Grecian Speculative Philosophy as a Devolution of

Egyptian Divine science, the case of Plato

Grecian philosophy has been described by some Afrocentric scholars as a paradigm taken from ancient Egypt; however, new discoveries about the revelatory nature of Egyptian rationality and the scientific value of its religion contend that the development of a speculative discipline in the mystery schools of the land of the Pharaohs is contrary to an ingrained epistemological perception whose acme in practice is the exercise of the freedom of the soul, of intuitive faculties. In this paper, starting from the demonstrated deductive scientific nature of Egyptian religion, the author proves that what is presented as Plato’s metaphysics is better explained as a devolution of this divine science, the kemetic highest knowledge, which was deliberately kept out of the reach of foreign students, including inquisitive Hellenians.

Introduction

In his book titled Stolen Legacy: Greek Philosophy is Stolen Egyptian Philosophy, originally published in 1954, James contends, “The Greeks stole the Legacy of the African continent and called it their own”\(^1\). This position naturally implies that philosophy, as a speculative discipline, was first practiced in the temples of

\(^1\) James, Stolen legacy, 109.
ancient Egypt, and that Grecian students learned it there as a full-orbed paradigm. A perception that has been reinforced by the seminal publication of Théophile Obenga, titled *La Philosophie africaine de la période pharaonique*, which has been prefaced as a more efficient proof of the existence of an African philosophy than the one offered by the ethno-philosophy of Placid Tempels. Stressing the idea of the Egyptian origin of speculative philosophy, Obenga affirms of ancient Egypt: “it reached such a speculation in absence of any religious revelation”\(^2\).

It is well known that the definition of philosophy is itself an object of philosophical speculation; “there is no single universally accepted definition of philosophy”\(^3\), explains Omotosho. Moreover, we don’t exclude the existence of a rationality sustaining the worldview of ancient Egyptians, as can be seen in their mastery of natural sciences and mathematics. But, the point we want to make in this paper is that within the framework of a civilization where “all sciences and all inventions are (...) linked to religion and to moral”\(^4\), a civilization whose religious doctrines can be demonstrated to be a deductive science and whose epistemology dictates that any truth is revelation, speculation could not arise to the level of a discipline, to be called philosophy, a discipline to which the Egyptian priests could have devoted their time.
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\(^2\) Obenga, *la Philosophie africaine*, 73.

\(^3\) Omotosho, *Critic of the question of African philosophy*, 61.

\(^4\) Mabika, *la Mystification fondamentale*, 188.
Therefore, capitalizing on the case of Plato’s metaphysics, as drawn from his various books, we intend to show that aside from natural sciences and mathematics, what is called Grecian philosophy could not have been a full-orbed Egyptian paradigm, but rather a lowering mis-presentation of Egyptian divine science. The reason to be given for such devolution of the highest kemetic divine knowledge, i.e., the Egyptian religion, will be that the priests of this ancient African civilization were not willing to open this gem of their mystery schools to foreigners, including Hellenian students. Therefore, these inquisitive Grecian students, whose highest aim was to study the great mystery, would be served only with partial notions of a science they will patch together into a system that will be construed as Grecian speculative philosophy.

Philosophy as a Speculative Discipline Could Not Develop in Egypt

As we said above, we intend to demonstrate in this paper that Grecian speculative philosophy could not originate from the Egyptian mystery schools. Two reasons can be given as to the impossibility of a speculative discipline to develop within the epistemological framework of Egyptian temples: the scientific nature of the religion of the land of the Pharaohs and the epistemological nature of the knowledge developed in the mystery schools.
The Scientific Nature of Egyptian Religion

The first reason to be offered to account for the impossibility of philosophy as a speculative discipline to develop in ancient Egypt is the fact that while in the West religion is a “system of beliefs held to with ardor and faith”\(^5\), the religion of the land of the Pharaohs has been proven to be a deductive science.\(^6\) This scientific nature of the religion of the bank of the Nile, well seen in Memphite theology, has been evidenced thanks to its comparative study with a natural systematic theology, the kemetic cosmological argument (KCA). Now, religion is to Egyptian knowledge what philosophy is to Western lore, as affirmed by Mabika, Egyptian sciences were “linked to religion and to moral”\(^7\); this implies that all lore in Egypt was linked to science.

The KCA is one of the great contributions made these days in the domain of philosophical theology by the Institut des Sciences Animiques, a think-tank based in Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of Congo, whose focus is the scientific defense of the epistemology and the spirituality of south-Saharan Africa.

Though, the use of cosmological arguments can be traced back to the work of Plato titled the Law, precisely in its book X, as used in Western philosophy and theology, this argument demonstrates only the existence of the first cause of this
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\(^5\) Woolf, Webster’s new collegiate dictionary, 977.
\(^6\) Author, Religion and science conversion possibility.
\(^7\) Mabika, La Mystification fondamentale, 188.
visible universe. The Western cosmological argument says nothing more about
the attributes of this first cause, not to mention the other doctrines of religion.
Despite its success in demonstrating the existence of a first cause of this temporal
universe, Rowe (2010) warns us “there remains the difficult task of establishing
that the first cause or self-existent being is God”.

