BIG MOTHER

THE TECHNOLOGICAL BODY OF EVIL

JASUN HORSLEY

In the 19th century science discovered that our nervous system is interspersed with forces of electricity. Science was quite right. But the scientists are wrong if they believe that the nervous force which belongs to us, and which provides the foundation for our inner world of pictures and thinking, has anything to do with the electric currents that course along our nerves. These electric currents are the forces that are introduced into our being by [another] being … They do not belong to our being at all …

We arrive in this world with the garment of our organism, without being able to reach down into it with our soul to any great extent. Instead, shortly before we are born … there is also an opportunity for another spiritual being apart from our soul to take possession of our body, namely, of the subconscious part of our body. This is a fact. Shortly before we are born, another being indwells us. In the terminology we use today we would call this an Ahrimanic being. It is just as much in us as is our own soul.

These beings lead their lives by making use of human beings to enable them to inhabit the sphere in which they wish to dwell. They have an exceptionally high degree of intelligence, and a very significantly developed will, but no qualities of soul, nothing like what we would call the human qualities of soul and heart and mind. So we proceed through our life while having our soul and also a double who is far cleverer, far cleverer than we are; very intelligent but with a Mephistophelean intelligence, an Ahrimanic intelligence. And in addition also an Ahrimanic will, a very strong will; a will that is much more akin to the forces of nature than it is to our human will, which is ruled by our heart and mind.

These beings have decided, out of their own will, that they do not want to live in the world to which they were assigned by the wise gods of the upper hierarchies. They want to conquer the earth, so they need bodies. Having no bodies of their own, they use as much of human bodies as they can, since the human soul cannot quite fill out the human body.

—Rudolf Steiner, *Secret Brotherhoods and the Mystery of the Double*

Electric information environments, being utterly ethereal, foster the illusion of the world as a spiritual substance. It is now a reasonable facsimile of the mystical body, a blatant manifestation of the Anti-Christ. After all, the Prince of this World is a very great electric engineer.

—Marshall McLuhan, *Letters*, 1969

BIG MOTHER

Books by Jasun Horsley:

BIG MOTHER

The Technological Body of Evil

Jasun Horsley

AEON

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

In 2020, I self-published my largest book, *16 Maps of Hell*. I considered it the culmination of my literary endeavours over the previous 30 years; if not my last book, then at least the last 'map of Hell'. In 2021, Aeon (publishers of *Prisoner of Infinity* and *Vice of Kings*) asked out of the blue if I had anything they could publish. Somewhat reluctantly, I dug out an unfinished MS I had worked on for a number of years, during the same 'Hell-mapping' period. The book's specific focus was on the interface between technology and human consciousness. The first part, *The Kubrickon*, though much of it was written later, will precede *Big Mother* as a separate volume.

This two-way conundrum, the degree to which human consciousness shapes technology and/or vice versa, how much our technology shapes human consciousness, eventually made it impossible *not* to notice the vacuum created by juxtaposing these two *apparent* causal agencies. If technology is created by a form of human consciousness, which is itself largely informed *by* the technology, where and what is the *missing* causal agency in this picture?

The same might now be said—at the end of this literary journey—of Hell. If I have written a dozen books mapping Hell and describing its

occupants, what of the original infernal architect? Simply put: what is Hell without Satan at its centre and core?

I have written a great deal over the years on both Satan and Lucifer. (They are not the same, at least to the degree that Bruce and Caitlyn Jenner or Anakin Skywalker and Darth Vader are not the same.) I wrote about Lucifer especially, in my earlier works as Aeolus Kephas; I even had a formal pact that I would always cite him at least once in my books. I have since renounced, if not denounced, those earlier books (*Lucid View* and *Homo Serpiens*), as at best naïve, at worst deceived. Ironically, those writings are also closer to the truth and to the heart of the matter in at least *one* sense: as Aeolus, I was emboldened (partly by the pseud-onym) to write of such things as Lucifer and Satan as *objectively real spiritual principles and intelligences*, existing above, before, and beyond the myths and belief systems created around them.

The problem with those earlier works was that my own perceptions and descriptions were informed more by beliefs than by direct experi-ence. I did *have* direct experiences—*as we all do*—which is very much the point of this opening argument; but they were distorted and restricted by the beliefs I had accrued around the experiences. Simply put, what I wrote about Lucifer, Satan, and invisible, discarnate, or inorganic beings—good, bad, or neutral—was, to a significant degree, *influenced by those same forces*, turning me into a mouthpiece or sock puppet *for* them. As a result, I literally (somewhat knowingly, but also naïvely) became Satan's advocate.

