

Roberto Mucciarini

Illumanesimo

**A NEW PHILOSOPHICAL THEOREM
AND AN EXISTENTIAL PROPOSAL
AN INTRODUCTION FOR THE GENERAL
READER**

Introduction: A Philosophy Born from Within

Illumanesimo — from the fusion of Umanesimo (Humanism) and Illuminismo (Enlightenment): the name of the philosophical proposal set out in full in the eight volumes of the corpus, of which this essay offers an introduction for the general reader.

Some philosophical proposals are born within universities, take shape in academic dialogue, and find their legitimacy in discussion among specialists. Illumanesimo is a proposal that does not belong to this category. It is something rarer and, in certain respects, more significant: a system of thought developed over decades of independent research, pursued privately, starting from a question no textbook has ever been able to answer in full. What is the meaning of life? What are we, really, beyond the body we inhabit and the mind that builds our stories?

This proposal emerges from a body of studies which, starting from those questions, revealed, over that long period of inquiry, that it contained far more than simple data and deductions. Systematic in-depth work allowed this research to take shape as a complete and deeply innovative philosophy. A path that fell into place almost on its own, with the quiet coherence of someone following an inner thread without knowing where it leads. At the outset, the path centered only on the results of studies in the field of altered states of consciousness: those particular conditions of human experience in which ordinary consciousness expands, is transformed, and reveals dimensions that everyday waking life normally obscures. Meditation, the states on the boundary between sleep and wakefulness, experiences of contact with something that seems to transcend the limits of the individual self: this is the raw material — certainly neither unique nor particularly innovative, since studies of this kind number in the thousands — on which an increasingly developed and increasingly ambitious body of reflection was built over time.

Over a span of time that covers the whole second half of the twentieth century and extends into the new millennium, this work took the form of an existential proposal arising from a broader philosophy. A system of ideas to be investigated, to be dissected in its many facets, including the cultural ones, and to be assessed with rigor and through one's own reason.

The name chosen for this system — Illumanesimo — is itself a manifesto. In Italian it evokes two great cultural revolutions at once: Renaissance Umanesimo (Humanism), which restored to human beings the centrality that medieval thought had taken from them; and eighteenth-century Illuminismo (the Enlightenment), which entrusted reason with the task of shedding light on ignorance and prejudice. The new philosophical proposal stands as the third act in this history — a third cultural turning point after Humanism and the Enlightenment: not a denial of what came before, but a further step, necessary for an age that has exhausted the answers of earlier paradigms and feels, with growing urgency, the need for new bearings.

“Just as Humanism arose to free the individual from medieval obscurantism, and the Enlightenment to affirm the primacy of reason, so today Illumanesimo presents itself as the natural next step. It does not disown the values of the past, but transcends them, because our time demands more.”

The Context: Why a New Philosophy Today

We live in an age of paradox. We have never been so well educated, so connected, so able to access information. And yet existential unease has never been so widespread. Neuroses

proliferate, depression is rampant, an inner sense of emptiness accompanies materially comfortable people who cannot explain their own dissatisfaction. Young people show a thirst for values that institutions can neither recognize nor satisfy. Critical thinking grows ever rarer, replaced by a conformism of image and immediacy.

The proposal diagnoses this condition with precision: we live in the oblivion of the foundation. We have concentrated so hard on the how — how to produce more, how to communicate better, how to optimize every process — that we have forgotten the why. Technology, which ought to be a tool in the service of human beings, has become the environment in which human beings live, shaping their desires, rhythms, and values. Metaphysics — the question of what being really is and of what our place in Reality is — has been pushed to the margins as an intellectual luxury with no practical use.

And yet metaphysics, as the Colombian philosopher Nicolás Gómez Dávila observed, “has been buried so many times that one comes to judge it immortal.” Every time it is declared superfluous it returns, because it corresponds to a structural need of the human being: the need for orientation, for meaning, for a map that is not merely geographical or economic but ontological.