Like all cosmological arguments, the KCA starts from “the presence of the
cosmos back to a creator of the cosmos”. However, unlike the cosmological
arguments used so far in connection to Western theism, the KCA is not limited to
the demonstration of the existence of the first cause of this temporal universe, but
evidences the main doctrines of solar religion, the religion that characterized
ancient Egypt. For the purpose of this paper, the KCA can be introduced in this
way:

- The contingent individual nature of this temporal universe is evidenced
  by the individualities and particular circumstances it contains.
- There is a necessary cause which includes this universe by hypothesis and
  explains its contingency.
- Being the cause of an individual universe, this necessary cause is
  individual.
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8 Rowe, Cosmological argument, 373.
9 Thompson & Jackson, The case for the existence of god, 2.
• The individual nature of this cause implies the existence of other relative necessary individual causes which are at least potentially creative.

• An absolute necessary cause exists which is the sum total of all the above-deduced relative necessary causes and which explains their possession of individualities.

• As the greatest possible being, the absolute necessary cause is the Most-high. This ultimate nature implies that the Supreme Being is absolutely without any contingence, absolutely immutable, and indivisible.

• Therefore, as the manifestation of the individuality of the Most-high, each relative necessary cause expresses his wholeness, the Word.

• Thus, forming a “solar trinity”, the Most-high, the relative necessary being and the Word are inseparable in their substance, existence and activity. The Most-high acts in the relative necessary cause through the Word; the relative necessary cause acts for Most-high thanks to the Word.

From this introduction, one learns that according to this deductive model of theism, the Most-high is absolutely transcendent. Due to this transcendence, and according to solar trinity, there remain two principles directly acting in creation: the demiurgic creator (who is a relative necessary cause) and the Word. On the cosmological level, it appears that since the Most-high is absolutely without any
contingence, creation happens in an illusory temporal consciousness of the creator and is but a perspective on spiritual reality.

This nature of the visible universe can be demonstrated in the following manner. Being a necessary cause, the creator cannot leave the celestial realm; therefore, creation happens in an intermediary plane. Moreover, creation cannot happen in the celestial consciousness, the consciousness of the Most-high, because God is without any contingence; therefore, creation happens in the temporal consciousness of the creator. But, since the creator is a necessary being, the creative consciousness must be illusory, in as much as all reality is included in the celestial consciousness, the consciousness of the Most-high. It follow from all of this that this temporal universe is only a limited perception of the celestial realm; everything in the temporal realm is only a limited manifestation of its reality in the celestial plane.

The KCA demonstrates the existence of a Most-high God enthroned about the creator, the Word, and lower divinities that are the manifestation of relative necessary beings on the temporal levels. Since the Most-high is the only being absolutely infinite, the greatest possible being, what we have is hierarchical presentation of divinities; therefore, we labeled it hierarchical monotheism.

The scientificity of this systematic natural theology, the KCA, is established first of all by its deductive approach, because “a deductively valid argument or inference is one where it is not possible for the premises all to be true while the
conclusion is false”\textsuperscript{10}. Now the premises of the KCA are the existence of individualities and particular circumstances in this temporal universe and the law of causality. The existence of individuality is obvious, because in order to deny one must have an opposite opinion, which implies to have a different individuality. As to the law of causality, the only objection that can be made against it is that quantum physics escapes it. However, this objection is not valid because the KCA offers an alternative to the wave/particle dilemma of quantum physics by demonstrating that subatomic elements are true particles in undulating trajectory. Thus, the premises of the KCA being true, by the very definition of a deduction, the conclusion of this systematic natural theology must be also true.

The second proof of the scientificity of the KCA is the fact that it results in a cosmology that explains the dynamics of the universe (gravitation, rotation, and translation) at the astronomic and subatomic levels, through the isotropic acceleration of the creator to the celestial level, in a single theory, a solar holistic “theory of everything”. This cosmological paradigm has been proven mathematically to be the simplest and deterministic explanation of the dynamics of the bodies of the universe (see annexe).\textsuperscript{11} Thus, Einstein was right to hope that

\textsuperscript{10} Ladyman, Understanding philosophy of science, 264.
\textsuperscript{11} Author, Religion and science conversion possibility.
“beneath the chaos of the quantum might lie hidden a scaled-down version of the well-behaved, familiar world of deterministic dynamics”\(^\text{12}\).

As a systematic natural theology, the KCA so far enabled us to cover the following domains of the doctrines of solar religion: theology proper, the doctrine of the Word, anthropology, pneumatology, soteriology, theodicy, ethics, cosmology and cosmology.\(^\text{13}\) Now, the main features of the theism of this scientific model of religion can be demonstrated to be in perfect congruence with the religion of ancient Egypt, especially Memphite theology:

The transcendence of the Most-high: the existence of the notion of the Most-high in ancient Egypt is testified by the *Book of the pyramid*, which speaks of him as “the Sole Lord”\(^\text{14}\) and by *the Egyptian Book of the dead*, which speaks of the creator (Ra) as “self-begotten and self-born” and as a son of Nut (the heaven). The first image alludes to the transcendence of the Most-high in relation of the act of creation; the appearance of the creator in the lower plane is self-acted, the Most-high is not the conscious author of it. The second image reveals a higher order in comparison to which Ra is called a demiurge. The transcendence of the Most-high God is affirmed by Rawlinson\(^\text{15}\), by his being neither named nor represented and by the consequential fact that he was never addressed in prayers.


