reality. This is a prerequisite of a good fairy tale and is a connective between a fairy tale and the reality. This is your entry point into a personal fairy tale and makes it possible to be interactive within a fairy tale. A fairy tale is personal and resonant because it is a space where you communicate with your self, and by so doing provides you with an untainted mirror to see the future without clouds of value entanglements. Instead of yourself formed as a consequence of social and physical realities you have a phenomenological self that could have been otherwise. Since the physical reality would not allow you to go back in time, you have an imaginary space that allows you all possible worlds from which you choose one that

resonates with you. A miracle is something that makes possible world alive by connecting you, a physical reality, with possible worlds, a conceptual reality, by virtue of a linguistic essence of coordinative necessities. Miracles here therefore cannot be a physical impossibility, which will disconnect you from any coordinative realities. A miracle that takes you into a fairy tale is thus a miracle of coincidence, which is a coordinative possibility, an actual probability with a numerical value, no matter how small it may be. You are at the centre of your rational coordinate and are able to measure such a probability, which will be able to weave a fairy tale into your possible worlds of coordinative realities. This is how a fairy tale can be adopted into your coordinative realities. If you replace 'you' as an individual person at the centre of your coordinate with collective or abstract 'you' or '0' at the centre of a chosen mathematical coordinate such as Hilbert space, then this is how physics is woven into coordinative realities coming up with parallel universes, multiverses, the 11th dimension, etc., just as fictitious or real as our fairy tales.

'God' refers to an intrinsic nature of our coordinative mind that keeps asking where, who, what, when and how. Scriptural fairy tales are lazy fairy tales in which instead of asking such questions with you as a coordinative centre they are posed as givens in a storyline, where questions and answers are tautological as the coordinate is spun out without an explicit centre and have to be taken for granted as a centreless coordinate centred around an implicit lattice of 'God' that demands a faith instead of 'measurements' as it were. Here you are not the centre of your coordinate from which relevancies are worked out. Instead you are a receptacle of this lattice by virtue of faith and are expected to accept any givens spun out of the mechanical lattice that defines everything including yourself in terms of omnipresent absolute and abstract will of 'God' as arbitrary definiens. There cannot be any resonance between you and 'God' as you cannot interact with an absolute lattice. This lack of flexibility was the cause of the downfall of 'God', as faith is contraindicative of intelligence, which makes us humans of freewill. Without coordinative resonance it is basically one-way relationship between us and essentially unknown/unknowable something named 'God'. Such a relationship, especially when used as a tool of institutional governance, is workable only if and so long as this institution is socio-economically viable, as the relationship has to be maintained tangibly. Even faith expects paybacks, positive or negative, in order to be visible. On the other hand, if it can afford to be invisible, then we have no ways of knowing how faith is working or if it is working properly. Only in a resonating relationship we can do away with institutions and maintain

dynamism of coordinative relevancies that intellectually make it worthwhile to indulge in fairy tales.

We should touch upon the meanings and uses of fairy tales in the sense of 'skazki (folklore)' and how they resonate with our contemporary mind. They come from days when there were little entertainments, when darkness prevailed upon villages and dwellings as soon as daylight is over and when religious institutions intruded into personal life as if their given right. There are many fairy tales of this type from medieval rural Europe, most famously from Slavic traditions of Baba Yaga, from Germanic forests as of the Grimm's and from salon pastimes of court storytelling, etc. As they become a literary genre of fashion, fairy tales were imported from the Levant (in the form of 'One thousand and one nights' in many versions), India (thanks to British Raj), Japan (remember Lafcadio Hearn), etc., and even turned into a respectable literary form (typically Andersen, but also seen in Ruskin, Wilde, Kipling, etc.). There are a few interesting aspects to observe. Firstly, there is an element of antithesis to invariant scriptural fairy tales of little imaginations. They conjure more of pre-Christen tribal Europe as if pining for freedom of mind and physical savagery. See how many of the Grimm stories are cruel, macabre and morbid. But there is a formulaic resonance despite vast variety of stories in the form of 'the good (with the help of magic) > the evil'. The good comes in the forms of princess, little girl, genie, etc. and the evil in the forms of stepmother, witch, ogre, etc., and the former almost always win over the latter, although there are some interesting exceptions of sad ending (maybe for theatrical aftereffects of unsaid implications). This is inevitably a consequence of fairy tales being children's stories, which aim for elements of moral teachings, combined with necessities of going along with traditional religious status quo. Savageries are a result of trying to make stories eye-catching as storytellers had to please the bored village audience with tortures, bloodbaths and mutilations, etc. The evil is usually pictured stronger, with trickeries and sorceries, but the good is miraculously rescued by the power of magic, which is an emotional salvation for the poor under the reign of more or less autocratic and unfair social structures across most of Europe and the world then. Thus, fairy tales in the sense of folklore were not only amusements for children and uneducated villagers but also psychological salvations for impoverished, socially deprived and oppressed populations, especially in Slavic nations, a century behind the western half of Europe. This therefore shows a resonance of social justice as reflected in the mind of the rural poor and is not a coincidence that folklores attracted attentions and interests from 19th century onwards with advent of industrialization and urbanization, together with emancipation

movements. The fashion of collected folklores evolved into a serious genre of literary fairy tales with the success of Andersen, who span fairy tales around his personal experiences of disappointed love (as seen in 'Snow Queen' inspired by Jenny Lind, of jealousy ('The Ice-Maiden'), of social injustice ('The Little Match Girl'), etc. or even about himself ('The Cripple'). Interestingly in a similar vein there was also a belated trend of utilising folk music in classical compositions (Liszt, Brahms, Kodály, Dvořák, Bartók, Vaughan Williams, etc.), but the fashion of fairy tales continues to our days with the like of Potter, Lewis, Tolkien, Rowling, etc., helped by visual effects, but Andersen's originality of utilizing personal resonance of events and emotions into story creations in terms of literary ingenuity and variety is unsurpassed. Contemporary monetary successes largely owe to digital gadgetries and special effects, not necessarily to creativity. I also observe that creativity (artistic or otherwise) is often borne out of flustered male ego and rarely comes out of a happy marriage, which only produces mutual distraction and brats. It is not a coincidence the best of artistic and scientific achievements disproportionately came out of bachelor men.

The literary fairy tales owe to the popularity of folklores. The like of the Iliad and the Odyssey started as folklores told by travelling storytellers, figuratively represented by the non-existent Homer. Over the centuries of being repeatedly sang and cited folklores acquired a literary styled completeness and gradual consistency of storylines, which were eventually texturized and standardized through library scholars (primarily of Alexandria), taking centuries. Here tribal identities represented by gods, their interactions and interrelations expressed in terms of human emotion-like connectives and primordial attempts to explain natural phenomena with the help of magic, culminates in our literary version of now classic Iliad and Odyssey. There are many parallel examples of folklores turning into a literary masterpiece. The Tale of the Heike is folklores sang by wandering blind lute player-priests in 13th century Japan (as quoted in the famous ghost story 'Earless Hoichi' by Lafcadio Hearn) that became a written literary work of epic war chronicles of 12th century Genji-Heike civil struggles seen with the eye of Buddhist anicca, where two early samurai clans' contrasting strategies produce the success of one (Genji cavalry army of norther samurai) and the disaster of the other (Heike naval force of western samurai), with the former's disdain of aristocratic status quo contrasting with the latter's willing assimilation into the existing aristocratic hierarchy. The former eventually becomes the founding dynasty of samurai-based feudal system lasting into late 19th century, while the latter often finding themselves impoverished but proud yeomanry commoners hiding away in mountains and distant valleys.

What resonates is Heike's rise into upper aristocracy forgetting their humble soldiery origin that immediately invites their downfalls seems to illustrate the teachings of Buddhism, ups and downs of life all for nothing, and there is no solidity to existence. Even the victorious Genji is plagued with family in-fights and is eventually taken over by a Heike branch that cooperated with Genji. This is a religious sentiment of anicca that recommends tranquillity of mind by moving away from unnecessary toils, physical and mental, for vanity and luxury. This would have resonated in war-tired minds of medieval folks and contributed to make those folklores into a literary masterpiece.

A good folklore resonates within itself with basic ingredients of raw emotions exacerbated by power and identities neutralised into happiness or hope by imagination with the help of magic. Such a resonance allows a folklore to transform into a literary fairy tale by giving emotions conceptual frameworks of a relatable space in which they are realigned alongside paradigmatic ideas, be it a religious sentiment, a naïve humanism or even a primitive nationalism, etc. If this internal resonance coincides with a larger sentiment of time and place, then fairy tales acquire pre-eminence that overrides their inferior status as a literary work. Neither Iliad and Odyssey nor Tale of the Heike would have been classical masterpieces had they been mere war chronicles, of which there are many. First and foremost, they must be entertaining as befit for storytellers' job, but it is the way they resonate within and with wider mind that make them works of art. For most of listeners and readers of folklores life is harsh and unfair if you are at or towards the bottom of social hierarchy. Anicca is a way out of this in terms of a sentiment of higher viewpoint, but then you do need some psychological trainings and intellectual attitudes. Good fairy tales provide an easier solution, in that they take you to an imaginary world in which magic works as equaliser for the powerless, the innocent and the good, or even a guilty conscience in their struggles against evil powers and seductive traps. Here imaginations are a reality for a mind seeking redemptions as a mind is a conceptual abode of all things including interpretations of so-called reality. Besides, while you are in an imaginary world, that is your reality, as much as in your dreams you would not know of dreams. Some people can even discipline themselves never to wake up. Whether you go deep or stay shallow, in your imaginary world of a fairy tale you see yourself in imaginary setups where you can excise your magic powers. This is how a good fairy tale hits the cord of empathy with a reality with you as participant halfway between the reality of imagination and the imagination of reality.

However, instead of readymade fairy tales you can make your own fairy tale that is guaranteed to hit the cord of empathy with a reality. That is, instead of being a passive off-chance reader of a fairy tale you have your own fairy tale in which you actively participate in a dynamic storyline with a predictive anticipation. The most critical ingredient in this scenario is a 'miracle', which catalyses you in your own story as participant. We are coordinative thinkers by essence. In the coordinate is always ourselves in the centre although necessities of communication force us to abstract ourselves as a centre as the centre. In this communicative coordinate we assume ourselves as more or less identical so that relevancies measured from the centre are indeed more or less identical and make sense in our communications. This is how concepts are more or less identical but have shades of difference depending upon the speaker's epistemic depth and width. It is ourselves as such that can turn a coincidence into a miracle without breaking laws of physics. An extremely low probability acquires a status of a centre of our coordinate by virtue of consciousness that collapses probabilities into a reality. We mostly live in a world of more or less identical coordinate, which is a commonsensical world of day-to-day communications where certain scientific paradigms and socio-economic value systems are taken for granted, and their domain is hopefully progressively getting wider and deeper.

However, although we assume we as a centre of this coordinate are more or less the same, it is 'I' that is the centre of my coordinate, which is more or less identical with the commonsensical coordinate. 'I' as the coordinative centre has a consciousness, whereas the commonsensical coordinate only has an assumed consciousness that is already incorporated into a paradigmatically accepted knowledge, where there are realities of commonsensical assumptions. 'My' personal consciousness, although fully aware of commonsensical assumptions, is more keenly aware of relevancies from a more personal perspective. An event of probability thus acquires extra layers of personal probabilities, which can take a probability into a realm of 'miracle' without breaking laws of physics. If you start a fairy tale with a miracle against laws of physics, the story is merely a children's story without resonances, whereas a fairy tale of a 'miracle' is one you can participate as interactive player and requires no audience. Our modern fairy tales of religion are ones that interact individually, and dynamically evolve into a halfway world of imagination/reality.

7. Analysis of 'Fairy Tale'

<Rationality of irrationals>

My 'fairy tale' is not intended as an exhibitionistic psychoanalysis of myself. This is more of a self-examination regarding my own philosophical belief in rationality. I am a 99% rationalist in that there is a physical world independent of my cognitions, with mathematically coherent, describable laws of physics, which may or may not be within full human reaches, but nevertheless physicality means logical evolutions of parts towards something more than those parts, and that dynamics of such evolutions is partly or wholly observable through our cognitions, conceptual reconstructions and logical necessities. We should be able not only to extrapolate a mechanism of such evolutions but also utilize it through our engineering. I do not believe in God above describability or miracles that supersede physical laws. Our consciousness or even that of the universe as of a quantum observer is a consequence of things that constitute us. Whatever that makes up the universe, if it has extra-physical aspects, spew out a describable mechanism that does not intercede physical laws. We are not the cognitive centre of the universe nor does the universe needs us in order to exist.