This proposal, however, while grounding its reflection in metaphysical concepts, neither rejects science nor demonizes technology. It proposes instead to reopen the space for questioning by starting from the human being: not by asking what we can do — indeed it offers no manuals or doctrines to follow — but by renewing the question of questions: what are we? Nor does it suggest sophisticated tools or predetermined paths; it seeks rather to suggest an existential idea toward which we are moving.

The traditional centers of thought — the churches, the universities, scientific research itself, and even political parties — appear increasingly voiceless in the face of the fundamental questions. The great religious traditions, though they contain precious insights and continue to provide important support to millions of people, often speak a language that can no longer reach the contemporary rationalist ear. At the opposite pole, materialist systems, for all their scientific achievements, leave that question unresolved. This proposal stands as a third way: neither faith understood as the abandonment of reason, nor materialism understood as the reduction of the human to pure biology. A way that brings together the critical lucidity of modern men and women with the ancestral need for meaning.

The Architecture of Reality: God, the CEFA, Matter

The starting point is an ontology, that is, a description of the fundamental structure of Reality. Not a religious description — there are no dogmas, no revelations, no sacred scriptures — but a logical-deductive construction that starts from explicit premises and develops their consequences through rigorous argumentation.

At the summit of this architecture there still stands what religions call God, but a God radically different from the God of the Western monotheistic traditions. It is neither a judge nor a heavenly father, nor a divinity that requires prayer. It is an absolute, infinite God: the Idea in the pure sense, the autonomous origin of all Reality, above all its manifestations.

Spirit

Spirit — which in this proposal is given a new name, CEFA (Campo Energetico di Forze Autocoscienti, Energy Field of Self-Aware Forces), because it takes on a role different from the one

traditionally assigned to spirit by human cultures and religions — becomes the most original and most central concept. This neologism, coined to replace the word “spirit” without carrying the religious meanings that have accumulated in layers around it over the centuries, designates the fundamental entity of every human being: that nonmaterial, autonomous dimension, endowed with a consciousness of its own, which in this proposal represents the deepest core of what we are.

Why a neologism? Because the term “spirit” carries with it a burden of religious, mythological, and philosophical meanings that make it difficult to think about the concept clearly within a proposal so different. The word spirit immediately evokes God, the afterlife, the Christian tradition, Eastern mysticism. The CEFA is instead conceived as a technical concept, almost scientific in its structure: an energy field — that is, a concrete reality, not an abstraction — composed of forces — that is, active principles, not merely passive qualities — that are self-aware, that is, capable of awareness of themselves.

The CEFA is not a mystical addition to the human being: it is what the human being is, in its deepest and most enduring dimension. Every CEFA is an individual and distinct entity, emanated from the divine substance — that is, of the same substance as God itself, bold as this metaphor may seem — yet endowed with autonomy, freedom, and an intelligence of its own. It is a real individuality, one that persists through time, that evolves, that carries with it its own history of experiences and knowledge.

The human being, in turn, is also the CEFA. Through its fundamental qualities — intelligence, freedom, evolutionary instinct — the CEFA manifests itself in the world through what we call the human spirit and its

qualitative parts: morality, ethics, the drive toward freedom, but also altruism, love of one's neighbor, and every other element that derives from these qualities. Every CEFA is different, and this accounts for the differences among human beings in how they relate to these aspects of living, in proportion to the evolutionary level attained. A CEFA at a low evolutionary level will have access to a limited part of its own potential; one at a high evolutionary level will express that potential far more fully. But the evolutionary level is never fully accessible to the human mind: it is always relative rather than absolute, and precisely because of this it is always possible to grow, to expand these qualities, and to improve one's life.

Matter: Not the Opposite of Spirit, but Its Training Ground

In this vision, matter is not the opposite of spirit, nor its enemy. It is a different state of organization of the same universal energy. Just as water and ice are the same substance in different states, so matter and spirit are the same universal energy in different configurations, with different laws and different properties, but with the same divine origin.