\(^\text{13}\) Author, *Religion and science conversion possibility; Solar religion; The theory of general devolution*.


\(^\text{15}\) Rawlinson, *Ancient Egypt*. 
The solar nature of the relative necessary beings, as the expression of the fullness of the glory of the indivisible Most-high, fullness that we called the Word, is expressed in Memphite theology by each one of them being called Ra (Sun).

The existence of two principles consciously and directly involved in creation (the creator and the Word) is affirmed of Memphis by James, “The same first pair of pre-creation Gods are together present, i.e., Ptah, the primeval Hill, who is the thought and word of all the Gods, together with Atum, who rests upon Ptah. Atum, i.e., Atom, having absorbed the thought and creative power of Ptah, then proceeds with the work of Creation.”16 The creator is called Atom; Ptah, as the Word or Logos, represents a lower divinity because Atom “sits upon [him].”17 This, coupled to the existence of a “dead God”18 in each district of ancient Egypt, implies a hierarchy of divinities.

The existence of many creators (actually or potentially causative), as the relative necessary causes of the KCA are, is attested by the fact that the Egyptian book of the dead clearly designates the creator, Ra, as “the firstborn of the primeval gods”16; but the same book alludes to “the Company of the Firstborn Gods”. Clearly, the existence of these others “firstborn Gods” does allude to their own
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16 James, Stolen legacy. 74.
17 Ibidem, 100.
18 Maspero, A History of Egypt,
actual or potential creative orders different from the universe of Atom. Theirs existence is affirmed in figure 1 as the suns in the heavenly consciousness.

That creation occurs in the temporal consciousness of the creator is illustrated in figure 1 where the demiurges are seen as suns in the body of Nut, the heaven, representing the divine consciousness; while creation, represented by reeds, is depicted as abiding in the consciousness of the creator represented by Geb.

Figure 1. The Nut, Shu, Geb scene


The congruence thus established between the theism and creationism of Memphis theology and the KCA, as a systematic natural theology that has been demonstrated to be an exact science (i.e., coherent set of knowledge based on deduction), points to the fact that the scientificity of the later can be extended to the former. This congruence can be extended to other field of theology (the
doctrine of the Word, anthropology, soteriology, etc.); it shows that the religion of ancient Egypt is undeniably a scientific episteme.

Now, if as affirmed in *La Philosophie africaine de la période pharaonique* by Obenga, “philosophy well remains an effort of man toward [emphasis is ours] an ordered thought”\(^1\), how could thought in the paradigm of ancient Egypt tend “toward an ordered thought” when it always started from the word of God, from a scientific, i.e., already ordered, religious thought demonstrated to be a coherent set of deductive knowledge? Thus, the argument that Grecian speculative philosophy was taken full-orbed from Egypt only denies, without proof, the deductively established scientific nature of this religion.

Moreover, Grayling, cited by Anthony (2014) shows us that, “the aim of philosophical inquiry is to gain insight into questions about knowledge, truth, reason, reality, meaning, mind, and value” (88). We also know that Grecian philosophy grew around 600 BCE\(^2\) out of the inability of Hellenian religion and mythology to offer valid answers to these questions. Seen in the context of Western worldview, it is understandable that Hellenian religion could not answer the questions asked by speculative philosophy because it is, like the religions of nowadays-Western civilization, a “system of beliefs held to with ardor and faith”\(^3\). Contrary, the religion of ancient Egypt is a deductive science. As seen in

\[^1\] Obenga, *la Philosophie africaine*, 73.
\[^2\] Jinadu, *Rethinking the comparison*.
\[^3\] Woolf, Webster’s new collegiate dictionary, 977.
the domains of theology its systematic natural theology, the KCA, covers, it is obvious that it answered the above-alluded questions satisfactorily. Hence, speculative philosophy could not grow out of the religion of ancient Egypt.

Seen from the historical point of view, the fact that philosophy started in Greece out of the inability of Hellenian religion and mythology to answer key questions about the noumenon and life leads scholars to opine the same genesial relation between Egyptian religion and speculative philosophy. This is what Obenga seems to convey when he affirms of ancient Egypt, “it reached such speculation in the absence of any religious revelation.” But, this relationship cannot be sustained because both religions share not the same nature; the Hellenian religion was a belief while the Egyptian one is a science.

The Epistemological Nature of Egyptian Lore

The second reason to be offered for the inability of speculative philosophy to originate from the mystery schools of ancient Egypt is epistemological. The epistemological features of Western knowledge, labeled lunar due to its focus on matter as the moon on the earth, shows that induction is the essential approach of its natural sciences. Now, induction is a kind of reasoning that always awaits the
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22 Obenga, la Philosophie africaine, 73.
suspended sentence of falsification. Alluding to this difficulty of reaching an absolute certitude that a generalization will hold in future, epistemologists conclude, “Despite a long history, there is no generally agreed upon solution to the problem of induction”23. Therefore, the findings of induction having not the power of finale truth, this kind of reasoning is bound to always lead to speculation; hence, in the West, it has eventually led to speculation as a philosophical discipline.