I find it interesting to see my mind seeks a solace in irrationality firstly of such rationality not being able to sustain its claims, secondly of the existence of something supra-logical, extra-physical that defies any rational descriptions. This may be of a psychological origin as it is soothing to give up any intellectual efforts, but it worries me to think, be it psychological or physical, that we have something not rationally founded to have such an impact on our thought processes. We give probabilistic values to coincidences as us as the centre of our coordinate that approximately consists in Newtonian time and space (being impractical to apply Feynman integral calculus to daily titbits) as well as working out a commutable and pragmatic framework to treat probabilities without disruptions to coherence. All probable worlds stand on this world that adheres to known laws of space and time, which forbid miracles, God and supernatural power.

Nevertheless, my fairy tale, which 1% of me not only believes but also 99% of my mental welfare depends, cannot dispense with the most improbable world of Magic Power. I am trying to work out how my rationality relates to my irrationality through this work. A workable fairy tale needs psychological remedies as well as supernatural fantasies. I can easily recognize the former in the shapes of various characters that reflect

actual personalities and are landscaped in atoned relational manners, in which they are more comfortable and compensated for any injuries they suffered in relation to myself and misfortunes. In the fairy tale they have idealized situations and roles embellished by Magic Power endorsed in the hierarchical structure. To the extent they are psychologically accountable, they are no mysteries and have narrative rationality. It is the magic power endowed in the two characters (one actual and another imaginative) that makes the fairy tale dynamically self-adjusting (to its enshrined *raison d'etre* of happy ending) and connectable to me and the empathic audience of this world.

Magic Power that is irrational and devoid not only of physical justifications but also of narrative rationality comes from the collapse of coordinative thought processes. All our rational thought processes and descriptions are essentially coordinative with metaphysical axes such as time and space, by which we measure relevancies from us as the centre of this coordinate. Any centres can be the centre, and that makes this coordinate commutative, with approximate likeness for relevancies making them communicative. However, in attempting to describe the relationship between the self and the inner self this coordinative framework breaks down because they can both be the centre of coordinate, and any relevancies are non-coordinative with no axes of parameters between them. Nevertheless, our narratives remain superficially coordinative in order to make any descriptive sense. This is where 'Magic Power' burrows itself in a narrative to perform a useful task of connecting relevancies without coordinative axes. Here the self and the inner self are connected with the former producing narrative characters for psychological recompenses, and the latter giving flesh and bones to such characters in order to make structural sense of narrative storyline. 'Magic Power' thus connects the self with the inner self in terms of a structure that represents the dynamic inner world of our self. 'Magic Power' per se reflects no physical realities, but collectively affects the world as much as mind/body duality subtly influences our world as we create our real world through concepts. 'Magic Power' here functions as a supra-logical connective and gives the self/inner self conjunctive strength as a conceptual identifier that results in more cohesive and stronger narrative structures.

There is an awkward similarity in quantum physics that tries to deal with events of essentially non-coordinative states (the uncertainty) that, despite being non-coordinative, can only be presented coordinatively (Hilbert space) in order to be understandable. Here the collapse of wave function invokes all possible worlds and/or parallel universes through probabilities

that essentially defy hierarchical causalities. It is coordinative presentations of essentially non-coordinative events that invoke such counter-intuitive consequences. Probabilities also demand the observer as the centre of their numerical relevancies, which ultimately seem to call for the anthropic principle and the consciousness of the universe. The respectable science of entanglement and non-locality, combined with coordinative inability to deal with probabilities, acquires itself an almost religious aura. This is also 'Magic Power' of conceptual deficiencies through pretended scientific methods that cannot graduate from coordinative processes.

The meaning of someone who purports to be rational believing in a fairy tale is philosophically interesting. It is in essence synonymous with a materialist (ideally also a scientist) believing in a religion. But of course, we have many two-sword fencers, especially if you allow quasi-sciences and quasi-religions, which merely accept sciences and religions as utilitarian knowledge. Most non-philosophical, working scientists and religious believers are reasonably pragmatic to accommodate grey cross-borders, partly since we have no complete knowledge in science or in religion. If being religious means not denying something non-material, then in fact many scientists including Einstein (with his quote of 'the old one') and quantum founders ('observer', 'conscious universe', etc.) can also said to be religious. What they object would be an interceding relationship between humans and whatever this something. However, once you allow this something, then it is not a tall order this something worms its way into a human relationship since we do not precisely know what we, body/mind composite, are. Setting aside this as a scientific problem that can be addressed by more matured science one day, and taking a side with idealistic interpretation it is contradictory to be rational and irrational, and it is especially ridiculous to have a faith in scientific knowledge and also truly to believe in a magical fairy tale, even allowing for our lack of complete knowledge of anything and psychological make-up of a belief. Psychology might explain motives of needing something religious, but once in the depth of the belief itself where irrational belief and rational knowledge become intermingled as subjectivity and objectivity come to have a blurred border in the concept of the self/inner self, there is no frame of reference. It is not psychology that allows rationality and irrationality to coexist, but that the supposedly rational science of psychology is irrationally founded on the dichotomy of body/mind that cannot itself be located in a coordinate common to both as they mutually define themselves.

Without a reference frame a supernatural rationally exists since objectivity and subjectivity are transmutable in an entity that cannot fix its point of observation. 'I' is such an object. A same 'I' is usually a composite 'I' of subjectivity and objectivity because the sentential subject of I is ubiquitously everywhere in my thought processes, with differing degrees of both subjectivity and objectivity. I might be stating a subjective opinion in the guise of an observer of myself or I might be making an observational statement seen from the phenomenological I, there is no way to make narrative distinctions without falling into the liar's paradox. I am using a language as a tool of representation of the world, and in doing so I am myself a tool of the language and thus part of the world, not master of the world. A descriptive tool cannot objectively describe itself as a tool, because an act of description is itself subjective. Here lies the rationality of a supernatural when I perceive a supernatural through myself as subjectivity blends with objectivity. What is objectively ridiculous is subjectively rational when objectivity is subjectified by narrative mutation of I without a reference frame.

This narrative eccentricity is mitigated in more objective scientific statements as metaphysical bases of coordinates are more sharable due to their descriptive viscosity of wider intuitive appeals based on supra-physical dimensions of time, space and spacetime as well as logico-mathematical objectivity of maths as the language of the universe, although one can question if they are genuinely parametrical or objective, that is more a domain of philosophy and may not be humanly knowable. This metaphysical stickiness allows science a commutative foundation that gives us an illusion that our science is universally objective and thus should be a model for narrative descriptions, making them more objective by adopting more scientific information. However, scientific descriptions and their accuracy and predictability we are so fond of have their associated costs in terms of units of measurements and expendable energy costs of engineering implementability. As science evolves measurement methodology changes with lower associated costs. This process ends only with human knowability, and we should not turn our science into a theology by mistaking the current measurement methodology and its costs as a sign of something absolute in our epistemic ability. Measurements are accurate not by itself but only as much as their associable costs and strength of approximations. Our biological existence and consciousness may turn out more of a hindrance that essentially entangles our knowability with our biological faculties. Even our maths may turn out not the language of the universe but rather the biologically biased language of the universe biologically so conceived. If so, as much as our rocket of chemical combustion and its energy costs worked out in

terms of Newtonian approximations do not epitomise our science, we can only claim our genuine achievement by contributing towards non-biological knowability with its wider epistemic spectrum. Uses of more and more scientific knowledge in our narrative descriptions do not turn narratives into a science nor make them more objective. While scientific knowledge is coordinative based on metaphysical assumptions, narrative descriptions are tautologies between the self and the inner self.

The strictly objective 'I', if used in a sentence such as 'I think . . .', then immediately the question of how do I know what 'I' thinks arises as it can be rephrased as 'I think 'I' think . . .'. It is thus that reasonably objective scientific statements coexist with reasonably subjective belief in a magic kingdom when I am halfway between objectivity and subjectivity as we all are. My knowledge of physics does not preclude my belief in a fairy tale and its supernatural not because of psychological make-ups but because I am a composite 'I' of subjectivity and objectivity that I need for my conceptual thought processes to accommodate both coordinative measurements and narrative fantasies, where the accuracy of the former is fashioned by the philosophical diversities brought about by the latter, turning into theories, conjectures and narratives. We have neither the theory of everything nor the bona fide language of the universe. We only have human perspectives best of which may come close to the theory of almost everything or the quasi-language of the universe with the help of AI that gives us the spectrum of our objectivity and subjectivity for best symbiosis with AI for the benefits of human conceptual creativities and measurements interpretations.

Coherent in the structure of a fairy tale there coexists rationality and irrationality, without either of which our conceptual thoughts face the brick wall of uncreativity. What is rational is appearances of semantically bound states within coordinative axes of metaphysical parameter, while what is irrational is that parameters themselves are not bound states and cannot be rationally explained, with the consequence that we have semantic stocks of free float states. They would intellectually appear as if freely floating so long as narratively deployed correctly (grammatically). This is made possible by tautological relationships between the self and the inner self that mirror rationality and irrationality in such a way the latter is needed by the former but cannot be rationally explained within the former. It is here we find 'magic power' that is irrationally rational and rationally irrational and creates havocs in the coordinatively ordered world of concepts. Remember parallel universes come to exist out of non-coordinative probabilities. They exist conceptually, and as long as linear one-one correspondences are ruled out

because we can only observe collapsed realities, we are none the wiser as to physical realities of any possible worlds. Here contradictions are not quantitatively measurable and conceptually authorise 'magic power' a meaning that is narratively valid, but experimentally useless. Aside from quantum justifications the same but wider interpretations apply to any magic formulae as rationality cannot rationally explain itself.

Our mind/body duality exists in the physically real world as well as in the world of language, which together form conceptual thoughts and of which the former is referents and is a necessary part of the latter. The latter provides linguistic materials that consist of referents of reality as well as various causalities of reality and values. Given multiple referents there are always causalities or higher order causalities that are more than the number of referents as our perception of reality is of multi-dimensions and multi-faceted. We have causalities that are biological, chemical, physical, social, economic, etc. depending upon applicable schema, theories and speculations. Even causalities of reality have many layers, such as Newtonian, Einsteinian and quantum-mechanical, validities of which also depend on theoretical consistency and completeness (which is strictly speaking pending) as well as descriptive convenience, engineering applicability and even availability of mathematical tools. Referents are necessary, whereas causalities are sufficient, to form well-formed and balanced conceptual worlds. Since we do not have any complete and consistent frame of reference, all we have is mixtures of reality and fantasies of various degrees. Sometimes even the most reality biased conceptual world ends up a bit of fantasy in the absence of real causality, e.g. parallel universes, all possible worlds, nonlocality, etc. But the most interesting causality is that between the self and the inner self, which both refer to the sentential subject 'I' in narrative descriptions. The referent of the concepts 'the self' and 'the inner self' is identically 'I' that transmutes between subjectivity and objectivity in spectrum-like representations of thought formations. I am everywhere in my thoughts disguised as 'the self', 'the inner self', objective 'I', subjective 'I', etc. like thematic recapitulations in order to weave out a musical essence out of semantic variations. The object referred to by 'the self' or 'the inner self' is invisible like an eye that cannot see itself but feels itself by changing viewpoints and fields of vision. The self/inner self tautologically relate in order to insulate itself in the arguments of rational/irrational so that their referent 'I' is neither real nor causal, but a strange object of linguistic necessity. The self and the inner self permeate across entire thought processes conveniently referring to each other as the composite 'I' of objectivity and subjectivity. Referred to but invisible, this is something that can only be represented by thoughts themselves. By tautologically

referring to each other they evade the necessity of being either an object of reality or a causality. The two concepts together metamorphose into an encompassing 'I' that is larger than either or both together because it connects 'the self' and 'the inner self' in a way neither contradicts the other and both become semantically enriched by referring to each other, while physically referring to a same object.

