



PROTHEAN INSTITUTE
ANALYSIS BRIEF | APRIL 2026

Thus Spake Ilos:

The rational case for doing what a dead god says.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The author of this paper practises the behavioural codes of Christianity more rigorously than most professing Christians. He does not believe in God. This is not a contradiction. It is the thesis.

Religious traditions face Darwinian selection. Those that survive across millennia do so not because their metaphysical claims are true but because their behavioural codes produce social outcomes that make practitioners more successful — higher trust, more stable families, greater collective capacity, more effective transmission to the next generation. Truth and fitness are orthogonal variables. The traditions with the best codes win. The traditions with the truest theology are irrelevant to the contest.

This brief argues that the behavioural codes of successful religious traditions are the most extensively tested institutional design in human history — and that an atheist has a stronger rational case for practising them than most believers, because the atheist must arrive at the codes through evidence rather than faith. The full whitepaper, with case studies, testable predictions, and complete citations, is available at protheaninstitute.com.

This is Paper 2 of 5 in the Prothean Civilisational Architecture series.

1. The Reinvention Problem

Try to raise children without religion.

Not without morality — without the institutional delivery mechanism. No weekly communal reinforcement. No lifecycle rituals binding individual experience to collective continuity. No unconditional authority underwriting the rules. No community of practitioners modelling the codes. Just you, reasoning from first principles, against the full weight of social media, entertainment culture, and an education system that has largely abandoned the task.

What you discover — what this paper's author discovered — is that you are reinventing from scratch a comprehensive moral and behavioural framework that has already been invented, tested across millennia, and refined through the accumulated experience of thousands of societies. Discipline over impulse. Obligation over convenience. Family over self. Long-term flourishing over short-term gratification. Rule by rule, you keep arriving at the same codes the religious traditions already encoded.

And then you discover something worse. The traditions did not merely invent the rules. They invented the propagation mechanisms — and the mechanisms were themselves part of the adaptive design. One day a week for communal reinforcement. Rituals at every major life event. Statements of commitment repeated at regular intervals. The entire infrastructure of transmission was invisible precisely because it was ubiquitous. An atheist parent trying to replicate it from scratch quickly discovers how much of it there was.

Nietzsche's Übermensch does not transcend the codes. He understands them — understands why they work — and practises them because the problems they solve are structural features of the human condition, not contingent features of any particular cultural moment.

2. Why Religion Exists — The Enforcement Problem

In a tribe of 150 people, everyone knows what everyone else has done. Trust, honour, and shame operate automatically. No formal enforcement is required. The tribe does not need God.

Scale beyond that limit and the system breaks. A person can defect from cooperative norms and escape reputational consequence. The rational response is selective defection: cooperate where observed, defect where unobserved. This is not moral failure. It is the Madisonian prediction — the structure changed, and the behaviour followed.

Religion solves this by internalising enforcement. The omniscient God who observes all actions is a direct functional substitute for the tribal community. You cannot escape God's reputation network by moving to the next street.

The Axial Age traditions of the sixth to fourth centuries BCE — Zoroastrianism, Buddhism, Confucianism, the Greek philosophical tradition, Judaism's prophetic tradition — represent a second-generation solution. Earlier civilisations had religious enforcement for millennia. What the Axial traditions achieved was portability: universal codes independent of any particular political structure, carried by transmission mechanisms that could survive the collapse of the state that birthed them. Egyptian religion died with Egypt. Judaism survived the destruction of its temple. The portable traditions are the ones that still exist.

As religious authority declines, the enforcement architecture degrades. What remains is the law — and the law produces compliance, not virtue. Compliance without virtue is exactly what a low-trust atomised society looks like.

3. What Makes a Tradition Survive

Three variables determine whether a religious tradition becomes a civilisational operating system: expansion capacity (including fertility), civilisational longevity, and innovation freedom. The variables trade off against each other. Traditions solving all three simultaneously dominate.

Judaism demonstrates extraordinary longevity without expansion — four millennia of identity maintenance through shared practice, the Talmudic interpretive tradition, and the intellectual cultivation norm. The matrix predicts precisely: profound influence, never civilisational dominance.

Early Islam was a genuine three-variable solution — the Golden Age produced expansion, longevity, and genuine innovation freedom. The progressive closure of *ijtihad* was the critical coding mutation. Al-Ghazali's attack on philosophical inquiry, compounded by the Mongol destruction of Baghdad's institutional infrastructure, selected for the conformity-stable variants that replicate through family and mosque rather than the intellectually productive variants that required institutional patronage. Eight centuries of cumulative selection — theological, military, colonial — produced the dominant forms of today.