Matter is not a place of perdition to escape from: it is a necessary field of experience, rich in opportunities for knowledge that the purely spiritual dimension cannot offer.

Incarnation: A Choice, Not a Condemnation

One of the most radical ideas concerns the nature of incarnation: the process by which the CEFA binds itself temporarily to a material body in order to experience the physical dimension. In all the great spiritual traditions, Western and Eastern alike, this bond has been interpreted in very different ways — as a fall from paradise, as karma accumulated in previous lives, as maya or illusion to be dissolved — but almost always as something not entirely positive, something problematic, something to be freed from.

These conceptions are overturned. Incarnation is not a fall, a punishment, a cosmic or individual error. It is a free evolutionary choice, made by the CEFA before every material life, driven by a deep necessity: to know from the inside what cannot be known from the outside.

To use an image — to go down into the water instead of watching the sea from the shore. Only through this immersion can experiences become real knowledge, a permanent part of what the Spirit carries with it in its evolution.

The Existential Program

Before every incarnation, the CEFA elaborates an “existential program”: a broad outline of the fundamental

experiences to be accomplished in that life. The concept of destiny too changes radically: it is no longer a rigidly predetermined destiny — that would be a denial of freedom, which is one of the fundamental universal principles — but a project in broad outline, an underlying orientation that identifies the priority evolutionary themes for that specific incarnation.

The program may include certain kinds of relationships, certain capacities to be developed, certain knowledge to be acquired. It may also provide for negative experiences — sufferings, losses, failures — when these are necessary in order to gain insights that could not otherwise mature. Those who have never lost something precious cannot truly understand the value of what they possess; those who have never experienced injustice cannot fully understand what justice is. Negative experiences are not, however, the purpose of life; they can become necessary means toward deeper ends.

The CEFA sets out the broad lines, but the incarnated individual — with their freedom, their choices, their relationships — determines how those broad lines take concrete form. This is the deep meaning of freedom.

An important point concerns the “failure” of the existential program: the parts of the CEFA’s program that a person is unable to complete do not constitute absolute guilt, just as individual failures and falls are not sources of guilt, nor are the errors that arise within social and cultural

conditioning. The assessment is not subject to external judgments but is carried out almost automatically and perfectly by the individual CEFA itself, taking into account the evolutionary level, the difficulties actually encountered, the unforeseeable obstacles, and the context in which one has lived. There is no divine judge who condemns: there is a process of taking stock conducted within the CEFA itself, according to criteria defined by the universal principles, but with full awareness of its own history.

The Body: A Precious Instrument, Not a Prison

The Western philosophical and religious tradition has often interpreted the body as an entity inferior to the soul: a prison, a source of temptations, an obstacle to spiritual purity. From Plato, who sets the immortal soul against the corruptible body, to Neoplatonism, which sees the descent into the body as a fall, down to certain Christian ascetic traditions that hold up the mortification of the flesh as a path to holiness: the thread of this devaluation of the body runs long and deep through Western culture.

This new theorem breaks sharply with that tradition. The body is not a prison from which the spirit must escape: it is a necessary and precious instrument, without which the evolutionary experience of incarnation would be impossible. It is the vehicle that allows the CEFA to experience materiality from the inside — to feel physical pain and pleasure, to come to terms with temporality and

limits, to build relationships in a concrete setting. None of these experiences would be possible without a body.

The incarnated personality — what each of us calls “I” — is neither the CEFA alone nor the body alone, but emerges from their interaction: CEFA, soul — the qualitative dimension through which the CEFA expresses itself in incarnated life — body, and cultural conditioning intertwine and influence one another to generate the concrete individual each of us is. This individual is unrepeatable: no other combination of these elements will ever have produced or will ever produce exactly the same configuration. Every human life is, in this sense, a unique experiment.

Symbolization: How Experience Becomes Knowledge

The proposal speaks of experiences and knowledge. How do these processes occur? Having experiences is not enough for spiritual evolution to take place. We all live, we all feel pain and joy, we all face losses and gains, we all eat a piece of bread and drink a glass of water. But not all experiences leave equivalent spiritual traces. The difference lies in a process we may call “symbolization”: the transformation of material experience into permanent spiritual knowledge.