This metamorphosis into the encompassing 'I' produces a linguistic magic of the predictive whole, which is larger than the self + the inner self and explains psychosomatic interactions. The self is the descriptive centre of analytic relevancies and is itself part of the coordinative world. Whereas the inner self of daemon is the phenomenological world of part = whole, with no measurable relevancies of coordinative descriptions. They are tautologically related as referring to an identical 'I', but this perspective of tautology allows a fuller whole that is predictive of the self by means of the inner self, which make sense of analytic relevancies provided by the coordinative descriptions. The inner self is the guidance system of the self as it were. Together they lead their whole into a futuristic direction. Neither the self nor the inner self is a given whole. They come as spectra of various combinations with degrees of insufficiencies. Given full capacities on both, the self provides as much coordinative relevancies as possible, and the inner self gives directional uses for such relevancies, resulting in a whole that bears temporal completeness. It is not that the self and the inner self together comprise a composite whole but that this composite whole is larger the two together in the sense that it is a predictive whole that goes beyond a plane coordinate into a future coordinate, making a whole a fuller whole of direction. It is here the mind/body duality expresses itself as psychosomatic interactions of power that is not explainable by either of body or mind.

The inner self has no analytic contents but contents of the self. They are analytically tautological, but synthetically directional with the inner self giving analytic contents contextual meanings, which are predictive. The duality may be analytically expressed as mind+body where + only has an arithmetic meaning, but mind/body is a predictive whole that describes itself extra-coordinatively that culminates in a phenomenological whole whose meaning has to be explored through without coordinative descriptions. The world of the self from coordinative perspectives produces many quasi- or even pseudo-scientific descriptions, based on various axes of time, space, spacetime, social, ethical values, etc. but the predictive momenta of the inner self that gives rise to a fuller self goes beyond a purely physical confines of time and space. 'Magic power' is a

conceptual power of daemon not always containable in analytically decipherable physical domains. The whole that is larger than the sum of parts ($(x) > x$) is a predictive whole of extra-physical dimension arisen from the directional self led by the inner self. We find an analogy in a photon assigned with c by a coordinative observer compared with a photon with no time element seen from itself. The same photon is a duality of the descriptively inner self that experiences neither space (distance) nor time (speed) and the coordinative self that is a physical constant in the coordinate of spacetime and energy. The observer defines c as he is himself intrinsically coordinative and make sense of his world by the directional whole of the descriptive duality of photon, which gives coordinative meaning to phenomenological chaos. In another word c is a predictive property of a photon from our epistemic necessity to describe a photon, which is by itself non-coordinative. A wave/particle that is massless at rest has ' c ', which is its speed in vacuum and is assigned a numerical value c in km and s in order to make a descriptive sense in the universe of human consciousness. The descriptively meaningless ' c ' of the subjective photon with no time recognition within and therefore intrinsically alien to any notion of motion within and without gives rise to c of a numerical value through our construction of spacetime in which physicality of a photon is mathematically translated into language of our conscious universe so constructed of which we are also part. Thus, the objective photon may have a different value in a different universe as we know not of any universality derivable from our consciousness. The composite photon of reality is thus a predictive whole comprised of the subjective and objective photon through our consciousness that happens to give rise to a particular c . ' c ' is tautologically c as they both refers to an identical photon, which is however a real phenomenological photon of the inner self leading a descriptive photon of the self with measurements so defined through the universe of human consciousness.

What can be said of a larger whole in terms of a predictive whole derived from the predictive momenta of the inner self can also said of space itself, which can be subjective as well as objective. We have a metric space of objectivity that applies to physicality of variously formulated realities as can be seen in classical and non-classical physics. We also have a conceptual space of subjectivity that may include various versions of metric space when so directed but can also be non-coordinative in dealing with objects of non-spatial orientations such as values, linguistic objects, logico-mathematical relationships, etc. These two spaces are, however, not necessarily clearly delineated as objectivity and subjectivity transmute into each other in our sentential subject 'I'. Sometimes it is even necessary to be in subjective space in order to

discuss objective space as objective space can only be formulated through metaphysical parameters. This narrative in and out of subjectivity and objectivity as well as intermingled spaces of concepts and realities are our sources of fairy tales and magic powers. It is here we narrate of power in conceptual space as if working in a metric space, giving rise to a magical narrative of imagination. However, we learnt that a fairy tale starts off best with a miracle so that we are comfortably lain in conceptual space, although imaginations are better enhanced in a metric space. Otherwise we end up doing philosophy instead of reading a fantastical fairy tale. This miracle is more realistic if started off as a coordinative event of the self overseeing unlikely probabilities, but nevertheless probabilities of space and time. A realistic miracle is also more convincing, leading to psychosomatic benefits of the inner self.

In the same vein of thought 'The Lady with an Ermine', in which the inner self (daemon) is thought symbolised by the ermine that describes the lady's self through symbolic representations as can be seen in the bestiary of medieval beliefs, encompasses two worlds comprised of a symbolic world in which the ermine is a key to codes of the bestiary and a pictorially real world of the lady and the ermine. Pictorially the lady may be holding the ermine, but symbolically the ermine is doubling the lady in assumed virtues (purity in this case). The accomplishment of Leonardo is the lady and the ermine not only have an aesthetically commutative likeness but mutually complement as a larger cohesive totality of character and appearance. The lady and the ermine together describe not only of this world but also a predictive whole as envisaged by Leonardo. I do not know if Leonardo with his scientific mind really believed in his bestiary that ascribes purity to an ermine. However, more insightfully one should notice the uncanny resemblance between the lady and the ermine, not only of appearance but also of characteristic. The lady is a mistress of Ludovico Sforza and as such a taciturn social climber living on her wits and fighting off her rivals in her teens, while the ermine is a vicious predator capable of killing much larger animals. Unlike Mona Lisa of his lifelong attachment this work was more of a one-off commission by his employer Ludovico, maybe a show-off of his youthful mistress at her then prime of the mid-teen years. The ermine chosen as a pet in the guise of bestiary characterization may have been more of Leonardo's way of saying this woman's true self seen through by Leonardo's sharp observation, an ermine not of the bestiary but of nature, a 'little thief' of ferret. In fact, this ermine is too fat and big to survive in nature. I know of no other works of Leonardo in which natural shape and size is so disfigured to the extent of unnaturalness. Leonardo is talented enough to utilize a genuine body size to fit into any dimensions of his

painting rather than to exaggerate its size to fit in his painting. The bestiary is merely a camouflage to placate his patron. This pregnant woman of 16-7 years old is too young to have developed an interesting self or inner self for Leonardo to engage as an artistic subject like Mona Lisa. She is just a young girl who became a plaything of a powerful Renaissance warlord. Leonardo is more painting the captured and fattened ermine than the lady who has no tract of human depth other than primordial female instincts and managed to have a little calculative mind to utilize herself in order to lead a plain long life, which neither her patron Ludovico nor his arch-rival Cesare Borgia managed in this most turbulent period of Italian history. Thus, this interesting portrait tells us 'daemon' coming out of the woman's self, painted as an ermine of the bestiary but intended as a cunning oversized ferret. Here Leonardo's job and artistic honesty were both satisfied by making use of the myth of the bestiary by making both his patron and himself happy with pretty youthful look of his mistress on one hand and with tamed predatory presence of fat ferret on the other. Such is a tact needed to survive the raw world of power, ambitions and violence even for the calibre of Leonardo's talent. Talking about 'daemon' through human consciousness we have a pictorial daemon of prima facie impression (ermine) and a Leonardo's interpretational daemon of consciousness (ferret). Even in the case of the very sentential subject 'I' the inner self may transmute through social consciousness as it interacts with the self. The self and the inner self may exist as if independent, but they are continuously interacting with each other, creating different levels of themselves and interactions, and thus psychosomatic interactions of self-propelled level-ups or-downs. The ermine is the daemon of both the lady and Leonardo. To label the ermine as the daemon of the lady is too naïve and simplistic. The ermine as a pictorial symbol is superficially the daemon of the lady through the bestiary, but also of Leonardo through his artistic intentions and also of us, the audience, through our interpretations. This applies to any 'fairy tales', in which there are daemon of the story, of the author and of the reader, thus giving a daemon potentially three shadows, making it literally much subtler than the devil with no shadow.

Adopting a fairy tale as a religion is superior to the other way around because it can be dynamic and interactive. A religion as a fairy tale is a given. It cannot be changed at will as its authority is based on its being a common property to be shared by the flock alongside various rules, social orders and psychological welfares that originate from its being a sharable organization. Whereas a fairy tale as a religion is a private property that exists to exonerate and redeem its author from the shortcomings of reality. Our so-called reality is a fiction of human values that

coincidentally and tautologically materialised in a certain fashion. It could have been otherwise in many ways. That is how we enjoy literary fictions, which indicate possible worlds, had we adopted different values and created altogether disparate world orders.

8. Aesthetics of Religion

<Belief and human values>

An institutional religion concerns aesthetics as outward pretences of its authority that borrows the various forms of art, such as architecture, music, paintings, etc. alongside ceremonial gestures to emphasize a certain atmosphere of austerity and gravity, which in turn help the religion to assert its pretence of power. Believers are induced to flock to a religion because it thus can claim a certain place in our power structure. Without the social status apparent in its aesthetical appearances, people are less likely to be impressed and persuaded to be part of its institutional settings, inviting its eventual demise. Institutions, aesthetical appearances and followers form a triangulation of power dynamics, and an institutional religion has an ostentatious need to display its social relevancies through art forms. Art forms evolved hand in hand with such religious needs as can be seen e.g. in style changes in architecture, music, paintings, etc. depending upon the social relevancies of a religion in wider contexts of political economy. When a religion was at its socio-economic height of hegemony, we had Gothic architecture to show off grandeur in spatial scale, pious chanting music and iconographic paintings of saints. They then acquire more liberal touches as a religion becomes less aloof to accommodate human elements of ancient achievements of less dogmatic eras, resuscitated by trades with the Arabic world, consequently Gothic giving way to Renaissance style, Gregorian chant to the Ars nova, stylized paintings to more natural and dynamic expressions and movements, reflecting secularizing trends in religion, which eventually leads onto Protestant movements of anti-establishment. Similarly, authoritative and stylised exoteric-esoteric Buddhism moves onto faith-orientated Pure Land Buddhism to accommodate less intellectual working population reflecting the shifting power structure from priests/aristocratic administrators to soldiers/warlords, with its various art forms also start catering for tastes of the wider power base, ranging from colourful screen paintings to tea ceremony. Anthropological studies of other religions also reveal the inevitable humanization of initial institutional rigidity, which, without such flexibilities, cannot withstand internal and external pressures of social changes. Now in contemporary fashion religions are more or less irrelevant not only to art forms but also to socio-economic values in general as they hold little tangible power in our society, not to mention that art forms themselves do not have unlimited evolutionary capacity. Art forms either adopt the prevailing power structure or adapt to rising

anti-establishment elements and avail themselves to more freedom of expressions in various degrees.

In short, a belief is a stage where human values are assimilated more towards a social structure in favour of political coherence. A belief encapsulates values to harmonise so that they are bound within this necessity of limiting each other instead of freely swimming around in all directions. Values can be in a state of plasma in which they are free to explore a direction of their own, thus making each its own art, and often ending up with quasi-contradictions for beholders of values, like a misanthrope's love of music. A belief rightly or wrongly harnesses values and turn them into an inner product space of vectors as it were. It is therefore constrictive and is more powerful by giving values directional impetus. Values that formed a hundred hippy arts are bundled into a rope of strength and endurance, which may be inferior in aesthetical terms but can leave its mark on our cultural, historical legacy. It is here various schools of belief flower at the expense of directionless but richer creativities. In return for adopting styles, tools and purpose of a school lessor creativities secure a place in a movement of social coherence, may even acquire a better financial return for being a part of something more visible and appreciative. Soviet arts, impressionist arts, hanga prints, pop-rock-punk music (assuming they are an art, rather than commercialized noise), etc. are examples of a belief that plays a part in organizing values and giving a direction to values, which otherwise might have fizzled out. Religions used to be such beliefs, but are today largely irrelevant to our values due to institutional declines. Like any beliefs, they prosper only within domains of space and time as much as our mind enjoys varieties and freedom of choice. The world of beliefs is competitive with rivals, combined with our fatigue prone mind, up and coming trends and new tools.