This led to a necessary rechecking of the sources, so to speak, over a 12-year period (2008–2020) of writing and researching by which I re-sorted the seeds of belief and experience, to separate the fertile and the fecund from the fetid and fruitless. As a result, the assumption of an objective reality behind my metaphysical beliefs had to be temporarily rescinded. My focus then went to the architecture and not the archi-tects: the cultural, social, political, and parapolitical dimensions of Hell, as a demonstrably *human* folly that exploited (and to a degree manu-factured) *beliefs* in invisible realities, as a means to achieve its goals. While immersed in this research, it seemed conceivable, for a time, that merely human neurosis and pathology might be enough to account for all worldly evil.

Not that I ever fully believed this (I always knew there were invisible forces, because I had encountered them). But it felt necessary to strip down the evidence of all speculations, and reduce it to documentable

facts, in order to see what it looked like. What it looked like was an all-too-human Hell that, at the same time—even by the same token— couldn't be *fully* explained as the result of human folly.

Just as water that is impure must have come into contact with something other than pure water, *any system that is anti-human and anti-life by definition cannot be wholly attributed to human activities.*

What I wish to state now, for the record, in these closing moments of a lifetime's literary output, is that the evidence I have amassed over the decades is nothing other than the evidence of entity infestation and entity interference within the human psyche-soul, and by extension, throughout human society.

Satan walks among us, and always has. Or, in the terms of this closing sin-thesis, Big Mother is watching us.

INTRODUCTION: WOMB ENVY

> As for my people, children are their oppressors, and women rule over them.
>
> —Isaiah 3:12

For my whole life, without knowing it, I was formulating a thesis. A few years ago, I gave it a name. I called it the Big Mother thesis (BMT).

It began with the premise that our disembodiment as human beings, as a species, is being engineered, and that, at the same time, *we* are engineering it through technology. With hindsight, this thesis began, appropriately enough, with movies. I say appropriately, because movies were my first focus as a young writer, and because they offer an experience of *immersion in a surrogate reality*.

The first and most essential ingredient for the BMT is the little-discussed but culturally prevalent (especially in the horror movie genre) phenomenon of unhealthy attachment between a child (especially a male child) and its mother. When a natural bond cannot form between an infant and its mother, the child is unable to separate from the mother when the time comes, and his psyche remains immersed in, possessed by, the mother's psyche. This kind of possession results in a lifelong, pathological unconscious quest to regain access to the mother's body,

as most extremely enacted in the case of a 'serial killer' like Ed Gein, who inspired Buffalo Bill in *Silence of the Lambs* and, most famously of all, Norman Bates in *Psycho*.

My earliest memory of my mother is of watching a (horror) movie with her. I have since deduced that attempting to separate from my mother and watching movies *with* her created a sort of *transitional space* between us. In that space, I was developing an identity separate from her gaze, because it was one of the few times her attention was on me in a way that wasn't overwhelming. She was looking at the movie, and I was too, but we were both aware of each other *looking*. We were *aligned* in the shared experience of gazing. The movie then became our shared reality.

If I was midwifed from my mother's psyche (and into a false reality) by movies, this would hardly have been necessary, or even possible, without the (relative) absence of my father. The same must surely be said of all the mother-bonded psychos throughout history. Who has ever heard of Mr. Bates?

In its gothic and sensational way, *Psycho* depicts a largely unrecognised psychological reality, unrecognised because also metaphysical (and ubiquitous): that of ancestral possession. It is the premise of this work that ancestral possession—and its accompanying and even more socially ostracised twin, demonic possession—is the primary motivating factor in history, and that, without including it, no understanding of human behaviour is ever going to be complete. This is particularly the case if we are looking at human pathologies, which (I will argue) are the *sine qua non*—the driving force—of the nightmare of human history.

(I am aware this could be viewed as a circular argument, that if we recognise a human individual as being pathological, that same diagnosis acknowledges that pathology is the driving force in this individual's behaviour. The same must also be deduced collectively: since history *is* a nightmare, history's dreamer must be disturbed.)

While not all ancestral patterns are pathological, all pathologies are to some degree ancestral. Our ancestry, of course, goes back a long way—into prehistory—and the most easily observable ancestral influence is that of family members we have direct contact with, especially those we were raised by. Of these, none has a greater influence than our mother. To an incalculable extent, our self-image, our preferences, desires, fears, obsessions, and choices are determined by her influence—most

especially if we consider that our mother and our father's influence is *itself* a continuation of the influence of previous ancestors.