However, when it comes to Africa the situation appears to be epistemologically different. Africa and Europe have always presented two different worldviews that result into two opposite perceptions of knowledge.24 While the dichotomous25 and dualistic perception of the West results in an epistemological view based on matter as the ultimate nature of reality, the holistic worldview of south-Saharan African26 expresses itself through a theory of knowledge based on the conviction that reality is ultimately spiritual. Now, this perception of the south-Saharan Africa has been demonstrated to be the very brand of the lore in ancient Egypt.27

The descriptive study of African traditional knowledge (ATK) has been always hampered by the “lack of indigenous written philosophical tradition in

23 Ladyman, Understanding philosophy of science, 51.
24 Ballester, la Prière qui transforme la vie.
25 Igboin, African religion and environmental.
26 Dolamo, Botho/ubuntu ; Obenga, la Philosophie africaine.
27 Author, An Essay on Naturalized Epistemology.
Africa, excluding Ethiopia and Egypt\textsuperscript{28}; therefore, for a long time, the study of
African lore could be undertaken only speculatively, mainly through ethno-
philosophy; a move that has been started by Placid Tempels. However, it has
been demonstrated that, due to its configuration which is different from Western
paradigm, the naturalized epistemology of ATK results rather from the study of
the initiatory schools and their curriculum.

Thus, undertaken from an analysis of the Kôngo initiatory schools (that, like
ancient Egypt, included the divine mystery, the civil, and the martial) and the
content of their teachings, the naturalized epistemology of ATK has revealed that
the bases of this lore, solar science, are the following truths:

- Reality is spiritual,
- Any truth is revelation,
- Any truth is included in the knowledge of God,
- Matter is only a limited perspective on spiritual reality\textsuperscript{29}.

Contrary to the West, the rationality of the land of the Pharaohs, that we label
solar due to its focus on the divine (the sun being the symbol of the creator in
Egyptian religion as well as in many trends of African traditional religion), is
based on the doctrine of the freedom of the soul from the body. This freedom is

\textsuperscript{28} Anthony, the Meaning and nature, 86.
\textsuperscript{29} Author, an Essay on naturalized epistemology.
stressed in ancient Egypt by its depiction as a bird or a butterfly hovering above man’s body or his corpse\textsuperscript{30}; this symbolizes the revelatory conception of reason in solar paradigm.

It should also be first stressed here that, while the validity of the presuppositions of lunar epistemology (the main of which is that reality is material) can never be demonstrated, the validity of the truths upon which the solar scientific paradigm stands can be demonstrated thanks to the KCA, they are thus a posteriori truths.

This systematic natural theology as summarily exposed above has evidenced deductively that the Most-high is the sum total of the celestial realm; thus he embraces all reality. In accordance to solar trinity and its manifestation in lower temporal planes, truth can be known only as an activity of the Word in the manifestations of God; and since the Most-high is the sum of all reality, any truth must be include in the knowledge of him, this is all the more the case as temporal phenomena are only a limited perspective on celestial reality. Thus, the fundamental truths of the solar epistemology are deductive results of the KCA.

It is obvious that in the context of such an epistemological paradigm, speculation could have only a low profile. This affirmation is confirmed by the fact that oracles where the highest means of acquisition of knowledge, even of scientific knowledge. Oracles were for instance used to solve scientific problems

\textsuperscript{30} Maspero, A History of Egypt.
as in the case of the Nile as reported by Herodotus in his *an Account of Egypt*, or in judicial practice, as affirmed by Diop\textsuperscript{31}.

In the context of the soul considered as “something secondary to, and dependent upon, the body” while its activity are reduced “to mechanical or physico-chemical processes”\textsuperscript{32}, the intellectual excellence in ancient Greece consisted in the expression of one’s cerebral potentiality. Contrary, in ancient Egypt intellectual excellence consisted in the release of the soul from the shackles of the body through the purification processes which enabled the initiate to “become as the god Osiris himself”\textsuperscript{33}. Thus, the acme of the Egyptian epistemological practice was the mental unity of the initiate with higher humanities. Therefore, in a paradigm where excellence was the ability to become a channel of divine revelations, a tool of divine oracles, how could induction be enthroned as to result in a speculative discipline to be called philosophy?

Moreover, as we said above, the Egyptian epistemic paradigm implies that God is infinite intelligence and the source of all knowledge in the view of the Egyptian elite. In such a perception, human’s intellectual faculties are only an expression of divine abilities; and this is the case all the more as “in ancient Egypt, man is properly god; he is man-god”\textsuperscript{34}. But how can the Most-high then

\textsuperscript{31} Diop, *Antériorité des civilisations nègres*, 172.
\textsuperscript{32} Crabbe, *Introduction*, 3.
\textsuperscript{33} Sayce, *The religions of ancient Egypt*, 77.
\textsuperscript{34} Obenga, *la Philosophie africaine*, 101.
speculate on the truth he well knows and which is the very expression of his own

essence?