A belief derives its strength in the multiplicity of minds that follow it. The less of followers, the weaker a belief is deemed to be. A belief and a mind are in a love and hate relationship as a belief empowers a mind with a herd mentality and gives some order to various, even conflicting, values. Those who are lowly in individualistic mind and creativity do well if endowed with a herd manipulative capacity, like our politicians. On the other hand, this convenience of housekeeping of free-range individuals constricts freedom of choices and enjoyments of creativity. It is often independently minded individuals who are more creative and who probably contributes more to our cultural and intellectual achievements. Here it is liberal and democratic traditions that cater for better compromises between constricted harmony and creative disharmony.

Belief influenced social systems of, say, pseudo-communism or nationalism in guise of personal greed a la Xi and Putin suppress individual minds superficially in favour of official belief systems. They are, however, inferior to liberal and democratic systems in activating and encouraging creativities of various kinds that include intellectual creativities. It is this last item that plays a decisive role in physical conflicts between divided societies by providing superior engineering and science, once dragged into doldrums. It is not an ideology that decided a victory for conflicts of axis vs allies, but relative tolerance for freer and creative minds that supported military infrastructures and technologies. It is often said that the axis had better soldiers (Japan) and officers (Germany), but by far best generals were always American, except maybe Zhukov. Generals matter because they are planners of tactics and strategies. At Russo-Japanese war (1904-05) Japan had good generals (except Nogi) who came out of the chaos of Meiji Revolution and had experiences of real wars without burdens of military academy labels and textbook teachings. From Togo who annihilated the entire Russian navy to Tojo who did not even know how to shoot himself it took only a few generations of label striven, exam-based military trainings. At WW II Japan invariably had worst possible generals who were always so predictable within the textbook framework and hierarchical mindset. Even Yamamoto (of Pearl Harbour fame) was deemed so mediocre (as proved by the continuous diminution of the best trained and equipped naval force circa 1940-1941) that American debated whether he could be more useful alive than dead until the eve of his assassination. One should also remember although Athens lost the physical war to Sparta, intellectual legacy always belonged to Athens. We know little or nothing of Spartan intellectual life. A belief strengthens a group but constrains individual minds, a value enlivens a mind but restricts grouping. In the end it is a loose group of lively minds that is a compromise between harmony and creativity. It is here we should find a personal religion that imposes nothing on others, if we still need a religion.

In our days of doomed institutional religions, they are no longer fit or powerful enough to harness minds used to divergences and freedoms. They are not fit because when a belief has to pander to followers to suit its theology to their taste it is no longer a belief to lead but a fashion to cherish, and in the end satisfies no one. See how Christian scriptural doctrines are continuously eroded to accommodate various minority social views. Any beliefs contain self-contradictions if allowed to fashion themselves according to whims of their would-be suiters as their *raison d'être* is to deprive such arbitrary pleasures. Often people just want to be told rather than engage in complicated and conflicting arguments, which

are signs of weakness for a belief. A belief is neither right or wrong, but more strong or weak. You seek a belief not for the privilege of modifying it but for the loss of such freedoms. Turn institutional religions to fashions to suit individual tastes, they eventually come to a stage when they can no longer contain self-contradictions. In line with a society intent on less of belief led institutional grip, accommodating loosely knitted individuals, we should have a methodology of personal religions. Our mind has layers and facets as much as it is a container of conceptual thought processes. We may have a predominantly rational layer/region with a stubbornly irrational part. It is more natural to be a mixed bag of contradicting layers and facets than a single-minded rationalist or materialist. A religion may be ontologically, epistemically irrational, but it is there for rational reasons, psychological, cultural, even socio-economic. It is not for its theoretical contents (if any) but for its non-nonsense authoritative stand that commands behavioural normativity for the ease of the bother of thinking, that commends a religion to many people. Thinking is for theologians and priests, not for people who are happy to take orders. The problem is we no longer respect theologians or priests for their hearsays, although more people want comfort of taking orders. There can be no religions that make everyone happy as much as penal codes that make no one criminal. Remove any pretence of authorities from religions, then there will be nothing left, take the enforcements away from the judiciary, then social disorders reign. However, if there are needs of religions, but cannot be satisfied institutionally, a personal religion is not only useful but also aesthetic in the sense that it fills metaphysical voids unsatisfied by the rational pretence of fundamentally incomplete (so far) science.

Needs for religions arise because we are imperfect individually and socially. Individually even our best and maximum knowledge will not allow us to say we definitely know anything once we start digging around axiomatic foundations of our deductive systems, only bits of useful engineering here and there. Away from science all our knowledge in humanities are tautological at best as knowledge here are of human inventions, i.e. about human values. Knowing about something we created for our conveniences is hardly a knowledge. Laws, economy, history, etc. are human creations for the sake of human needs. Remove human conventions, knowledge reveals its superficial nature. Knowledge are judged on the merits of usefulness in the contexts of social needs and give no fundamental satisfactions on philosophical grounds. Knowing applications and interpretations of a certain legal code in the contexts of precedencies and relevancies may take years of legal trainings, or mathematical interconnections of various financial tools to extrapolate a

non-linear outcome from breakdown of arithmetic symmetries between yield differentials may demand experiences and intuitions. History is not only circumstantially distorted, often unfairly diminishing the losers' views but also evidentially highly dubious in the sense that so-called historical evidences are often non-material and conceptually interpretational. Value-based knowledge may be more monetarily relevant and therefore useful in life, there are no constants from which equations can be derived to give us insights into working of non-human nature. These are so-called practical knowledge for humans, by humans and of humans. In the days of God or even humans as agent of God such knowledge may have counted useful as well as epistemic, but without deferential anchor of master of the universe our practical knowledge is not only trivial and irrelevant but also misleading as to the epistemic essence of knowledge. We are too full of self-importance and self-satisfied with trivialities.

Even in science we end up with the anthropic principle that suggests than even if we are not master (or its agent) of the universe, our maths is the language of the universe and gives rise to measurements that are only possible if we are the epistemic centre of the universe. Physicists are dubious about this claim but find it not easy to rebut and take sympathetic views, although some of early quantum physicists are quite enthusiastic about our status as observer, eventually giving rise to the participatory universe, the intelligent universe, etc. This probably stems from our coordinative thinking in which we are indeed the centre of relevancies to measure probabilities. If this is the case, then this aspect of physics is sadly tautological and only tells us we cannot observe and measure without essentially intruding in our own numerical assignments. But removing the status of the language of the universe from our maths, we should seriously question our epistemic capacity of knowing anything, let alone everything, like some physicists seem to claim as we do not yet have any alternative maths.

Not only there are no individuals with complete and definitive knowledge of anything from science to humanities, socially we are becoming intellectual egalitarians, superficial though, still less and less respectful to any authorities, especially politicians, who are not only ignorant but pretentious. In the fields of humanities this is understandable as one set of human values has no intrinsic superiority over another except narrative coherence and power of arguments abided by fashions of time, space and socio-economic necessities and of course survivability. There are no true authorities here other than width and depth of memory-based encyclopaedic knowledge to avoid juvenile errors. So, we should

all be humbly egalitarians in value-based quasi-knowledge. This, however, exacerbates considering the seemingly solid base of scientific knowledge is actually quite shaky, what with the quantum uncertainty uncontainable within our fundamentally coordinative maths and unaccountable infinity. All we have is theoretically flawed classic physics approximated by coordinative maths and adopted and materialised by engineering adaptability. With this we explore the solar system, extrapolate cosmological principles and investigate the biological viability of the future, relying more and more on AI and algorithmic modelling. Our knowledge base is coordinative, and our descriptions are coordinative, which seems to destine the limits of our biological brains.

If the value-based knowledge is at most tautological, and the coordinative knowledge is recursive to the anthropic line of thought processes, then our individual fallibility and imperfection have to be accommodated through the religion of fantasies. Human thoughts evolved with the hope of the eventual final redeemer, be it God or maths as the language of the universe, need adjustments as something fundamentally unreliable and subject to continuous and relentless changes. If we are never to have any perfect and definitive knowledge of anything as a matter of shortcomings of our essentially coordinative thought processes, sciences or humanities, then it is here religions come to placate and replace this fundamental epistemic imperfection. The aesthetics of religion is gracefully to surrender to this imperfection and hands over the baton to a personal religion. It is ridiculous to regard any parts of religions, scriptures or theologies, as anything other than not only imperfect but also false knowledge.

Being a religion, a personal religion is a belief that is a fiction without perspectives. We picture fictions with various degrees of perspectives that are brought about by triangulations among the object (fictions), the cognisor (imager) and the originator (writer). The cognisor and the originator can be a same source or separate sources. In the former case, think of our two eyes that give rise to spatial depth and orientates ourselves with better and more accurate perspectives with regard to the focused object of interest. Our mind has layers and facets that allow us to take multiple roles that act as with two eyes. In the latter case, think of us as a reader against the author as the creator of a fiction. As with our two eyes we read fictions with some distance produced by degrees of empathy between the reader and the writer. The more the reader identifies himself with a character in the fiction, the deeper the empathy between the reader and the writer, and the less objective the world of this fiction with regard to the so-called normal world. In another word, the more we see ourselves

in the fiction, the more we are engulfed into the fiction. In most case some distance is always there as we do not normally fully empathise with the author. This distance is a protective layer, so to speak, to keep ourselves within the normality of our cognitive reality. However, if and when our cognitive normality is fully engulfed by fictitious pictures of no perspectives, then we are in the domain of a belief that overrides common senses. This is in a way a perfection in the imperfect world, where the self and the inner self matches so that there are no longer any coordinative perspectives that are normally created by the self as centre of our cognitive evaluations, which produce distances and directions between ourselves and our environments.

The self that is a centre of our world from which we create various perspectives is now and then assisted or even abetted by the inner self that acts as the doubting Thomas so that we would be more reflective in evaluating and making a choice (sometimes a wrong one). Normally the self and the inner self are one and the same as, otherwise, life becomes impossibly complicated with too many perspectives arisen from two centres of a same coordinate. However, this superficial and convenient identity breaks down faced with the question of the coordinate itself, because 'centre' cannot see itself. The coordinate is the externalization of a 'centre' as the centre from which, by so doing, it can gauge relevancies with regard to itself numerically (mostly by approximation) replaceable as a point in the coordinate. In this way (i.e. scientifically) the centre is merely a centre that can be the centre and has no semantic identity. Thus, given a situation, it has similar relevancies as any other similar situations, allowing us social understandings. This is where the inner self comes in to answer the unanswerable question of what the self is. If each and every one of us is a unique coordinate with the self as the centre, then such coordinates are useless as much as a language is useless if each and every language is allowed to be different. It is the commutability of a coordinate with a centre that can be the centre that gives rise to meanings to relevancies, where instead of a unique relevance we have exchangeable and evaluative relevancies. Much as we would like, we are all different, but cannot afford to be unique in order to make sense of ourselves. Some of us like to be solipsistic, but this is an intellectual fantasy as we have to make a living as a biological organism, which is in our case necessarily social. Solipsistic individuals would be the least productive individuals, barely affording to feed themselves. Thus, the self and its coordinate of relevancies is commutable and social, leaving out the question of the solipsistic self, unique and seemingly paramount as it may be. Despite social similarity we would like to think we are all uniquely different from each other that makes our life uniquely worthwhile. Whether this is a

mere psychological illusion, that will be debated differently from socio-economic views to existentialist fantasies but usually comes to a compromised view of individualistic creative necessities fed on public needs of social cooperation, necessarily complimenting each other. This is why we pursue the inner self (Socrates's 'daemon') beyond the self of the communal garden. In contrast to the externalization this is the internalization that denies any triangulations. If the self and the inner self are identical, then it is the inner self that takes over the self and denies coordinative descriptions of the self in the same way we would have no triangulatory perspectives without two eyes. The world of one eye is simpler and is in a sense aesthetically more perfect, though cognitively more imperfect, without perspectives brought about by depth of space. It is a way of camouflaging 3-D onto 2-D and allows 3-D properties described by compact plane geometry. The inner self thus removes complicated perspectives of reality and makes the world simpler and more perfect. You could say it sort of a miracle. This is the world of religion that make a perfection out of the imperfect world. By describing the self in terms of the inner self we create a psychological cell that is insulated from the complicated mess of a social world, which is more real in terms of socio-economic needs demanded by our biological self. We are, however, pragmatic enough not to be over-dominated by this psychological creative accounting, leaving out pragmatic inconveniences to be dealt with pragmatically. Most people somehow juggle divided selves for conveniences of survival. When one over-dominates the other, it is usually an unhappy state of mismanagement, fanaticism of one sort or another. Interestingly, though, such mismanagements are endowed with a self-balancing capacity of correcting themselves, from religious collectivism arising secular social mechanism, from the jungle of extreme market economy popping out religious sanctuaries, etc.