* * *

> All forms of violence are a quest for identity. When you live on the frontier, you have no identity. You're a nobody.
>
> —Marshall McLuhan

As befits a work on unconscious urges and possessions from the ancient beyond, this book first began a long time ago, without my realising it. In 2008, I met an autistic woman at an online political discussion forum who introduced me to a more nuanced view of autism than I'd previously had. More importantly, she introduced me to the possibility I was myself on the spectrum. (Most importantly of all, she later became my wife.) My hero and role model as a teenager was David Byrne of Talking Heads, who self-identified as Aspergerian during this same period (2008). It wasn't hard to identify many similar Aspergerian qualities in myself. Since I am also highly impressionable (an autistic trait!), I took to the idea like a snake to grass. The big suit fit, so I went to the dance.

Three years later, in 2011, I was undergoing a trial separation from my wife, due in part to the difficulty I was having with her extremely 'autistic' ways. It was during this period that I saw the movie *We Need to Talk About Kevin*. I was disturbed by what I saw as an inaccurate and irresponsible depiction of autism (while Kevin, the school killer, is never identified as autistic, he has several obvious characteristics). I was particularly bothered because my niece (who has some autistic qualities herself, and was about 14 at the time) loved the film (it was she who recommended it to me). I wrote a long post at an online parapolitical forum, challenging the film and filmmakers and sparking a discussion that went on for a couple of weeks.

Then, in December 2012, when I was on my way from London, England, back to Canada to be reunited with my wife, a news story about a school shooting at Sandy Hook broke. In the light of that media event, and specifically the citing of autism as an 'explanation' for it, I went back to my postings about the *Kevin* film to see if my comments had been prescient. I decided to use the movie as a fictional counterpoint to the Sandy Hook incident as a way to discuss the ways in which

the media can—and does—create a false connection between autism and violent crime, and how (and why) this faulty perception seemed to be taking hold in the collective imagination.

As I worked on the piece, I shared the early drafts with my wife. Each time I did, she came back with a dozen links to articles she considered relevant. What had started out as an impulsive post at a forum turned into a 30,000-word opus, and even *then* I didn't feel like I was finished. Half the links my wife sent were opening new doorways (or uncovering new rabbit holes), and I was putting them aside for a second piece, in order not to lose the plot of the first.

There is now almost nothing left of that original material, or intention, that was the earliest iteration of this current book. It began as a first-person investigative narrative into the evolutionary enigma of what makes people different, the difficulty in meeting and embracing such differences, and the dangers, both personal and social, of rejecting them and thereby eliminating diversity.

When I first embarked on this exploration ten years ago, neurodiversity was a 'hot topic', one that almost no one could agree on, not even self-identified autists.* My impression, then and now, is that most people think of autism as a medical question, or at best a psychological and social one. I have long considered it a spiritual matter. In fact, my search to understand my own neurodiversity (my feeling of alienation and estrangement, of 'difference') has taken the form of a lifelong spiritual quest—albeit one that was atypical, unorthodox, and eccentric (even as a seeker I was an anomaly). What I hadn't realised—until I met my wife and began to seek answers in the field of autism—was that neurodiversity is also a highly *political* subject. In a way, it is the ultimate political subject, because the idea of a different way of perceiving reality is potentially the greatest challenge, not merely to political regimes, but to prevailing ideas of what reality 'is'. It suggests a revolution to end all revolutions.

---

*Neurodiversity is a spectrum. That means that, at one end, there is one kind of human nature (infrared), and at the other end another kind (ultraviolet). Since neurodiversity is a spectrum, there may be as many different kinds of it as there are individuals. It's the opposite of a 'one-size-fits-all' mode of being. The neurodiverse are those individuals who can only learn how to be themselves by shutting out the signals from the outside, by looking all the way inside for the real signal, the one that's absolutely unique to them. The most common, or at least well-known, form of neurodiversity is autism.

Like UFOs, ghosts, demons, or 'AI', the nature of neurodiversity is elusive. In a curious way, the more concrete the example there is to study, the less we're likely to learn from it, *unless we are able to meet it on its own turf*. A genuine alien encounter would be beyond our everyday understanding. It would require a shift in perceptual bias—humancentricity—and a letting go of certain, taken-for-granted beliefs, both about reality and ourselves.