Finally, one of the characteristics of the solar epistemology that ancient Egypt

shares with south-Saharan Africa is the perception of reason as a revelatory

activity, a series of direct and/or indirect revelations. Alluding to a new idea a

member of Kôngo ethnic group would say literally, “a thought came to me”, i.e.,
came from higher planes. Symbolically a south-Saharan Africans affirms that

thought proceed from the heart. This means ideas of revealed to us from the

horizontal and vertical affections that link us to humanity. Abioje reveals the

presence of the same conception of revelatory reason among the Yoruba of

Nigeria:

At a more private level, it is not uncommon to hear an African saying: “My mind
told me”, “Something told me”; “I come to realize that …”, and so on. These type of
expressions indicate that revelation is an ongoing activity by which God continue to
guide His people.

This perception of reason, as being essentially a revelatory activity, that

south-Saharan Africa share with ancient Egypt puts a low key on induction as a

personal conceptive ability. This state of things, coupled to the fact that Egyptian

35 Author, An Essay on Naturalized Epistemology.
36 Abioje, Divine revelation in Christianity.
37 Abioje, Divine revelation in Christianity, 13.
sciences were “linked to religion and to moral”\textsuperscript{38}, implies that philosophy, as a speculative discipline, could not arise from the mystery schools of the banks of the Nile.

To sum up all this, it is obvious from the very nature of the solar epistemological paradigm that induction bows to the supremacy of revelations and oracles: these are sought in ATR as the acme of knowledge. Thus, induction could only have a very low profile in ancient Egypt, the priests could not devote their time to speculate on the nature of the truth whose perfection they knew could be reached only through revelations. Thus, within the Egyptian solar epistemic framework speculation could not result in a scientific discipline called speculative philosophy.

\textbf{Grecian Speculative Philosophy as the Devolution of Egyptian Religion}

We know that the natural epistemic evolutionary process is to go from speculative philosophy to science; i.e., science puts an end to speculation. This process has been the case with psychology which once was part of philosophy, but was sufficiently emancipated to become a science. The evolution of psychology from philosophy to science is seen in the fact that in the first years of

\textsuperscript{38} Mabika, la Mystification fondamentale, 188.
last century this discipline was part of the department of philosophy at Harvard University. However, since 1934 experimental psychology led to the organization of a separate department of the science of behaviors thanks to the efforts of E.G. Boring39.

We have proven above that, as evidenced by its natural systematic theology, the KCA, the religion of ancient Egypt is a deductive science. It follows that if Grecian philosophy, as a speculative discipline, were “taken full-orbed” from the mystery schools of the banks of the Nile, it would bear the scientific imprint of Osirian religion; speculative philosophy should include deduction as the essential mode of its reasoning. However, this entails an obvious contradiction. The Egyptian origin of Grecian philosophy is contrary to the epistemic evolutionary process which dictates going from philosophy to science as seen in the case of psychology.

As evidenced by the KCA, it is obvious that Grecian philosophy “taken full-orbed” from the Egyptian mystery schools could not be a philosophy, a speculative discipline, but a deductive science! However, we will conclusively demonstrate that the philosophical doctrines of Plato about theism and the nature of the noumenon are not at all congruent with the conclusions of the KCA, a deductive episteme. Thus, the speculative nature of Plato’s metaphysics implies

39 Psychology and its history, 14.
that, if his teachings were “taken full-orbed” from ancient Egypt, then they are
the devolution of an Egyptian paradigm which was already a deductive science.

Plato’s Metaphysics as a Devolution of Egyptian Divine Science

Contrary to the Egyptian theology whose systematic nature is evidenced by
the KCA, the eclectic metaphysical doctrines of Plato are not an organized corpus
of knowledge and are found dispersed throughout his works. It is recognized that
these doctrines “had a significant influence on the development of the Christian
doctrine of God”\textsuperscript{40}. Thus, it is interesting to study the nature of Plato’s teachings
about theism and the noumenon in comparison with the KCA.

We don’t dispute the affirmation that Plato, like other Grecian philosophers
who visited the land of the pharaohs, got the gist of his metaphysical ideas from
the Egyptian mysteries schools\textsuperscript{41}. But we contend that he handled these glimmers
of Egyptian divine science in a manner that lowered their epistemic import, as to
make of them speculative devolution of scientific notions to be called Grecian
philosophy. Thus, our purpose in this section is to evidence the devolutionary
process which is entailed by the affirmation of the ancient Egypt full-orbed origin
of Hellenian philosophy.

\textsuperscript{40} Santrac, \textit{Three I know not what}. 2.
\textsuperscript{41} James, \textit{Stolen legacy}. 
Plato’s Theism

History teaches us that the customary notion of God among the Greeks was anchored on anthropomorphic polytheism; however, the elite instructed about the mysteries of nature reasoned differently from the populace. Xenophanes said about this situation: “many gods exist according to custom but only one true God exist according to nature”\textsuperscript{42}. Therefore, “Plato’s highest idea was strictly monotheism, although he presented it in his own way”\textsuperscript{43}.