This coupling of the self and the inner self is rhetorically not unlike a biological couple of man and woman seeking a cell of united interests as a combined front against the tide of social onslaughts, helping to promote each other's interests and insuring each other's shortcomings, although we are now too flexible to make it a tight fighting unit. One sees here two imperfect individuals trying to form a less imperfect unity to fight off imperfections that would be individually more than mouthful. What unites two imperfect biological individuals is a shared interest that is beneficial commonly to individuals concerned and our species that their offspring are better protected and brought up as useful members of next generations. Likewise, the coupling of the self and the inner self is pragmatically motivated by the psychologically necessary illusion that although we are reasonably realistic to deal with perspectives arisen from

the self's needs to navigate in the world that it cannot be fully control of, by pretending to give over to the inner self it satisfies its existential necessity of being in itself, being in control of itself, with free will and choices. The removal of perspectives provides us with a fiction of being in itself, being in control of itself, with free will and choices, because then we are in our own solipsistic world of the self, nothing but the self, with nothing external to excise free will and choices.

In order for a fairy tale to be more than a mere storyline for children, it need to acquire the power to crossover from imagination to reality, and from reality to imagination, by common referents. The superficial one-way traffic from imagination to reality has a counterpart in the physical world that is audio-visually commonsensical undercurrent of our language, which ensures meanings to words. Thus to 'sky' one merely points a finger to the sky saying that is it. This is fine and easy until conceptual intricacies and scientific interpretations abided by pseudo- and quasi-scientific complications set in. Then 'sky' is no longer the sky of simple reference. We have many skies of different shades and colours, depths and ranges as well as scientific and speculative. The sky becomes 'sky' where reality and imagination share a common referent that is a perspective shared by imagination and reality. This perspective is the predictive relation between the self that is a coordinative centre and the inner self that is essentially non-coordinative. Here multitudes of relevancies become irrelevant, and the simple storyline moves back and forward between reality and imagination. A perfection on the back of simplification by the daemon.

◇ **Epilogue - Exempli Gratia -**

A Latter-day Andersen

Kingdom of Joy and Sorrow

‘ . . . , and I have never before been so clearly conscious of two persons in me - the one that explained everything, and the other that laughed at such foolish explanations, yet was horribly afraid. ’

Algernon Blackwood

From ‘The Willows’

Thus armed with two minds we cannot easily dismiss, my fairy tale starts like this :

Prelude - within the boundary of a reality -

There were many events that, taken individually, can be dismissed as mere coincidences. The first clue that led me into this strange world of fairy tale came as a collection of unusual coincidences of reality. To my best of recollections, it was Friday, 11th of August 2000, there was an after-work party of some sort in a restaurant in Chancery Lane. At that time, I had two houses, one in London and another in a countryside, where I used to spend weekends. That evening I was on my bike as the country house was far away from the station. At the party I had a few drinks, but not so much as being drunk. After the party I was on my bike to a nearest Thameslink station to get to my weekend home, this being a Friday. As I was about to cross a road, the signal was still red, but I ignored hoping the signal was about to change. As I was crossing, a desperate car rushed out to cross before the signal changed. It was a direct hit sideways to my bike. I was thrown out of my bike. Now this is the strangest thing ; not a scratch on my body, not a speck of dust on my dark blue suit, while the bike was so severely damaged that it had to be written off. The driver was surprised that there were no injuries, and that I could just walk off as if nothing happened. I was probably shocked, which came later, but walked on to the station and got on my intended train. I had a pet rabbit at home, a black floppy-eared male, no longer mischievous after many months’ illness. He was definitely good looking and intelligent, too small to be an English lop but too big to be a Dutch. When he first came, he was in a wicker basket and sat in a corner like a little fluffy black ball. Not knowing his sex, he was named Rosie, befitting for

his cutie look, but later turned out a boy and so the name changed to Mr Rosie, less confusing for him. The time I spent with him was the happiest time in my life, to this day. When I came home during his illness, I was so pleased to see him OK, doing his usual rabbity things. He was not well for many months, and every time I came home I prepared for the worst. Every time I saw him somehow managing, that was the brief respite of utmost relief and happiness, and this seemed yet another of such weekends. However, that night the event took a turn for the worst. Now this is a coincidence, strange but nevertheless within the wider boundary of a reality ; I narrowly escaped from a potentially serious accident literally without a scratch, and on that night he dies as if having waited to see me. I knew the moment of his death to a second as I was awakened from my sleep with a dark premonition. He never made any vocal sounds in his life, but at the moment of death he cried. That strange sound remains in my ears. I remember feeling dazed with this chain of bizarre events on that night.

I could let go that strange weekend as a freak coincidence, but I did have a very uncanny similar coincidence many years before with my dog named Jon. I was very far away from home in another country and had a strangely vivid dream of his death a day before I had planned coming home. He died the night I arrived home. I remember hearing his pleasurable barking literally a kilometre away on my walk home from a bus stop as if he could smell and hear me that far away. As soon as I saw him, I knew he was going to die and freed him from his lead, not wishing him to die tied up. He run off as if he could not have waited a second longer. That night he did not come back and found dead in a field next to the house by my sister. Now it looks like he managed to hold onto his life awaiting my home coming. Would it be a coincidence ; the dream, my planned home coming and his uncannily timed death ? I was young then and did not inquire further. This was left as a mere coincidence but strangely remained in my mind.

Let me give you a few more coincidences, two more on Rosie and one on another pet rabbit, Ronnie, and another on Madam Butterfly. I mentioned Rosie was not well for some time, the cause of which I do not wish to go in as it involves no coincidence and can be rationalized as part of my domestic affairs, but it fair to mention of my fear of having a direct responsibility, too painful to touch upon. Anyway a few months before his death I took a photo of Rosie as he was in his garden box for fresh air. He was normally in kitchen or living room, lying around or roaming free. He was already unwell and would not readily come out of his box, although as usual demanded the door being kept open. I was surprised he

dashed out as I approached with an old-fashioned SLR camera. I wanted his photo just in case (some premonition). I had one off-chance potshot, thinking how lucky he came out. To my surprise many months later when I happened to study this photo in details I found myself reflected on his eye. I could actually see my face on his cornea. Of course this could happen, but no matter how many hundreds of photos you may take on purpose, what would be the likelihood of catching such a subliminal moment on a casual photo without any considerations for reflections and lightings ?, and this was a cumbersome film photo, which needed focusing. Sorry to go on, but one more event I remember well ; my father had died a few months prior to Rosie in spring - yes that was my annus horribilis -, and I had to go abroad to attend his funeral. I came home after two weeks and went upstairs to wash my hands after 30 hours travel. There came thumping noises outside the bathroom door and there he was looking up at me. He is usually downstairs, on top of being unwell and never before attempted to come up the awkward doubled up staircase on his own, but I remember his expressions to this day, almost like human expressions of condolence after a sad event. Once again this could happen. There were a few more strange coincidences relating Rosie, but I will skip these.

I move on to another incident, one with Ronnie. Ronnie was another lop-eared pet rabbit (brown and white with butterfly nose) that eventually took Rosie's place. He died after some blotched dental operation. He came home after the operation and never recovered and died after a few days. A strange thing is ; he was sick and never managed to come out of his box, except the very last time I saw him. I was going away to work and wanted to say hello before I went. Then he was out of his bed and came out to drink from a bowl a few meters away and looked at me as if to say goodbye. That was the only time he came out of his box during his illness. Less of a drama, and once again this could happen.

Let me go on with a few more coincidences. Madam Butterfly is a warbler, who had a strange entanglement with me. She is so called because she made a most pleasurable shriek when she found a dead butterfly in my back garden. She had a nest in the hedge with a few chicks and was desperate to find foods for them. She knew me as I often sunbathed nearby. One day one of the chicks dropped out of the nest. I tried to pick and put it back, but it was too quick and hopped around just short of my reach and was clever enough to hide in a bramble bush. The chick stayed on the ground for a next week or so, and I often saw Mother and the chick together foraging for foods. The chick liked the small wild mint bush, hopping on and off mint leaves, maybe snacking on Aphis. I

watched, but stayed out of their way. On the last day before they flew away, Mother showed off her chick in a most funny way right in front of me by feeding the chick from her bottom instead of by mouth. The other chicks left one by one, staying for a day or so practicing flight skills on branches of nearby trees. Mother and this chick were the last to fly away. This chick, now called Hoppy, however, never left my house. She was often in the front garden, dashing in and out of the neighbour's hedge, especially when I open my front door, as if waiting for me, obviously recognizing me. Once she openly groomed herself spreading her wings this way and that way like a fashion model on the lawn a few meters away as if to say look at me, how beautiful I have grown, and once most memorably she came out of the hedge and sat on a fence pole and stared at me in rain and wind on a stormy dark autumnal evening. That was the last time I saw her in a recognizable way, unless it was her that came back to nest in my back garden following year. I have a reason to believe it was Hoppy. I knew there was a warbler's nest in the back garden and hoped it was Hoppy. One day there was such a din in the garden and I looked out. A bird was shrieking and repeatedly hopping on and off from a tree branch to the ground, in a similar manner as Madam Butterfly. As with the previous case, one of the chicks dropped out of the nest, and the bird was calling for a help, reminding me of an identical incident the previous year. Sadly, the chick was too young and was already dead. I pretended to return it to the nest, but actually buried it in the mint bush and made a little grave with flint pebbles nearby. Hoppy kept coming back to tend the rest of babies, maybe believing her lost baby is also there. Some of grown babies I saw hopping around the grave of pebbles and nearby bush of wild mint. I do not know if my gesture fooled Hoppy, or if it was indeed Hoppy, but often saw the chick's siblings hopping around the mint bush. After Hoppy and Hoppy's baby I hoped someone of her lineage will come back to nest, but I have not seen any successful nesting since despite obvious advantages of the hedge.

These strange afflictions, together with all the other coincidences, culminate in my willingness to be drawn into the world of a fairy tale in which they resuscitate themselves into a coherent play. Here instead of being a coordinative centre of coincidences I surrender to coincidences in which I am only a passive player borne out of the collapse of the coordinative centre. Coincidences are no longer measured from the centre in terms of relevancies. Instead they form a world of their own in which the centre is a transpositional centre that becomes the connective of all those coincidences. Thus, the centre becomes an identifier of events, making coincidences into a miracle. Those coincidental events came to me unasked for, and turned me into a part of their story. I am here to

weave a narrative whole to make sense of them. This is a tautology to equate a part with a whole. I am only part of a game, but in making sense of the game, I unwittingly becomes the game.

Philosophical Ground - ready to switch on fairy lights -

I cross from reality to imagination as I am myself the connective between the two worlds as conceptual vehicle. It is consciousness that one-directionally bridges reality with imagination with linear connection between concepts (tools of description) and reality (data), while 'I' am the descriptive overlord in the metaphysical Neverland as I and 'I' as concept are descriptively one and the same. While imagination cannot become reality, I can freely go from one to the other as my descriptions are both imagination and reality in the sense I am the descriptive intermediary for both. This is why even physical events have to go through my metaphysical parameters in order to be described. It is assumed the supposed common structure ('logical structure' a la Wittgenstein) between reality and conceptual descriptions is the only safeguard not to confuse them, and my 'consciousness' is the guarantor of my descriptive sanity as my personal coordinate can only be a case of the overall communicative coordinate. However, as my consciousness is overloaded with unlikely coincidences exacerbated by the coordinative shift from 'we' to 'I' as centre, the linearity with reality become blurred, and thus the descriptive borderline between reality and fiction loses its foothold with myself hovering between the two worlds. Here the communicative coordinate with 'us' as the centre is overtaken by a personal coordinate with 'I' as the centre, which magnifies the magnitude of a coincidence by manyfold and more and more firmly engages myself in the personal coordinate rather than the communicative coordinate. This is the solipsistic comfort of a personal fairy tale as religion.