This process is neither automatic nor guaranteed. Living through something is not enough for that experience to

turn into knowledge. It requires attention, conscious participation, will, reflection, a certain depth in approaching one's own experiences. It requires, in other words, that individuals not simply let themselves be carried along by events, but process them, understand them, draw out their deepest personal meaning.

This explains why people who live through similar experiences can have very different sensations and draw very different lessons from them: the quality of symbolization depends on inner openness, on reflective capacity, on the depth with which one is willing to face one's own experiences.

The Meaning of Life: An Answer Without Shortcuts

The answer this philosophy offers to the question — what is the meaning of life? — is at once simple and deep, and it has the merit of offering no easy consolation.

The meaning of life is written in no book — including the eight volumes of this philosophy. If the meaning of life is knowledge, such knowledge is not information that can be acquired from outside, a system of rules to conform to, a doctrine to be accepted. It is something each person must discover through their own path, through their own life experience, through an honest reckoning with themselves. “The true meaning of life, unique and personal, must be

sought within oneself and through one's own life experience."

The value of a life is not measured by outward success — by what one has achieved, by how much one has been appreciated, by what material legacy one leaves. It is measured by the quality of inner experience: by how one has lived, by how faithful one has remained to oneself, by the effect that living has had on the Spirit. This does not mean that concrete results are irrelevant, but that they are not the fundamental criterion of assessment.

A particularly significant element is one's relation to the inner impulse: that set of deep inclinations, persistent values, and epistemic needs that seem to resist cultural and family conditioning. These inclinations are not accidental, nor the mere product of environment: they are traces of the existential program, signals from the CEFA seeking to orient the incarnated life toward the experiences it has set out for itself. Learning to listen to them, to tell them apart from surface desires and cultural conditioning, is one of the fundamental tasks of a conscious existence.

Ethics, Morality, and the Universal Principles

One of the most significant and practical consequences concerns the field of ethics and morality. The perspective introduces a fundamental distinction between ethics and

morality that goes beyond the traditional one, and opens up a new view of values and of their foundation.

Ethics concerns the public and collective dimension of behavior: the set of conventions and principles that regulate human coexistence in the world. It rests on values such as justice, fairness, and honesty, and it is in a certain sense an “average” of the different individual moralities — a compromise useful for establishing shared rules that make coexistence possible. Morality, by contrast, concerns the private and subjective dimension: the values and principles that guide the choices of individuals in their innermost sphere. Every individual has the right to follow their own morality, provided they do not impose their principles on others and do not infringe upon the public sphere regulated by ethics.

This distinction has important practical consequences. The state and public institutions have no right to invade the private moral sphere: their task is to safeguard public ethics, that is, the conditions of coexistence, not to dictate how people should live their inner life. Laws must protect individual freedom while respecting the freedom of others, not impose a single model of the good life.

Universal Ethics and the Divine Principles

Above both collective ethics and individual morality stand the universal principles: freedom, equilibrium, justice, and

truth. These principles are not cultural constructions or social conventions: they are structural forces of Reality, emanations of the divine principles, operating at every level of existence, from the physics of the universe to the inner life of the individual.

The crucial distinction introduced here is that between human ethics and universal ethics. Human ethical systems — including the most fully developed moral philosophies in history — are cultural adaptations, historically determined, varying enormously across cultures and over time. Universal ethics, by contrast, rests on immutable principles valid at every level, principles that transcend cultural differences. It is not something that can be decided by democratic vote or by legislation: it is something that is discovered, as the laws of physics are discovered.

This has a paradoxical consequence: the universal moral principles, though they are not sacred in the traditional religious sense, can prove more demanding and more strict than any human legal system. Because they operate according to the law of cause and effect, without exceptions, without indulgences, without forgiveness in the miraculous sense. Whoever violates the principle of equilibrium — whoever acts so as to break the harmony of Reality — is not punished by God, but undergoes the necessary consequences of that violation along their own evolutionary path.