Post-Reformation Christianity solved the problem most completely among modern competitors and gave rise to the most expansive and technologically productive civilisation in history. Expansion coded from the origin. Longevity through text, liturgy, and family transmission. Innovation freedom reintroduced by the Reformation. The behavioural codes — monogamy, family obligation, honesty, Sabbath — are what Lost Coherence identifies as the structural conditions of unified social energy.

The traditions that demand more are currently growing. The traditions that accommodate secular norms are declining. The Anglican Communion is fracturing over women bishops and same-sex marriage — with the Global South churches, growing rapidly, rejecting the reforms that the declining Western provinces adopted. This is the three-variable matrix operating in real time.

4. The Madisonian Function of God

The core behavioural codes work because they align individual self-interest with collective flourishing. The prohibition on theft makes property rights enforceable. Honesty requirements make contracts credible. Monogamy generates trust infrastructure. Family obligation creates population growth and long-term thinking. Sabbath structures rest and weekly communal reinforcement.

These codes were not arrived at by blind trial and error alone. Moses, Paul, Muhammad, Luther — these were deliberate institutional designers who understood what rules would produce what outcomes.

The Darwinian framework operates on the tradition's survival across centuries, but the coding itself often reflects the intentional reasoning of founders. The combination of intelligent design and subsequent selection pressure is what makes these codes so robust.

The divine mandate makes the rules unconditional — resistant to the case-by-case renegotiation that self-interested actors will always attempt. When the delivery mechanism loses credibility, the rules become negotiable. This is what has happened to Western Christianity over the past half-century. Not abolition — negotiation. Not revolution — erosion.

The New Atheists got the metaphysics right and the inference wrong. "The claims are unsupported" does not entail "the codes are invalidated." The codes were validated by outcomes, not by justification. Understanding that aspirin works through prostaglandin inhibition rather than divine intervention does not make headaches less painful or the aspirin less effective.

The deeper New Atheist error is inheritance. They benefited from civilisational infrastructure built by the codes they were dismantling. They could not see it — the way a person cannot hear their own accent. They inherited the output and attacked the mechanism, assuming the output was the natural condition of human civilisation rather than the product of a specific cultural inheritance system.

5. The Prescription

Practise the behavioural codes of your civilisational tradition regardless of metaphysical belief. Not as performance. As rational life design — and as a short-cut that avoids reinventing an entire moral code from first principles.

The prescription is adaptive. Reform what the changed environment has rendered maladaptive — ensuring always that the reformed code still creates a Madisonian incentive for a self-interested individual to produce beneficial outcomes. The *ijtihad* principle held permanently open. A tradition that reforms a code to function in changed conditions is adapting. A tradition that abandons a code because it has become unfashionable is dying.

Harvard longitudinal research confirms that the measure most strongly associated with positive life outcomes is service attendance — practice — not theological belief. The practice rewires the practitioner's moral architecture regardless of metaphysical position. No study has yet isolated practising-but-not-believing from believing-but-not-practising. This is a research gap. The prediction: practice without belief will produce outcomes closer to practice with belief than to neither.

Nietzsche declared God dead and predicted the Last Man. This paper predicts the *Übermensch* — and identifies him as the child who sets out to create new values from genuine openness and discovers he is reinventing the religious codes, because the problems they solve are structural. The child who creates new values necessarily creates the same values, because the problems are structural.

Zarathustra descends from the mountain. The codes work. Practise them.

This Is Paper 2 of 5

Thus Spake Ilos is the second paper in the Prothean Civilisational Architecture series. It examines the institution that solved the vertical trust transmission problem Lost Coherence identified — and derives the rational case for religious practice from functional analysis rather than faith. The papers that follow develop the remaining dimensions of the problem and the conditions of its remedy.

Paper 1 (*Published March 2026*) — Lost Coherence — identifies what has been lost: the structural conditions of civilisational flourishing.

Paper 2 (*Published April 2026*) — Thus Spake Ilos — examines what provided the vertical trust transmission technology this paper identifies as the unsolved problem of post-religious modernity.

Paper 3 — The Threshold — examines what the removal of key developmental conditions is producing at population scale — and why the implications are more disturbing than the fertility data alone suggests.

Paper 4 — The Cage We Built — proposes a structural cause for the modern depression epidemic that the standard frameworks have not identified.

Paper 5 — The Invisible Path — identifies the intervention point in the fertility crisis that financial policy has consistently missed.

The full whitepaper — with complete citations and falsifiable predictions — is available at protheaninstitute.com. What you have just read is the argument. The whitepaper is the proof.

protheaninstitute.com

About Prothean Institute

The Prothean Institute is an independent research organisation dedicated to understanding the structural conditions of civilisational flourishing — and to preserving that understanding for those who come after. We publish policy briefs, whitepapers, and analytical commentary. We follow evidence to uncomfortable conclusions and say so clearly. We do not produce output calibrated for institutional acceptability, political safety, or the comfort of any particular audience.

The archive exists for those paying close enough attention to find it.