I as the hovering connective between reality and fiction tends to resides in this world of so-called reality, but my fairy tale has its root in a fictional world of floating concepts that defy commonsensical laws of physics. Here coincidences cast doubts on the universal validity of metaphysical parameters and semantics of certain basic terms (time, space, etc.), albeit without appropriate scientific replacements, the logical structure is still partially maintained by syntactical structures. The primary object of my fairy tale is to prepare a predictive self that reconciles deficiencies of the irretrievable past with desires for a happier future with the present shifting away from unwanted and undesirable realities, making myself ready to take up a permanent residence in this imaginary world, if allowed in. Here my consciousness towards reality is

overtaken by my desire for a predictive whole, which has the power of $(x) > x$, while consciousness is merely a coordinative necessity that is, in this case, overridden by an intuitive preference for something more coherent. After all there are not and cannot be any perfect descriptions so long as concepts are definitional, and the dictionary with one word is meaningless. Consciousness is the pivot of rationality that allows coordinative descriptions on the assumption that the centre of the coordinate, be it 'I' or 'we', is more or less identical, thus creating the communicative coordinate. The consciousness in question is the personal consciousness that leads onto the collective consciousness. The power of $(x) > x$ is that without this totality we are barred from any precise communications, and that we would have no collective memories. Pets seeking the sanctuary of the collective memories, which only humans managed to possess on this planet, so that they too are also preserved in our collective memories come to us as the preservation of their species become tenable. They do appear to have an uncanny instinct to make themselves available to our capacity of collective memories.

Fairy Tale - crossing into the realm of imagination -

I already touched upon coincidences of reality leading to miracles when the coordinative framework is moved from 'we' as the centre to 'I' as the centre, which turns the coordinate into a solipsistic space of relevancies, but with conceptual legacies of the coordinate. 'Our' coordinate can only be a tool of communication under metaphysical parameters, underneath of which is lain 'my' consciousness that is the very centre of any relevancies. We extend this into a communal coordinate by assuming 'I' is part of 'we' as, otherwise, we are unable to communicate, even with ourselves, by empowering parameters with universality. However, at the bottom of our predictive mind is reactive balancing that enhances predictivity. Thus, starting with the communal coordinate for communicative purposes (including with oneself) we can be reverted back to reactive space of relevancies. The objective I that is part of 'we' transmutes with the subjective I as they are linguistically hard to separate. It is thus that coincidences take appearance of miracles, and vice versa. Here solipsistic relevancies are described with coordinative legacies.

A fairy tale is the product of a reactive mind for the sake of a predictive totality, reassuring a balanced ground for our predictive necessity out of a well-formed mind. Considering that the eventual goal of a fairy tale is to contribute towards predictivity of mind, the narrative subtlety of coincidences/miracles does not matter. It is not what is in a fairy tale but

a fairy tale itself that has an eventual impact on predictive mind, which rightly or wrongly represents relationship between our consciousness and the world. A fairy tale is reconciled with reality by the protagonist taking over the sentential subject, and thus turning itself into its own world. It is here that the imagination and the reality become one.

“ The place is Rosie Kingdom, a spot of beautiful greenery on the shore of The Acheron. The river in the distance, the kingdom in between, Rosie’s manor house stands midway on the terrace of a cliff that encircles this cove of the kingdom. Rosie is a black lop-eared medium rabbit and is actually Mr Rosie, because he was like a pretty little fluffy black ball when I first saw him in a wicker basket left for me and could not envisage anything other than a girl, which later turned out to be a boy. In order not to confuse him a Mr was added to his name. Mr Rosie is a king here because he founded this place with his magic power, which I will explain later. Anyway, today that is 9th March 2022 of human calendar he is busy welcoming two new comers, Alise and Tanya, two little girls from Ukraine, untimely deaths in the hands of Putin (henceforth to be known as Putin la Putain or PooChin the snake face)’s wretched soldiers. How they came to be in Rosie Kingdom, we don’t know. Anyway, there they are, they were found wondering on the shore. The only way they are allowed in this kingdom is to be made an honorary bunny, which Rosie most gladly obliged. Rosie also arranged their lodging in the gatehouse that is the primary residence of Otto, the elderly commander of his little but powerful army and stands in the ground of his manor house. Otto already has another lodger, Nóra, an English girl lost in Malaysian jungle taken in by Rosie some years ago and made the manager of the royal orphanage to look after hundreds of little baby bunnies. Alise and Tanya are to be baby minders as assistants of Nóra. Motherless and traumatised as they are, they will be looked after by Nóra, sharing a beautiful large attic room in the gatehouse, facing the manor house higher up on the terrace across the large moated courtyard. Tomorrow Nóra will take them to the orphanage to introduce them to their charges, but for now they will enjoy special treats sent down from the manor house, beautiful large strawberries from the royal greenhouse on top of the cliff.

A few days later Nóra reported Alise and Tanya are settling down well, each with their favourite little ones, who took to their heart that Alise and Tanya are indeed their comrades and are hopping, jumping and cuddling all over the two girls. The royal orphanage is a large wooden building with its own enclosure, only a short walk away from the gatehouse on the outer fringe of the courtyard on the slope to the moat. It is manned by the three girls and a friendly mischievous black cat (an honorary bunny)

called Mishka, who is a guardian and is responsible to herd any lost babies back to the orphanage. The orphanage is ever so busy, and Rosie has a room for another assistant. A girl called Olivia from Liverpool will soon join after being made an honorary bunny. The orphanage is soon to be headed by an efficient supervisor called Yoko from Japan as a large expansion is due. This is a worthwhile event to describe as it shows how a household member is recruited. Junior members are allowed in when and as Mr Rosie takes an exceptionally empathetic interests in events that evoke the sense of unjust and injustice. Although he has little power to proactively punish those directly responsible, at least he can accommodate noteworthy victims in his kingdom to balance any injustices. Those named above are but a few of many working in his kingdom, on the condition that they have to be eligible to be made an honorary bunny. Senior members are directly related to me as the proprietor of this whole narrative and are made active personalities of the kingdom to reflect my sense of balance in terms of personal debts and thanks. Here Rosie is my shadow doing and undoing my shortcomings in reality either way and made possible because of reality/imagination connective due to coordinative transmutation where coincidences and miracles are a matter of replacing the centre of coordinate within 'we' that contains 'I'. This settling of scores through reactive imagination enhances predictive fullness that has potential of affecting reality.

Take Yoko as an illustration. She is my estranged sister and had not been intended to be a member of Rosie household. However, December 15th, 2022 she died at the relatively young age of 63. Preceding to this, events culminate on December 2nd, when she turned up at the door step of my ghastly cold country cottage unannounced after 15 or so years, laughing and chatty with presents, although this long absence was more to do with my misanthropic eccentricity than her faults. I am myself only an occasional visitor to this cottage. A few unrelated incidents contributed to her death. Firstly a few days prior to December 2nd I had a debilitating injury on my thigh after falling onto a sharp bamboo stump, with a laceration of some 10cm long by 2-3cm deep. I could see red muscle under cleanly split layer of white fat. I had an awesome fascination of seeing such an injury upon myself and decided to have a go at myself with a sawing kit and a small bottle of TCP 10 years out of date. Call it willpower vs medicine. I incompetently stitched up myself with nauseating sense of faint heart, but was proud of sawing myself. It probably needed many more stiches to heal properly, but I could only manage 5-6 loose stiches at an awkward angle, leaving deep holes in the fat layer. Despite seeping of fluids and rancid smell I was reasonably confident it will heal unless infected, although I had to suffer from pains

and inconveniences. Eventually it took more than 1 month for the gush to close up. Long and short of it was I was less than competent in my observations and reactions during early part of this recovery. This was how I greeted Yoko with less than deserved enthusiasm. Secondly her visit was a consequence of her friend spotting me on my way to a family hill in order to tidy up the family grave yard fallen on a hard time after my absence of 3 years due to Corvid. This person, knowing my sister well, phoned her to say I was at the cottage. It is this contact that prompted her to catch a flight to come over to see me after all these years. Thirdly unusual to her meticulous habits she incredibly forgot to bring her smartphone, which plays a part in her death, as I do not have a phone on my occasional visits to this now foreign country. Fourthly we had unusually warm November followed by unusually cold December, and I had less than a week of December to cope with before I intended to leave this cottage. So, I had decided to persevere with this cold misery rather than to bother with any heating arrangements such as a kerosene stove that requires touching up and cleaning before I left. Thus, the cottage was cold, dark and unwelcoming to say the least. It is a consequence of this strange combination of freak coincidences that assigned her death with an uncanny quality of mystery, entitling her an entry into my magic kingdom, earning her immortality alongside all the residents. I never expected to see someone die smiling in the morning and suffering a fatal stroke in the evening, not at her age and certainly not my own family member. She came unannounced with a big smile, went through the usual family routine of saying hello to our dead parents, paying homage to the ancestral graves up in the hill, greeted a friend and also a distant relative who is also the cottage caretaker with presents, after which I prepared a hot bath by wood-burning stove so that she could warm herself up to bear up a cold evening. We had a good meal together with a bottle of wine she brought. We talked this and that to midnight and then she became quiet and sleepy. I left her to sleep in the relative warmth of this living room with many blankets and went up to my room to read a book as I was too much in pain to sleep in comfort. I came downstairs at about 2am and heard her snoring but did not pay attention, thinking she had a long tiring day. It was next morning she failed to get up, unusual for an early riser like her. I made tea and called her. She did not wake up. This was how the longest day of my life started. I had no phone to call an ambulance. I run to the house of her childhood friend some distance away. Her friend had already left for work, but her invalid mother was in the house. We both came back to the cottage and found my sister unconscious. An ambulance came, her friend came back, and we went to a hospital where after many checks and tedious paperwork my sister eventually went through an emergency brain surgery at about 14:30 that did not finish

until 18:00. Her family (husband and daughter) managed to catch a flight and came in during the operation and finally relieved me from the ordeal of a lonely wait. She never woke up and died some 2 weeks later. What struck me most is the uncanny contrast of manner life and death played. What she did in her last one day of conscious life ; someone spotting me accidentally on my way to the family graveyard, hitting the idea of coming to see me at the place she was brought up, where her father and mother, and even her dog, also died, show of happiness to see me, obligatory visit to the family hill, dark and cold, vividly contrasting with her untimely death at an unusually young age, her urban lifestyle of wealth and every possible modern convenience, her ostensibly good health and young looks, her joviality and optimism in life. This contrast plays up the tragic nature of her death in such a way as to suggest an element of mystery that lured her into this last journey, even forgetting her treasured smartphone. She did say she had a premonition of seeing me for the last time, considering my inept social attitudes, only that the freak combination of coincidences worked upside down. I with many medical problems, some fatal, live on, while this affluent and still attractive woman dies, as if she came back to this place to die, watched by her mother and father.