The metaphysical ideas of the Grecian philosopher have influenced the Christian notion of theism. Santrac (2013) affirms of this “according to some church fathers, Plato’s idea of a Good (the Idea of the Good) has been recognized as analogous with the notion of a Christian God” (p. 2). To this notion of the idea of Good, Plato added the concept of the demiurgic creator. One of the characteristics of Plato’s demiurge is that, contrary to the KCA, he is the same with the Logos. However, certainly recalling the insistence of the Egyptian priests on the notion of trinity, which was instrumental to their notion of creationism, Plato added a third divinity that he called the Psyche or the world Soul.\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{42} Latourette, \textit{A history of Christianity}. 98.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibidem, 92.
\textsuperscript{44} James, Understanding philosophy of science; Santrac, \textit{Three I know not what}. 
Through the mouth of Hermogenes, Plato define Psyche as the power “which carries and holds nature”\textsuperscript{45}. This concept of the “soul of nature” inspired the notion of the Holy Ghost. Thus, as adopted by the Church, the concept of the “soul of nature” led to the Christian notion trinity as including the Father (the idea of Good) the Son (the creator who is also the Logos) and the Holy Ghost.

Stump defines Christian trinity is this way:

According to the doctrine of the Trinity, God is three persons but only one substance; the persons of the Trinity are distinguished from one another only by relational attributes and not by any intrinsic essential or accidental properties, all of which are identical among the three persons\textsuperscript{46}.

Stump estimates that this notion of trinity is not reconcilable with the doctrine of the simplicity of God.\textsuperscript{47} The difficulty involved in the Christian notion of trinity is called the “logical problem of trinity”, alluding to it, Murray and Rea say:

“the doctrine of the Trinity appears, on the surface, to be logically contradictory (…) there are at least initially persuasive reasons for thinking that no being could

\textsuperscript{45} Plato, \textit{Cratylus}.
\textsuperscript{46} Stump, \textit{Simplicity}, 273.
\textsuperscript{47} Stump, \textit{Simplicity}. 
possibly be both fully human and fully divine, as well as reasons for thinking that the
doctrine of the incarnation as it is traditionally understood is logically untenable.”

Contrary to this intricate Plato-inspired Christian trinity, solar trinity as
drawn from KCA is the natural deductive result of the transcendent and
indivisible nature of the Most-high God. It helps explain the presence of two
distinct creative principles (the Creator and the Word or Logos).

Thus, Plato’s concept of monotheism evidences a complete deviation from
the simple deductive creative theism of solar religion and results in a devolution
from a scientific religious episteme toward a speculative theism. The adoption of
Plato’s theism in Christianity resulted finally in the concept of the Most-high-
creator a notion in which “God turns out to be a logically impossible being”.

Plato on the Apparent Nature of Phenomena

One of the convergences of Plato’s metaphysics with the KCA is the
perception of the phenomena of this visible universe as mere appearances of the
superior world of pure essence, the world of ideas; “the noumen is real and

48 Murray & Rea, an Introduction to philosophy of religion, 64.
49 Meister, Introducing philosophy of religion, 52.
perfect; but the phenomenon is unreal and imperfect”. Ekeke explains this idea
in this way:

Plato also held the view that there are two worlds; the visible world and the invisible
world. The visible world is the shadow of the real world. He further stressed that
reality is not temporal, but it is spiritual and eternal.

From the KCA this notion of the apparent nature of the visible world is the
deductive result of the absolute non-contingency of the Supreme Being and the
fact that creation occurs in the temporal illusory consciousness of the creator; the
finale result of this concept of the temporal universe in solar cosmology is the
mathematical deterministic explanation of the dynamics of the universe at the
astronomic and subatomic levels, a solar holistic “theory of everything”.

Though Plato clearly affirms the apparent nature of our temporal world, he
does it as a mere philosophical intuition. Handled in this way this notion became
a mere speculation for the materialistic scientific community of the West and was
soon abandoned; while the Egyptian scientific affirmation of the same nature of
the phenomena has been kept up to now because its presence is signaled among
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50 James, op. cit., 52.
51 Ekeke, the Greco-Romans and Jewish contribution, 30.
the Yoruba of Nigeria\textsuperscript{52} and among the Bantu ethnics of Katanga in Democratic
Republic of Congo\textsuperscript{53}.

Moreover, speaking of the phenomenon Plato explains in \textit{the Sophist}, “what
we call an image is in reality really unreal”; contrary, the KCA depicts the
phenomenon not as being unreal, but that its apparent limitation of the reality,
which is spiritual, is. In other words, the good that appears in the phenomenon
has its substance in the Most-high who is all-in-all, hence it cannot be unreal.
Therefore, Plato doesn’t handle the phenomenon in a scientific way as the KCA, a
deductive reasoning, does. Plato’s metaphysics is in reality a devolution
compared to Egyptian divine science.

\textbf{The Doctrine of Opposites}

The doctrine of the opposites is one of those the Greek philosophers are said
to have taken from Africa; but the use they make of it rather deviates from the
one it had in the mystery schools of the Egypt. According to James, “these
opposites are equivalent to the male and female principles in the cosmos”\textsuperscript{54}.
However, the unity of the female and the male is, in solar theology, a

\textsuperscript{52} Omotosho, \textit{A Critique of the question}.
\textsuperscript{53} Tempels, \textit{la Philosophie bantoue}.
\textsuperscript{54} James, \textit{Stolen legacy}, 46.
manifestation of the completeness of God, the Word. Alluding to this male-female
nature in Bukôngo, Fukiau sustains also that it is expressive of the divine
completeness of the human being. This completeness (the Word) is the
manifestation of the original male-female nature recognized to Gods. In
conformity to the KCA, this completeness originates from the indivisible unity of
the transcendent Supreme Being.