Speaking from my own experience, as well as what I've learned about other people's, being neurodiverse is a bit like being stuck in an adolescence that never ends. We never really 'grow up' and become adults; at best we just learn to 'pass'. So all the advice, counsel, and guidance from the people who *managed* to grow up—who became socialised units of the collective neurotypical community—is pretty much useless. We just don't get it, because they just don't get *us*.[1]

* * *

> Do people think they can cure the ills of the present time by applying the same principles which have brought them about? If so, they are utterly deceiving themselves.
>
> —Rudolf Steiner, *The Fall of the Spirits of Darkness*

The womb is the last time a man was fully at one with a woman—and with existence. In fact, it wouldn't *be* a woman to us back then, it would just be—existence. We wouldn't have known our world was the inside of a woman's body until *after* we emerged. On the inside, there was nothing to compare it to. For all of us, men *and* women, woman is the original existence from which we emerge. (What's more, *all human foetuses start out female*.)

Francis Bacon—the natural philosopher and proto-scientist—saw 'science [as] a chaste and lawful marriage between Mind and Nature that will bind Nature to man's service and make her his slave'. In *The Masculine Birth of Time* (1603), 'Bacon called for a "blessed race of Hermes and Supermen" who could "hound", "conquer and subdue Nature", "shake her to her foundations", and "storm and occupy her castles and strongholds"' (Pulé and Hultman, p. 504).

Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (subtitled *The Modern Prometheus*) implied that all male-driven scientific endeavours, mythologically revealed as *hubris*, are driven by womb envy.[2] Perhaps womb envy was

driving both Bacon's and the Baron's zealous attempt to force Nature and existence to submit to their will? The ultimate goal—of science as much as alchemy—is to create life and so supplant the power of the female, the primacy of the womb. Yet it only seems to be able to do so by chopping up life—or robbing graves—and re-stitching the bits together.

At the same time, central to the Big Mother thesis, it is apparently being fuelled by an unconscious desire to get *back* to the womb. 'Science'—seen through such a lens—becomes one, history-making displacement activity that stems from feeling exiled from the paradise of the mother's body. After that ejection occurs, like Lucifer we enter into competition with it, become hostile towards it, envious of it. Womb envy clearly intersects with, without being the same as, the desire to get *back* to the womb. Since we can't ever actually do that, the next best thing is to create a substitute for it.

It is here that we see the rough blueprint for the BMT: *the desire to create through technology a replica of the mother's body*—so we can disappear into it. The technologically assembled and technocratically imposed *architecture of illusion* is there to invite us to completely forget that we exist as organic beings, and to immerse ourselves eternally in an infantile metaverse of superpowers and epic adventures. Before that can happen, we must be acclimatised to a disembodied state—if there even *is* such a thing—or at the very least, softened up to the *idea* of it.

The juxtaposition of nature vs. culture, or natural and unnatural, can certainly be too broadly or lazily made; but I find the counter-position, that 'everything is natural', since humans are part of nature too, to be equally lazy and a lot more demonstrably false, and often indistinguishable from sophistry. *Clearly*, there are things about human behaviour and human society that are unnatural, in the sense of ethically abhorrent and adverse to life. It might even be reasoned that *everything* human beings do in the 21st century is unnatural, as Thomas Berger jibed in *Reinhart's Women*:

> Nowadays Gay Pride spectacles were commonplace in our major cities … That it would always be a joke with respect to Nature might be considered as certain, but then so too was flying when you weren't born with wings, and eating cooked food and reading by electric light, and in fact, simply reading: no other animals did any of those things. If *Homo sapiens* in general was a pervert under the aspect of eternity, then why jib at a subspecies?
>
> (1982, p. 21)

To argue that all forms of technology are natural because they are created by humans is the flip side of suggesting that human beings are unnatural in every way that they differ from animals. This creates an impossible conundrum, because animals also do things that humans are considered sociopaths, even psychopaths, for doing. So are the worst kinds of psychopathic crimes part of human nature just because humans commit them? This leads to an absurd—but also aberrant—form of moral equivalency in which 'everything goes'—and becomes a source of pride—because anything anyone chooses (especially when it goes against social norms) is proof of individuality and freedom of choice, consequences be damned.

If there is a quality-spectrum of human behaviours and man-made things—ranging from beautiful and good to ugly and bad—there are presumably different types of inspiration that drive humans and that determine just how natural or unnatural these productions are. On either end of the spectrum of human endeavour, from holy to unholy, sublime to profane, there is a natural mind and an artificial one (one that is unnatural or anti-natural), informing the choices and actions that create the products that shape our culture and society. So wither cometh these two minds we are currently in?

The evidence suggests strongly that the artificial mind has for a considerable time been dominant, that humanity's endeavour—so-called historical progress—is moved, not by angels but by devils. This argument supposes an inversion, by which good has been supplanted by evil, Nature (the qualities that extend from God/the angels) by anti-Nature (Satan and his devils). That this may all be in the Nature of Things (God's plan) is a valid issue but also a separate one. Plainly, if it is in the nature of God's plan to work with devils as well as angels—serial killers as well as saints—this does not make it any less essential to discern the difference. On the contrary, developing such discernment—discernment for identifying spirits, or soul-sentience—may be central to the Plan.