Without this strange circumstance Yoko would not have had a place in my magic kingdom as we owe no emotional hang-ups to each other. She had a good life, and I had a contended life. But, now I am indebted to her for my unintended incompetence to help her, together with coincidences that brought her to this place of life and death. She would have never imagined she would die at this place, which she did not really like. What else can I do but to give her a place in my immortal kingdom to allow her to live alongside with her mother (Okka), her father (Otto), her dog (Jon) together with every large and small figure that enriched my life ? Here once again it is a 'miracle' that transmuted from an unusual set of coincidences, each insufficient on its own to shine through, that set up an acting mechanism of this kingdom. I touched upon Yoko's case in some details, but all the protagonists sprung from 'miracles' in one way or another and spin around Mr Rosie, who had by far the strongest of all 'miracles' and provides structural details of this fairyland, conceptual legacies of working mechanisms that give rise to dynamic motions to conceptual meanings and thus contribute to a narrative structure. Mr Rosie takes the shape of a bunny in reality and then turn coincidences of reality into a miracle through switching over of the 'self' as centre of my coordinate of relevancies. That is, Mr Rosie takes the place of this centre as my shadow, and this centre is unable to distinguish 'self' as myself or as my shadow because the centre of coordinate cannot be coordinatively

described as much as 'I' could be 'I' as the sentential subject of indiscriminate sentences as well as 'I' as the invisible proprietor of a whole discourse. The writer of a fiction permeates as any of his protagonists with varied preferences and also as the creator of his whole fiction, maybe also as his real himself represented as a point in his life or as a segment in his life. In short 'I' is a shapeless object that can transform into any parts of his imagination as a sentential subject. This is the cause of a miracle and is neither rational or irrational

Yoko by the way had a good welcome as we all knew her pending arrival. Okka and Otto as well as the members of the royal orphanage were there at the river landing stage to greet her, and Philomena provided a beautifully illuminated passage from the landing to the manor house, where Rosie personally welcomed her. Okka provided a temporary bed for Yoko in her room until her own room could be arranged, which is now a small but handsome room near the side-entrance that overlooks the orphanage so that she can keep an eye on her charge. Meanwhile Okka will be busy showing Yoko around the house.

Let me explain the set-up of Rosie Kingdom. This is a bunny kingdom and everyone is either a bunny or an honorary bunny. Bunnies have a right of entry by birth, while you will only be made an honorary bunny by invitation. Otherwise you will be deported to suitable neighbouring kingdoms. If Putin la Putain should wander in Rosie Kingdom, he will be packed off to Snake Island or Rat Valley. If they should decline to take him in, then Putin will end up in a Bruegelian hotpot of creepy-crawlies and deadly insects, which might extend the hand of friendship as their fellow compatriot. Everyone in the kingdom can choose to be immortal or on anicca, the former makes their burrows near the royal compound and the latter lives near the river, which every now and then floods and carries the willing unfortunates to the next world, which may or may not be more to their tastes, but certainly more adventurous. The royal compound comprises the manor house in the midriff of the cliff, the leisurely garden slope on a cliff side becoming the semi-circular moated courtyard extending from a cliff edge to a cliff edge, behind one of which is the ruins of the royal mausoleums, probably of dynasties preceding Rosie Kingdom and house interesting friendly spirits, who guard the kingdom from the mountainsides. Spirits are not subjects of the kingdom but are favoured guests, who return the favour by providing a protection for the kingdom. They are all connected with the current incumbents of the kingdom one way or another. In a corner of the front courtyard of the ruins is a thorny bush with two beautiful statuettes who found their way here from the Garden of Time, symbolising the misanthropic nature of the

Rosie Kingdom. From the ruins one finds a narrow path leading up to the top plateau of the cliff, which is the royal vegetable garden with a greenhouse, catering for royal kitchen needs. This is Okka's most favourite haunt. The front of the royal compound is made up with the gatehouse and barrack, which accommodates smartly dressed Moroccan bunny-soldiers complete with fez, all specially recruited from Essaouira wet market, fatalistic sad creatures, promising good soldiering materials with their dislike of humans. Immediately outside the royal perimeter, but alongside the moat is the royal orphanage looking down the river far, far away, caring for baby bunnies. The orphanage is of a large wooden structure manned by 4 little girls (now honorary bunnies) and now headed by Yoko and assisted by Mishka the cat (ditto) who are good at herding any lost bunnies. So, the kingdom is protected by the river in the front and by the encircling cliff and mountain in the back. Beyond the mountain border is all possible worlds of parallel kingdoms. One of Rosie's privileges is to have a new bed made up with fresh hay every day, which is then taken apart and redistributed to all over the kingdom. That is how Rosie always smells fresh hay and everyone in the kingdom has a warm bed and never goes hangry, tempered with Rosie's magic fragrance.

The Rosie Kingdom comprises his family, his household and his kingdom and connects with the world of reality through a special tunnel, where Mr Rosie reacts with me. His family is himself, Penny the mistress, Philomena the magic princess and Taiga the juvenile. Mr Rosie and Penny have an origin in reality, whereas Philomena and Taiga were born in imagination. Mr Rosie is there by right through the miracle of coordinative transmutation, bringing with him all his relevancies together with coordinative legacies, which bring about narrative structures of his kingdom. He is a handsome lop with one ear floppier than the other, but both would stand up smelling the dill, his most favourite food. Penny is a smart black bunny with straight ears, who did not have a happy life due to a human negligence, ending up a cripple. She is the only female bunny Rosie ever saw, and it was awhile after Rosie founded his kingdom that he remembered Penny (then only a baby) and brought her to his kingdom. I suppose Rosie was lonely with his empty kingdom. As he remembered more of his relevancies, his kingdom grew with reactive products of imagination. Philomena is their daughter but without a double chin so common to female bunnies. Philomena is sweet and smart as Rosie was in his younger days with lop ears and is endowed with magic power so that she can stand in for Rosie while Rosie hops over to reality. Her magic power is growing little by little as she learns various knacks from Rosie. Rosie and Philomena are the only two possessors of magic power

in this kingdom. Magic power originates from ‘miracle’ that is transformative of coincidences by virtue of the collapse of a coordinative centre, which then caters for non-coordinative events. In this sense Philomena’s magic power is secondary and is functionally encompassed within Rosie’s. The special tunnel that connects Rosie Kingdom with reality is a stone found on Brighten beach. An egg-shaped grey stone that fits in the palm with a strange natural hole going deep inside. It is a natural stone with a faint face-like pattern with a hole where one would expect an urna. I found it unexpectedly lying right in front of my eyes while lying elbowed on the beach. I might even have been thinking about Rosie, because the stone spontaneously connected with the idea of the bridge between the reality and the imagination as if I were looking for it. Naturally it became part of my imaginative world, allowing Rosie to come over every now and then, an important connective that allows fantasies to mingle with the physical world, without which it will be difficult to make the imaginative world meaningfully alive. You may think imagination and reality as two separate worlds, but then reality provides imagination with basic ingredients, while imagination gives rise to essential tools of representation for reality in the form of metaphysical parameters. It is this tunnel that brings about live meanings to both imagination and reality as the two implement and enrich each other. As much as inquiries into metaphysical parameters constitute fundamental philosophy, this is a philosopher's stone with mythic alchemical substance that enriches imagination with reality, reality, with imagination. At the moment Rosie with his magic power is the only one who can squeeze across this tunnel, with Philomena to follow if only helped by Rosie. With Rosie as a connective his magic kingdom merits our world of reality with restorative predictivity by providing a better balancing between imagination and reality. It is imaginative enrichments that arrows a better coordinative representation of reality. Taiga is still a baby boy with unknown calibre. He does not seem to have magic power, maybe a useful assistant for Philomena one day. He enjoys mimicking Philomena when she sings and dances.

Rosie Household is made up with Okka who is almost member of Rosie Family. She is my mother as well as mother-figure for Rosie. She likes gardening and is in charge of the royal vegetable garden and also manages a kitchen garden within the vicinity of the manor house. She is also the only person permitted to groom Rosie, with a courtesy title of Royal Groomer cum Gardener. Rosie sometimes brings Philomena to my garden of reality for sunbathing as the sun is good for their magic power. She occasionally brushes Philomena when Philomena had a sand bath when Rosie brings Philomena to my garden of reality for sun-bathing.

Otto, my father, is the commander of Rosie Army comprised of Moroccan recruits and is uniquely qualified with some knowledge of weaponry, having been a police inspector in his former life. He lives in the gatehouse next to the barrack. He also allows girls of the orphanage to lodge as he has many spare rooms. Jon, the dog, is the royal bodyguard and the sergeant of the army. He has a special guard room/bedroom by the side-entrance (leading to the terrace) to the manor house, and comes and goes as he likes day and night through a flap door, making sure the royal compound is safe and secure. He has the privilege of a first use of hay from Rosie's bed to maintain a warm and dry bed for his good sleep and comfort. Finally, Yoko is the most recent member of the household with a beautiful room with a bay window across from the guard room. They are now neighbours as Jon used to be her dog. They all have a status of honorary bunny. Ronnie is the butler and, like Rosie, was my pet, but with a lesser capacity for miracle events. Okka has a bedroom next to the kitchen garden, and Ronnie has one next to the kitchen. In the kitchen garden is a family of warblers, Madam Butterfly, Hoppy and Hoppy's baby. They are 3 generations of a family nestled in the hedge of my back garden, made honorary bunnies on account of bizarre, almost mythical behaviours exhibited in my gardens. They sing for Okka and work for Rosie watching over the kingdom from the sky. Okka enjoys listening to their family chorus from her bed, which is her weekend treat. My own family is well incorporated into Rosie Household, looking after his family and is in return assured comforts in this eternal kingdom. Lastly, I must not forget to mention a beautiful white horse recently found grazing by the river. How he came about, no one knows, but maybe originate from a white stone of a vague horse shape I found in the Essaouiran beach. I think he appeared in my dream, giving a ride to Yoko. Anyway, he will be useful for carrying things too heavy and going to far corners of this kingdom. From his manure come magic fireflies which are diets of Madam Butterfly and her family.

Upstairs is for the family. Rosie has a large bay windowed room with a view of his whole kingdom with the river in the far distance. He has a privilege of a new bed of hay every day, on which he exercises every morning by jumping up and down, diving, rolling around and stretching. When I come, I will probably ask a corner of this room for my bed, so that we can discuss issues of the kingdom day and night, how to feed the population, defence of the realm, diplomacies with neighbouring kingdoms, especially the powerful rat kingdom beyond the mountain, how to tame those spirits resident in the ruins of the royal mausoleums, reclaims of the marshland, etc. Penny, Philomena and Taiga share another large room with a separate bed for Philomena. Soon we will have to find

a room for Philomena, which she is hoping to be the one that looks down the ruins of the royal mausoleums. She has one or two spirits showing friendly interests, useful connections to cultivate. She is thinking to take over the turret room with a viewing gallery upstairs.

Thus, I introduced the family members and most household members and friends. In addition, we have the Philosopher's grove, which is a bamboo bush with a cottage in the middle, halfway on the slope of terrace garden, where an old Sensei and his wife live. He used to be a professor of philosophy, the only person among many I came across, who is a distinguished scholar as well as a man of philosophical character, closer to what a 'teacher' represents in the Confucius tradition and one of Nishida's favourite students. He taught me not so much of philosophy but more of spirit of philosophy. He never scorned me when I turned up at his house unannounced. He is one of the reasons why I came back to philosophy after the life of moneymaking. I felt I owe it to him betraying his expectations. His cottage consists of a small bedroom and a library with all his books amounting to more than 10,000 copies. Between the bedroom and the library is a ceramic stove keeping the whole cottage warm and comfortable. Otto visits here every now and then to play Go, he comes to the gatehouse to enjoy Otto's piano and girls' singings. His meals are sent from Rosie's kitchen, which his wife also enjoy using and helping. I am sure to enjoy visiting him when I become a resident of Rosie kingdom.

Adventures and events of this kingdom occur in reactive chemistry of imagination to reality as imagination augments reality in its perceived shortcomings through subjective interpretations. Reality inevitably metamorphoses from phenomenological neutrality to psychological dissatisfactions/satisfactions as we adopt coordinative frameworks with transmuting 'I' as the centre, which solipsistically collapses faced with overwhelming coincidences that turn into a 'miracle'. A 'miracle' goes over the boundary of coordinative descriptions and is the primary source of 'magic power', which once given, allows fairy tales narrative privileges unconstrained of physical laws. A proper fairy tale should be able to trace back the origin of its magic powers to coincidences at a personal level if ever to avoid nonchalant origins of magic power.