Intelligence is not separate from ethics: it is not a purely instrumental intelligence that can be put at the service of any end whatever. True intelligence — the intelligence that expresses the evolutionary level of the CEFA — includes the capacity to recognize the universal principles and to act in accordance with them. Not out of obedience to an external authority, but out of an understanding of one's own deepest nature.

Freedom and Responsibility

The principle of freedom occupies a central place in the ethics of this philosophy. Freedom is not a gift that institutions grant or withdraw: it is a universal structure of autonomy, a constitutive characteristic of the CEFA. Every individual is born free in the deepest sense of the term, and this freedom is inviolable in its spiritual dimension even when it is repressed in the material one.

Freedom, however, is inseparable from responsibility. Freedom does not mean the absence of consequences: it means the capacity to choose consciously, in the knowledge that every choice produces proportionate effects in one's own spiritual evolution. Whoever chooses to harm others does not merely violate a social norm: they violate the principle of equilibrium, which is a universal law, and they bear the consequences along their own evolutionary path. Whoever chooses to limit the freedom of others — who possess the same fundamental right to freedom — comes

into conflict with one of the principles most deeply rooted in the structure of Reality.

This view has implications for the legal and political system. The philosophy suggests the need for a legal order capable of protecting the multidimensionality of human experience, including its spiritual dimension; of recognizing the separation between public ethics and private morality; of promoting individual responsibility as the complement of freedom; and of creating flexible structures able to adapt to the evolution of society without betraying the fundamental principles.

The Ontological Reversal: Where Are We Really?

Among the most original and most deeply subversive ideas is what may be called the “ontological reversal”: a radical inversion of the way we are used to thinking about the relation between matter and the human being, and about the reality of our inner life.

In common thought — and in much traditional philosophy and theology — matter is “this side,” the familiar territory, the place one starts from; and spirit is “the beyond,” the unknown territory, the place to be reached after death, or else a transcendent dimension accessible only through special practices or extraordinary revelations. Material life is the point of departure; spiritual life is the destination.

This new conception overturns that perspective. The CEFA — spirit — is the true “here”: permanent, stable, continuous, eternal. It existed before incarnation, it exists during it, it will go on existing afterward. It is the most certain, most solid, most enduring reality available to us. Matter, by contrast, is “the beyond” in the ontological sense: the temporary, changeable, transitory territory that the CEFA visits in order to know it. We are not material beings with a spark of spirit: we are spiritual beings with a temporary experience of matter.

The implications of this reversal are enormous. First of all, it radically changes our relation to death: death is not the end of what we are, but the conclusion of a visit. As travelers who return home after a long journey bring back the experiences they have had but come back to their natural environment, so the CEFA that leaves the body returns to its original condition bringing with it the knowledge it has acquired.

Second, it changes our relation to the difficulties of material life. If physical life is a field of experience freely chosen — not an imposed destiny or a punishment — then its difficulties too take on a different meaning: they are not trials to be passed in order to earn the beyond, but necessary and instructive aspects of an adventure of discovery. Discomfort does not become pleasure, but it acquires meaning.

Third, this reversal reconciles human beings with their own inner life. If the CEFA is the true “I,” then the inner voice — that set of intuitions, deep values, persistent tendencies and needs that seem to come from a place deeper than the conscious mind — is not a subjective whim but the voice of one’s most authentic core. Learning to listen to it, to tell it apart from the noise of cultural conditioning and social expectations, becomes an act of fidelity to oneself.

Dialogue with the Philosophical and Religious Tradition

One of the most valuable features of this philosophy is the way it engages with other traditions of thought. It does not present itself as the only possible truth that invalidates all others: it offers itself as one voice among many in the dialogue of philosophy, able to recognize the contributions of earlier traditions while maintaining its own coherence.