Ancient Egyptians understood opposites also as the cycle of lunar and solar
thinking taking turn every three thousand years. The Persians referred to this
cycle as the God of light and the God of darkness taking turn after 3,000 years. Ancient Egyptians used to name the solar phase of this cycle “the return of the
Osiris from the Amenti.” Solar and lunar thinking are two different expressions
of the same reality.

This Egyptian perception of the opposite as manifesting the completeness of
the same divinity and as two different epistemic expressions of the same reality is
destroyed in Plato’s philosophy as illustrated by this dialogue of his personages
in Protagoras, “And that which is done in opposite ways is done by opposites?
Yes.” What we have from the Greek philosopher is a dualistic doctrine of
opposites coming from opposite principles. Moreover, contrary to the male-
female unity, Plato sustains in Symposium a unity by disunion “like the harmony

55 Fukiau, Le Mukôngo et le monde qui l’entourait, 112.
56 James, op. cit.
57 Volney, Les Oeuvres de C. F. Volney.
58 Rawlinson, Ancient Egypt, chap. II §26.
of the bow and the lyre”; while the male-female nature implies a unity by the
indivisible essence of God.

It should be added that duality is ruled out by the KCA which describes God
as the transcendent ultimate reality and evil as an illusory limitation of reality. If
evil were real, its reality would be added to the Most high God who already
includes all reality, which is a contradiction. Moreover, due to the indivisibility of
God, a real evil would be part of his essence, and would result in a Supreme
Being infinitely good and infinitely evil, which is logically impossible. Thus, the
duality of evil and good crystallizing later in the notion of Satan is absent in solar
religion. Alluding to this reality in Kôngo religion van Wing\textsuperscript{59} shows that \textit{Nkadi ampemba} (the devil) is not conceived as a personal being in this solar culture but
as an attitude.

\textbf{The Doctrine of the Transmigration of the Soul}

There are authors, like Sayce, who deny the existence of the doctrine of
transmigration of souls in the religion of ancient Egypt. “There was no passage of
an individual soul from body to body, from form to form”\textsuperscript{60}. The transcendence of
Most-high dictated by the KCA sustains that the apparition of human beings in

\textsuperscript{59} Van Wing, Etude Bakongo.
\textsuperscript{60} Sayce, \textit{The religions of ancient Egypt}, 243.
the temporal planes is the result of their own bad use of the free will; therefore, 
the natural law that governs the evolution of the souls is the law of the 
progression back toward the celestial realm thanks to the purification of being; 
this is in conformity to the temporal and illusory nature of evil in solar theology. 

This law of progression is the very teaching of *the Egyptian book of the dead*, 
where the Osiris Ani, because he lived a life of purity, claims the right to become 
an Osiris, i.e., the Child of God he has been before his fall. This law is the very 
opposite of the law of reincarnation on which Plato insists in *the Republic*. Plato’s 
doctrine of reincarnation teaches the tenfold retribution of sin which results in a 
span of a thousand years in the higher plane transitional world before the 
transmigration of the soul to the lower realm. From the deductive doctrine of the 
progression of the souls back to the celestial realm through purification to the 
speculative doctrine of reincarnation the trend is clearly devolutionary. 

The Egyptians’ Reluctance to Share their Religion with Hellenes 

It is clear that ancient Egyptians were not willing to share the higher spiritual 
gem of their teaching, divine science, to foreign students. The mystery schools of 
an ancient Egypt were even completely closed to foreigners. Thus, the Hellenians
had to wait the invasion of ancient Egypt by the Persians (525 B.C.) to get the opportunity to acquire secret knowledge from their temples and libraries.61

This reluctance is seen for instance in the fact that, though the Grecian students were willing to get the best they could from the Egyptian mystery schools, the hierophants insisted on the fact that they should first of all master the human mysteries, which took them too long time. This useless insistence is manifested in Plato’s requirement that the student of divine science in his academy "Let no one enter who doesn’t know geometry".

The purpose of the divine science, as seen in the Egyptian book of the dead, is to enable the initiate to regain through purification the manifest expression of the Word, to become an Osiris, i.e., a Child of God. The mastery of human knowledge could in no way advance the initiate in this process of purification. Therefore, the insistence of the hierophants on it was only a dilatory maneuver.

The reluctance of the hierophants can be justified by the fact they knew perhaps that this knowledge could jeopardize the lives of the Greek student back home. James informs us that, “Anaxagoras was imprisoned and exiled; Socrates was executed; Plato was sold into slavery and Aristotle was indicted and exiled; while the earliest of them all, Pythagoras, was expelled from Croton in Italy”62.

---

61 James, Stolen legacy.
62 Ibidem, 8.
The Inconvenience of the Egyptian Full-Orbed Origin of Grecian Philosophy

The idea of the full-orbed Egyptian origin of the Grecian philosophy has the inconvenience of closing to Africans the scientific nature of the religion of this ancient civilization. Now, it has been demonstrated that the southward migration of African ethnics and their immersion in the same solar epistemology with ancient Egypt imply that solar religion is the original brand of ATR, a paradigm that has been kept in Kôngo religion, Bukôngo. Hence, any trend of the ATR can be explained from solar religion, from Bukôngo. Therefore, by clinging to the theory of the Egyptian origin of Grecian philosophy African scholars turn away from the needed demonstration of the scientific original nature of ATR and the superior scientific nature of the bases of epistemology that characterizes it.