The most important protagonist is Mr Rosie with his magic power. He proved time and time again through miracles that he is capable of transcending coordinative frameworks of time and space. He is here with his kingdom because I owe it to him that he be assigned immortality through our collective memory. He is most notable of loving me

unconditionally and furthermore proving of his uncanny ability to exercise non-coordinative power to interfere with probabilities of reality. How he possesses such a power I can only extrapolate that it is because rationality of reality and fantasies of imagination are two sides of a same coin, in that reactive mind that has no place in reality creates a space in which it can react so that together they achieve predictivity that is conjugate of reality and metaphysics. Death in reality can be predicted to be an entry into immortality if this death calls for a reactive space in which events of reality can be undone, neutralising physical death. This is where characters of reality live on as conjugates of fictional characters, where the connective is the objective 'I' as part of the subjective 'we' within the transmutative framework of a coordinate. I can rationally turn coincidences into miracles where I am the sentential subject of a storyline. Mr Rosie's kingdom is in my mind as my mind seeks a reactive space in which he is not only immortal but also commands magic power that sets right whatever was wrong in reality, so that this reactive space also becomes part of our conceptual legacies. Physical Rosie may be dead, but I make him live through our collective memory, which is meaningful in reality as base of predictive mind and also part of functionality of reactive space. This is how reality and imagination are two sides of a same coin. Reality per se only makes sense through our imaginative mind that is predictive. ”

Supernatural - fairy tale moving back into reality -

Given details of Rosie Kingdom, its set-up and main characters, this fairy tale can easily proceed to adventures and mysteries, such as hostile invasions and revolts within. For example ;

“ Saturday routines ” is a pictorial story of how the family spends a typical Saturday, culminating with the picnic in the hilltop vegetable garden, Okka's pride and joy.

“ Serpent episode ” is an epic story of how a gigantic snake landed from the river, and the whole kingdom united to expunge this hideous creature.

“ Adventures in the ruins of the royal mausoleums ” is Philomena's venture into this relatively unexplored region of the kingdom and discovery of some friendly spirits and ancient history.

There are enough ingredients to play with to make this fairy tale reasonably dynamic on its own as well as in its relations to my reality. It is important not to fall into a stalemate of static story lines as then a story psychologically fails to connect with progressive events of your real life. A fairy tale as fiction has a role to play along a fairy tale as religion in

the sense that in order to keep it alive a fairy tale needs moving parts and actively engages us in our daily irreversible goings. However, a fairy tale as religion operates altogether in a different mode ; it is there not as children's amusements and overflowed imaginations, but as a balancing tool of austere and irreversible reality and rich and versatile imagination so that our mind remains predictive instead of being reactive, allowing 'I' of reality to break through one-dimensional barrier to be united with 'I' of imagination through 'miracle', so that together I am better balanced with less regrets and stay being more wholesome. Reality's damages are repaired by imagination's remedies as here it is possible to reverse in time and retrospectively undo and redo things. Whether the exact nature of 'miracle' is real or imaginary, that is no longer a question as coordinative frameworks are removed by the collapsed centre of coordinate. I, instead of being a centre of relevancies, become multi-I's without frames of reference, like transpositional 0 reverting back to its ontologico-notational origin (see 'Maths, Logic and Language'). A miracle is really a miracle of transmuting I that is essence of human descriptions. Colloquially put, I of rationality is not distinguishable from I of intuition as much as axioms cannot be sourced to either. It is the intrinsic movements of the transmuting I that bring forth the question of identity and its self-evident answer by means of directions translated into implication and negation. It is our logical inability to locate the transmuting I and epistemic necessity of descriptions as such that safely bury the coordinative questioning of what a miracle is. If a miracle is contained within the descriptions of 'I', then within certain modes of descriptions its uses are legitimate.

As much as Rosie Kingdom is founded on 'miracle' and its magic power that continuously repairs and restores predictivity against reactivity, and the biological inevitability of I of reality eventually merging with I of imagination, Rosie Kingdom is the final destination of my reality. It is to this end I can prophesize my time in reality is coming to an end as the more and more I come to know of Rosie Kingdom. Not only that is where I am going, but also, I derive a pleasure and comfort in this knowledge. Here I know I will be with Rosie, Philomena, Mother, Father, Sister, Dog and all the other relevancies of my life. I can even arrange my own accommodation and dream of adventures in this kingdom. Rosie, who is really imaginary I, will be a comrade in arms to safeguard this kingdom and ensure its immortality. In a way I am writing this to secure such an immortality in our collective memory. The uses of a miracle, first as a transmuted coincidence and then as a narrative tool of reconciling I of reality with I of imagination for a better predictivity, are altogether justified on the ground of my surviving my death through transplanting

myself in our collective memory. An ability to write, together with a possibility of being remembered, as well as a possibility of written of, are the ultimate power that transcends derisory human inventions such as money, political role-plays and social gimmicks. Institutional religions of bygone days had all these until corrupted by stupidity of wanting to be near touchable reality than rich but empty imagination. But then, in the fight between life and death life is but an infinitesimal gap defined by limits of infinity. Its reality is made physical sandwiched between invisible series of fictions, one, what is (interpreted as) real I can see behind, another what is (predicted as) imaginary I can see ahead. The gap is defined as reality of the moving present that is a product of predictivity. As the top end of reality and the bottom end of imagination come nearer, reality and imagination collide. This only happens predictively as imagination turns into reality, while reactively reality only produces reality, making sure the end of life as reality is a death as a limit of life. There is nothing before and after, and the present just vanishes. This is the world of nothing, while imagination as a product of reality ensures a probability at least of collective legacy even through AI, which has a better prospect than nothing. A good fairy tale resonates and contributes towards predictive mind that ensures $(x) > x$.

Reality may precipitate imagination as we experience no reality per se. Raw realities of senses are processed conceptually and interpreted according to presuppositions and metaphysical parameters. That is how 'snake' that holds little fear for children of epistemic innocence becomes a detestable snake that should be avoided, as we hear about poisons and associations with other abominable creatures. We learn to put snakes with or without poisons in a same box as creepy-crawlies, rats, etc. that hide, slither and bite where it is dark, dump and foul, something to loathe and avoid. In a word a 'snake' becomes a snake with our language and its conceptual associations. As a child I never feared a snake as most snakes are timid and harmless. Only with books, films and popular views I come to be afraid of them as I dip in our culture and psyche of anti-snakes/snake-likes. It is not the snake but the concept of snake that formed our imagination. Imaginations run wild before realities are epistemically processed and categorised. Coincidences, however, blur our knowledge, and wild imaginations may be rekindled, exacerbated and juxtaposed to some level of knowledge. A fairy tale is an imagination that acquires a life of its own regardless of our knowledge base, as it exists to rebalance mind that may be overburdened by so-called commonsensical sciences, which every now and then call for paradigmatic reviews. This is even more of a case when a fairy tale has its own raison d'etre for psychological conditioning towards predictive mind by attaining

balanced net total of the past and the present in terms of concept/reality netting. We are capable of balancing irretrievable misdeeds of reality with a fairy tale of the otherwise, like switching of presuppositions. This is the same psychological mechanism that a sinner of reality can salvage himself through repentance, which is a fiction outside religious prescriptions. A salvage is a social device to give rise to pragmatic accommodations for the irretrievable, which, otherwise, would clog our mind with sludge of spent memories with no ethical overdrives, a legacy of natural self vs social self that cannot always seamlessly contain the former without stigma and moral hangovers.

A religion that denies its own fairy-tale-ness relies on an institution so as to be prescriptive. This is how something essentially personal acquires a tool of governance by becoming an institution of hierarchical power that can impose its will through structural power transmissions. One becomes so misguided that he almost assumes a synonymy between being religious and being member of a religious institution as it is easier to visualise something intangible such as a religion through something tangible such as an organizational structure. I suppose that is how Protestantism started off Catholicism through abhorrence of rotten organizational deeds, but could not really shake off the need of an organizational structure. Such is the need of an incompetent religion for an institution. While an institutional will is fundamentally alien to a personal sentiment of natural preference as it is essentially mired in socio-economic needs of a human institution, we find it easier to translate personal sentiment in terms of institutional will. The difference would stay below the surface so long as one is not too uncomfortable with his institutional whereabouts. There is a fine balance and dynamic evolutions between an institution for its own sake and an institution as a collection of individuals. However, below the surface there is a deeply flawed contradiction of being a person that has to be socially regulated.

On the other hand, if you remove the power of an institution from a religion, then the religion is a rather poor fairy tale with no resonance. A good fairy tale but without a bad after-taste of an institution is an interactive fairy tale in which reality and imagination play together to create a personal reality that can dispense with prescriptive interferences of an institution. Here one can come and go freely between unsatisfactory reality and predictive imagination. It is the resonance within a fairy tale that points towards an imaginative reality of future where your unsatisfactory present plays a role in a fairy tale in creating predictive environments. Our commonsensical knowledge and superficial science prevent us from participating in a fairy tale by rigidly segregating reality

from imagination. Coincidences cast doubts on legitimacies of such knowledge and bring about a 'miracle' by blurring this border between reality and imagination. Coincidences are within the laws of physics with low probabilities, which are so accentuated by our communicative coordinate of more or less identical self (centre). By replacing the communicative coordinate with the personal coordinate of the solipsistic self as centre, we resuscitate accentuated low probabilities into likely probabilities that allow us to see beyond or underneath more or less accepted common knowledge.

This helps breaking of the barrier between reality and imagination instigated by superficial science and common sense that rigidly segregate reality and imagination, which in turn assume mind and body in a similar fashion, with mind in the sphere of psychology and psychiatry and body in the sphere of physiology, where the two are more or less parallel, minding their own business, but the body sphere is overwhelmingly large as it is more tangible and scientifically easier to investigate. We have a disproportionately advanced knowledge of the body sphere compared with relatively undeveloped understanding of the mind sphere. After all it is a function of mind that investigates the body as if it is an object, whereas mind cannot see itself as an object and, whatever it says of itself cannot wipe away a taste of paradox/tautology. This is how the study of the mind is relatively underdeveloped compared with the study of the body. For us it was always body first and mind distant second as knowledge base, whereas it may be closer to something like mind over body in its working relationship, as much as to say it is really software that turns hardware into a working machine. Even science has to rely on the use of metaphysical parameters (tools of imagination) to analyse physical states by providing mathematical interpretations of data. If so, who is to say a fairy tale is for children and is a useless fantasy? Its use and usefulness lie in the mind that transmutes between coordinative rationality and solipsistic collapse of transpositionality. A fairy tale is telling us we are not always rational not arbitrarily but intrinsically. That part of our mind feeds on non-spatial residues of narrative that neutralise constrains of reality with freedom of imagination.

My fairy tale is not intended as an exhibitionistic psychoanalysis of myself. This is more of a self-examination regarding my own philosophical belief in rationality. I am a 99% rationalist in that there is a physical world independent of my cognitions, with mathematically coherent, describable laws of physics, which may or may not be within human reach, but nevertheless physicality means logical evolutions of parts towards something more than those parts, and that dynamics of

such evolutions is partly or wholly observable through our cognitions, conceptual reconstructions and logical necessities. We should be able not only to extrapolate a mechanism of such evolutions but also utilize it through our engineering. I do not believe in God above describability or miracles that supersede physical laws. Our consciousness or even that of the universe as of a quantum observer is a consequence of things that constitute us. Whatever that makes up the universe, if it has extra-physical aspects, spew out a describable mechanism that does not intercede physical laws. We are not the cognitive centre of the universe nor does the universe needs us in order to exist.

So where is this kingdom ? It is where consciousness has nothing but itself to be conscious of and externalises itself as its own world. At a limit life and death come so close that the coordinative centre of relevancies (the self) collapses and approximates itself to the non-coordinative daemon. Here a coordinate is substituted with a predictive direction towards the combined whole of the self and the inner self, which, in its diminished form, reconciles the dichotomy of the representational forms. This is where a miracle comes into the rationality, and coordinatively impossible magical events take place. The self is seeing itself in the inner self that encapsulates the past, the present and the future in one whole and net out various forces and directions of relevancies into a reconcilable sum that is larger than its parts. You know your end as you see this kingdom more and more in details. Meanwhile a fairy tale is helping you by allowing you to interact with yourself over the constrains of reality. All my irrationalities are balled into the rationality of fairy tale, which can contain ghosts, spirits and superstitions, ensuring that I am at peace with myself.

I hope this work provides you with a methodology of creating your own religion, which makes you less contentious and above all allows you to face a death with courage as well as happiness.