A better dichotomy than natural and unnatural, then, since it makes the dividing line more clearly drawn, is natural and *anti*-natural. There is, experientially, an aspect of human experience (we cannot speak for any other species) that is 'unnatural' insofar as it is in every sense detrimental to life. My interest is not in exploring this philosophical question but taking it as a given, as common sense, and offering it as evidence of a *non*-human (hence 'unnatural') element, acting both on and through human beings in society and, by extension, within nature. It is this

element that I have taken the plunge, after all these years, in identifying as satanic, thereby placing it within a more 'mythical' framework than a strictly scientific one.

And in fact, here is perhaps the fundamental gulf between the scientific (falsely called, I would say scientistic) and the religious perspective (see the Afterword for a full discussion of scientism). In science, there is no opposite to the universe. In Judeo-Christian and Islamic religious thought, *necessarily*, God has his opposition. I say necessarily, because I think it is largely the evidence of our own experience that makes this dualistic interpretation framework necessary. We *know* that there is good and evil, that there is something within us that is deeply opposed to life, because we experience it every day, every hour, and probably every moment of our lives. And those who deny it are almost invariably the most fully possessed by it.

This doesn't mean I will be attempting to superimpose more secular concepts of culture (or technology) vs. nature, or even human vs. divine, onto this primary, ancient metaphysic of good and evil. On the contrary, I will be seeking to find ways in which the two forces within ourselves can be mapped inwards, from the outer clues of the world that surround us, to a schism that exists at the very core of us, in the place where not just God but also his prodigal firstborn son, Satan—pun fully intended—*lies*.

What follows is not a conventional history, neither of neurodiversity, artificial intelligence, computing, nor even of techno-culture. There are plenty of books that offer that, and I am neither qualified nor inspired to attempt such a study. My approach is to intuitively explore the (possible) emergence of artificial intelligence as a sociological, cultural, psychological, and above all spiritual (or anti-spiritual) phenomenon, as well as a technological one.

To lay the groundwork for this exploration requires mapping, not the origins of computing, but something closer to the origins of consciousness and of social identity. For it is out of this, I will argue, that 'AI' is emerging, with the technology being nothing more nor less than the necessary vehicle for that arrival.

What 'AI' actually is, before and beyond the technology that is delivering it—i.e. what it is in Nature (and culture) that is *anti*-Nature—is the larger question that this work will attempt to answer.

A bold examination of artificial intelligence, consciousness, technology, and the human urge to return to the womb.

The thesis of *Big Mother* begins with the premise that our disembodiment as a species is being engineered, and that, at the same time, we are engineering it through technology. It proposes that the primary driving force of human civilization is the desire to create through technology a replica of the mother's body—and then disappear into it.

Taking us into the uncanny valley where neurodiversity, linguistics, consciousness, technology, demonology, Rudolf Steiner, Philip K. Dick, Norman Bates, Ted Bundy, transgenderism, liquid modernity, identity politics, the surveillance state, virtual reality, transhumanism, Satanism, medical totalitarianism, and a new world religion of scientism collide, *Big Mother* explodes the technologically-assembled and technocratically-imposed architecture of illusion which the modern human being is increasingly lost inside, and points the way back to our original soul natures.

"Anything Jasun Horsley writes compels me to an uncanny degree; the stakes feel enormous. He exemplifies a mind grappling to the very edge of itself and to the edge of collective human experxience simultaneously. Language, in his hands, seems pressured into use as spacecraft into unknown territory."

Jonathan Lethem, author of *The Fortress of Solitude*

"Jasun Horsley is making a habit of writing books everyone should read. Somehow Horsley emerges from his own close encounters with such terrors and seductions sufficiently intact to write an extraordinarily coherent and grounded guidebook for others who may be wandering along these frontiers or about to embark into them. Horsley takes readers on a personal journey they should not miss."

Gregory Desilet, author of *Cult of the Kill: Traditional Metaphysics of Rhetoric, Truth,* **and** *Violence in a Postmodern World*

Jasun Horsley is the author of many books, including *Seen and Not Seen, Dark Oasis, Prisoner of Infinity, The Vice of Kings, 16 Maps of Hell* and *The Kubrickon*. He lives and farms in Galicia, Spain. His website is landmademan.com.

Cover artwork by Michelle Horsley

9 781801 520539 >