The dialogue with materialism is perhaps the most urgent, given the centrality of this paradigm in contemporary culture. The achievements of materialist science are not denied: biological evolution, neuroscience, psychology. What is contested is the reductionist conclusion that consciousness is nothing but a product of the brain. Not because that conclusion has been shown to be false, but because it has not been shown at all — and because there are qualitative phenomena of human experience that resist every attempt at materialist reduction.

The dialogue with the great religions is more delicate and richer in nuance. Here it becomes necessary to recognize in the religious traditions profound attempts, rich in valuable insights, to give form to the human desire for truth and for orientation. What is proposed is only the revaluation of what all religions, and all human cultures, recognize as universal principles. A recognition that raises these principles beyond mere declarations of intent, turning them into a shared instrument of discussion and application. This does not separate them from the interpretive needs of the individual religions, but makes them an instrument of encounter and union above cultural and instrumental differences.

The engagement with existentialism is particularly significant, because existentialism addressed the same fundamental questions — the meaning of life, freedom, death — with a seriousness and a depth that deserve full recognition. Illumanesimo shares with existentialism the centrality of freedom, individual responsibility, and the refusal of easy consolatory solutions. But it rejects the conclusion that the absence of an objective ontological foundation implies the absurd: the sense of absurdity, on this philosophy's account, arises from the epistemological limitations of the incarnated subject, not from universal Reality itself.

Freedom is not Sartre's "condemnation" — that impossibility of escaping choice which generates anguish — but the expression of a universal structure of autonomy

that is deeply positive. We are not thrown into the world without meaning: we are immersed in matter by choice.

The Scientific Proposal: Toward an Indirect Investigation of the CEFA

This philosophy is aware that it moves in a territory that empirical science cannot yet examine directly. The CEFA is not observable with the current instruments of neuroscience or physics: it is not a material entity, and its effects manifest themselves in dimensions that the present scientific paradigm considers subjective and therefore not open to objective observation.

It would not be enough, however, to leave the proposal in a purely speculative space. The fifth volume of the corpus, *CEFA – Proposta di indagine* (a proposal for inquiry), builds a methodological bridge toward a possible indirect confirmation. The approach is that of “indirect validation”: the investigation proposed there does not observe the CEFA directly, but seeks to identify measurable effects that its existence would explain better than any alternative explanation.

The theoretical instruments proposed include Gödel’s incompleteness theorem — which demonstrates the existence of truths not formally provable within a system — and Bayes’ theorem as an instrument of probabilistic inference. The aim is not “proof” of the CEFA in the strict

scientific sense, but the construction of a framework of indirect evidence that raises the plausibility of the hypothesis above that of alternative explanations.

This proposal represents one of the most original and most courageous aspects of the whole undertaking: the openness to discussion with the scientific community, the willingness to be examined and debated, the awareness that philosophy cannot be self-sufficient but must enter into dialogue with the empirical sciences. It is not the position of someone who fears examination: it is that of someone confident enough in the soundness of their proposal to want to submit it to the most rigorous scrutiny possible.

Cultural Consequences: A New Paradigm for Humanity

If a philosophical theorem of this scope were absorbed into contemporary culture — not as a doctrine to be imposed, but as a horizon of reference freely adopted — what would the consequences be? This is perhaps the most fascinating question the proposal suggests. A question worth exploring even though the conditional is unavoidable.

The first and deepest consequence would concern the individual's relation to themselves. An identity founded not on social position, economic success, or public image, but on the recognition of oneself as a CEFA and as belonging to

universal Reality, which does not transcend the individual but encompasses them.

In this perspective the parameters of self-assessment would change radically. The question would no longer be “how much am I worth in the eyes of others?” but “am I being faithful to what I am deep down?” The existential unease that afflicts millions of materially comfortable people would find a name and a meaning: it is not pathology, but the signal of a gap between the life being lived and the deepest needs of the CEFA.