As we stressed above, philosophy is to Western epistemic paradigm what religion is to solar knowledge. When Eurocentric scholars speak of the origin of Western scientific culture, they start with Grecian philosophy. Due to the belief that this philosophy was a discipline taken from Egyptian mystery school, African scholars make great efforts to claim the starting point of this philosophy as a full-orbed Egyptian paradigm, while efforts should rather be made to understand the scientific nature of Egyptian religion which is a paradigm anterior to Grecian philosophy.

---

63 Author, *The theory of general devolution.*
However, we command the works that has been done by authors such as James\textsuperscript{64} and Obenga\textsuperscript{65} knowing that did they have the new apologetic tools of the defense of solar spiritual and epistemic paradigm introduced by the Institut des Sciences Animiques, tools that reveal the scientific nature of Egyptian solar religion and epistemology, their contributions to this area of Africology would have been different.

Conclusion

Grecian philosophy has been believed by some Afrocentric scholars to be a paradigm taken from ancient Egyptian mystery schools. However, new discoveries in the domain of africology contend for the impossibility of the full-orbed Egyptian origin of this western speculative disciple.

In this paper, two reasons have been given as to this impossibility: firstly, the revelatory nature of Egyptian rationality which implies an ingrained epistemological perception whose acme in practice is the exercise of the freedom of the soul, of intuitive faculties; this paradigm gives a low profile to induction, the incentive for speculation.

\textsuperscript{64} James, Stolen legacy.
\textsuperscript{65} Obenga, la Philosophie africaine.
Secondly, the scientific nature of Egyptian religion demonstrated by its newly
developed natural systematic theology dictates that Grecian philosophy is in
reality a devolution of this divine science, because the natural logical epistemic
trend is to go from philosophy to science not the reverse.

To sustain this points we have proved that what is called Plato’s metaphysic
is in reality the devolution of Egyptian divine science, the kemetic highest
knowledge which was deliberately kept out of the reach of foreign students,
including inquisitive Hellenians.
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Annexe

Mathematical Verification of the Solar Cosmology

From the KCA we know that creation occurs in the consciousness of the creator, that there are more than one temporal plane (the intermediary and this visible one), and that the creator moves back to the celestial realm thanks to the impulse of the Word. It follows than that there are two kinds of space-time: the relative space-time which is the usual one where our perceptions occurs, and the absolute space-time which includes all the relative ones. The isotropic acceleration of the creator toward reality implies the isotropic acceleration of the absolute space-time toward nothingness and the acceleration of the relative space-time toward infinity.

By considering the feeble acceleration of the relative space-time as negligible, we can use of the isotropic acceleration of the absolute space-time to explain in the solar paradigm the dynamics (gravitation, rotation and translation) of the universe at the subatomic and astronomic levels.

Let A and B be two points at the intersection of the absolute space-time and a relative one; the distance AB measured in both spaces-times are respectively: $r_i$ and $r$. The feeble acceleration of the relative space-time is considered as negligible in this calculation. Two conditions must be met: the acceleration of $r_i$ toward nothingness and its appurtenance to the absolute space-time.
At the initial moment, seen from the point B the situation is in accord with the equation: $r_i = r$. (1). As time elapses, our observer at B witnesses of the of the distance $d$ by $r_i$. We get $r_i = r - d$. By writing $d$ as a factor of $r$ we have $r_i = r - r_k$. (2). Thus, as $r_i$ accelerates toward nothingness, the factor $k$ accelerates toward infinite, with an initial magnitude and velocity both null. The equation (2) becomes $r_i = r(1 - \frac{1}{2}gt^2)$. (3). By a double derivation of the equation (3) we get the value of the acceleration of $k$ according to the time of the relative space-time: $a = -rg$. (4).

For the second condition, we have to express the appurtenance of $r_i$ to the absolute space-time, i.e., to a volume of this space-time. Let’s consider a prism having $r_i$ as the sides of its square base. According to (1) we have $v_i = hr^2$. (5).
By writing \( h \) as a factor or \( r \) we have \( v_1 = q r^3 \). (6). From (6) we get
\[
\frac{r}{q r^2} = \frac{v_1}{v_1}. \quad \text{(7)}.
\]

The exact height doesn’t influence the calculation; thus we equate \( q \) can be taken as a constant \( c \) to get
\[
r = \frac{c}{r^2}. \quad \text{(8)}.
\]

By replacing (8) in (4) one gets
\[
a = -\frac{c g}{r^2}. \quad \text{(9)}.
\]

With \(-c g = G\), we finally get
\[
a = \frac{G}{r^2}. \quad \text{(9)}.
\]

Now by multiplying both sides of the equation (9) by the reciprocal masses of the celestial bodies symbolized by the points A and B one gets:
\[
F = G \frac{Mm}{r^2}
\]

that is Newton’s law of gravitation easily explained according to KCA, thus offering the mathematical verification of this cosmological argument.