Our relation to others would change. A system of values founded on the universal principles — freedom, equilibrium, justice, truth — and on the awareness that every human being is a CEFA in evolution, deserving the same fundamental consideration regardless of their present evolutionary level, would offer a far more solid basis for coexistence than any purely positive normative system. It would not be a matter of imposing a single morality: it would be a matter of recognizing a shared structure of dignity and rights that does not depend on cultural conventions but on universal principles.

Politics and law would be involved as well. A culture permeated by this awareness would feel the urgency of building legal systems capable of protecting the multidimensionality of human experience — including its spiritual dimension — and of distinguishing clearly between public ethics and private morality. Institutions

would have the task of guaranteeing individual freedom while respecting the freedom of others, not of dictating how people should live their inner life. Individual responsibility would be promoted as the necessary complement of freedom, not as an alternative to it.

Formation would take on a privileged role, existential as well as social. A system of formation inspired by this new awareness would place at its center not the accumulation of information and technical skills — necessary as these are — but the development of self-awareness, the capacity to question oneself, the building of a personal system of values founded on reflection rather than imitation, on relationships with others rather than competition. The formation of young people would not have entry into the labor market as its main purpose, but the development of individuals in their entirety: body, with all its material needs, but also mind and spiritual dimension.

A humanity that recognizes itself as a community of CEFA entities in evolution — different in evolutionary level, in culture, in history, but equal in fundamental dignity — would have far more powerful conceptual tools for facing the great collective problems: planetary inequalities, ethnic and religious conflicts, the ecological crisis. Not as a consoling illusion, but as a horizon to work toward with lucidity and commitment. A conceptual reversal in our relationships, one that extends to the collective level but begins with the individual.

Conclusion: A Living Seed

The proposal is ambitious. To redefine the identity of the human being in spiritual terms without abandoning rationality; to reconcile science and metaphysics without reducing one to the other; to offer a perspective from which to found ethics not on conventions but on universal principles: all this requires intellectual courage and a willingness to risk being misunderstood.

It is precisely in this courage that its value lies. In an age of small thoughts, of narrowed horizons, of philosophies content to describe what is without daring to say what could be, the proposal has the greatness to ask large questions and to take on the responsibility of sketching answers. Not definitive answers — the most important questions admit of no definitive answers — but serious, coherent answers, open to discussion.

A new humanism, illuminated by the awareness of its own spiritual dimension: this is the vision. Not the abandonment of the world for a distant paradise, but a more conscious and fuller immersion in the world, guided by the understanding of what we really are. Not flight from matter, but the recognition that matter is the field in which spirit is formed and reveals itself. Not the renunciation of reason, but its completion by that dimension of deep intelligence which decades of research have sought to illuminate.

The seed is planted. The cultural soil that will receive it is the soil each of us prepares with our own questions, with our own willingness to question ourselves, with the courage not to settle for easy answers. The journey toward understanding what we are has only just begun anew.

The Genesis of Illumanesimo

Illumanesimo did not arise from a sudden intuition, nor from a system worked out at a desk. It is the fruit of a long journey: decades of independent research into altered states of consciousness, begun around the middle of the twentieth century, which gathered a wealth of observations, experiences, and reflections. From the second half of the last century to the present day, Roberto Mucciarini has undertaken the structuring of that wealth into an organic body of philosophical thought: a patient work of analysis, synthesis, and reformulation that transformed the original insights into an argued philosophical theory. The salient stages of this path: the first public use of the term Illumanesimo in 2011; the publication of the first volumes in 2025-2026.

The eight volumes of Illumanesimo, with their extended abstracts, are presented on the Books page and in the Abstracts index of www.illumanesimo.it.

The books are published through [Amazon KDP](#); the texts are archived on Zenodo, Academia.edu, SSRN, and PhilArchive.

© 2025 Roberto Mucciarini. This work is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC BY 4.0): <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/> — Reuse, distribution, and derivative works are permitted, provided the author is properly attributed and any changes are indicated.

Translation Note — The English translation has been produced with the assistance of artificial intelligence tools and subsequently revised. In the event of any discrepancy, the original Italian text constitutes the sole authentic reference and shall prevail. [Original abstract](#)