



Musings

The Philosophy of God

By

Michael Dean Taylor

www.zurpublishing.com

Musings
The Philosophy of God

By

Michael Dean Taylor

**Musings:
The Philosophy of God**

ISBN/EAN: 978-1-4303-0436-4

Copyright © 2006 Michael Dean Taylor

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without the prior permission of the author and publisher.

ZUR PUBLISHING
PO Box 26388
Colorado Springs, CO 80936-6388
USA

Retail Sales available by Lulu – www.zurpublishing.com
Published and distributed by Lulu.com

First Edition, January 2007

Table of Contents

Forward.....	7
Introduction.....	9
Part I – Origins & Science.....	13
In the Beginning.....	15
Sequences or Time.....	20
First Cause, Infinite Causation, The Prime Mover, and the Big Bang.....	22
Intelligent Design versus Nothing.....	28
Part II – God, Religion, & Reason.....	39
God Defined.....	41
Does God Exist?.....	43
God on Trial.....	46
Religion.....	48
Good and Evil.....	51
The Problem of Evil.....	54
Plato’s Cave.....	57
The Matrix.....	60
If There is no God.....	63
Free Will & Puppets.....	65
Part III - Society & Issues.....	71
Homosexuality.....	73
Materialism & Free Agent Slavery.....	75
Responsibility of Government.....	77
Responsibility of Citizens.....	80
Responsibility of the Church.....	82
Responsibility of Science.....	85
Part IV – In the End.....	87
Freedom and Corruption.....	89
The Philosophy of God.....	91
The Meaning of Life.....	93
Renaissance or Enlightenment?.....	95
In the End.....	97

Table of Contents (Cont.)

Part V: Random Musings	99
 Random Musings.....	101
 Bibliography.....	109

Forward

“He that will not reason is a bigot; he that cannot reason is a fool; and he that dares not reason is a slave.”

Sir W. Drummond (1585-1649) (1)

What a troublesome work these philosophical musings have turned out to be. Every time I would begin working on these musings, where the existence of God or other great mysteries to man could be proven via logic, reasoning, or mathematics, my life would be brought to the verge of extinction. The more I worked on intelligent design and its counterpart atheistic Darwinism, with breakthroughs in reasoning forthcoming, breakthroughs more greatly clarifying the subject and mysteries unknown, or perhaps better said mysteries unexplained, my life, like a candle dying and flickering as if it were suffering from a lack of oxygen, would come ever so close to the very edge of being snuffed out. Hmmm makes me wonder if I should be writing this work at all? Perhaps some things are meant to be a matter of faith and not reason? Perhaps ignorance is bliss?

The first book I wrote was on Christianity, but unlike many Christians, I have studied philosophy and other fields of study in hope to reason out the existence of God, good, and the meaning of life. The work you now hold is a philosophical attempt, separate from religion, to prove the existence of God and the meaning of life to include many musings I have pondered over my lifetime. I feel if one has logical reasons for what they believe, in addition to their holy books, people would be much better off and even wiser.

Unlike most philosophical works, I have not attempted to do all of the thinking for the reader, and I do not go into great detail on any concept; though I do believe I have offered up enough information to steer the reader into the desired course of thought. The idea, hopefully, is that the work will be more entertaining and even more thought provoking seeing that I do not always explain every idea in extreme detail – Ockham’s Razor. However, I do believe the ideas are developed adequately enough to provide the reader with a great tool of understanding about God, good, and the meaning of life that is outside of holy books and religions. Logical reasoning is the basis for all of the book’s ideas and presentations. Another reason for keeping the works as concise as possible is to prevent overwhelming the reader with too much information.

I am very pleased to have finally finished the project of writing this book. All my life, I have run into people and have had many discussions which made it apparent to me that most people do not think seriously or deeply on many important issues. I, myself, did not begin thinking until about a year after taking a philosophy class in college. Yes I used my mind and thought about things, but never did I reason out things deeply like one should. I joke sometimes and say, “*I did not have my first thought until I was thirty years old.*” I can thank St. Thomas Aquinas and philosophy class for my mind awakening to a new thought level. I believed in God because of my life experience and the bible, but it never occurred to me that I could logically reason out the existence of God. St. Thomas Aquinas’ five proofs for the existence of God opened up my mind to the idea that it was possible to prove or reason out everything I believed using reasoning skills.

With no further ado, I now offer you an understanding much deeper than you would learn from studying holy books alone. I offer you God and good thru reason that was once hidden behind the curtain of previously unreasoned reason.

Introduction

Reality is the perception of something you experience through the unreliable source of your physical senses and perceptions. With no two people having the exact same perception and interpretation of reality, reality appears to only truly exist in the fables of society's collective misperception.

What is reality?

Nobody knows for certain, seeing that each person is only capable of knowing a small amount of all possible knowledge that is reasonable or perceivable. If a person can only know a minute fraction of all the knowledge that is knowable, then no one person can fully understand reality on all levels. Personally I try to stick to the big picture since I understand that there are way too many minor details for me to know them all.

I guess the picture does not get any bigger than God, so trying to understand God appears to be a wise pursuit. I have studied God thru religion, personal experience and perception, and thru logical reasoning. I have also used science's discoveries to try and understand God and the big picture even better. Knowing a little about everything helps too, so when I was in college, I took multiple classes in about every field there is. This allowed for further study seeing that the classes afforded enough information to understand the major concepts in each field. In turn, I use all of my knowledge and my reasoning skills to try and understand

anything related to the meaning of life, and I use my abilities to often try and prove the existence of God.

I sometimes chuckle inside when I hear someone say that God does not exist, knowing that it is impossible to prove that God does not exist – it is only holy books or bad interpretations of holy books that can be disproved. However, proving God does exist is an entirely different story.

There are different methods one can use to try and prove the existence of God. Statistical improbabilities and impossibilities can be used to support the likeliness of a Deity existing. One field of study where statistics and reason can be used to prove that God exists is evolutionary biology. There are other fields of study that you can use reason and mathematics to support that God exists as well, such as Astronomy, Physics, and Philosophy. I pursue trying to prove the existence of God and the meaning of life in hope of helping society and mankind as a whole. Because I have many concerns about the well being of man, I not only work on my understanding and knowledge, but I write books as well. I also pursue understanding and write books because I have concerns for society and its tendency to be self destructive.

In addition to society being self destructive, another concern that I have is man's forever and continuing ability, and handicap, of closing his mind without understanding that the universe is quite larger than all of us combined to include all that we do know and all that we can know. Because of man's desire to be a know-it-all, one field will make a conclusion on its limited data, such as evolutionary biology, then in turn we are all expected to change not only what we believe, but change all of the other fields of studies conclusions based on some sketchy and partial ideas and information. Man, by almost an infinite value, is closer to knowing nothing than something if something shares any value of infinity. In simple terms, if knowing everything is much closer to infinity and knowing nothing to very little is much closer to zero (if we are representing infinity by numbers), then all of mankind is infinitely closer to knowing nothing than anything at all.

Man does possess some truths that he knows, though the understanding of truth can change based on it being perceived and understood in how it relates to other truths.

Now lets us examine the house of cards man has built for his castle of ideas. And while we are doing so, lets try to come up with some answers that will help this cheap hotel we call life renovate itself into a resort of higher existence and understanding.

Part I – Origins & Science

*“New opinions are always suspected,
and usually opposed, without any other reason
but because they are not
already common.”*

John Locke
Essay Concerning Human Understanding

1

In the Beginning

“The authority of reason is far more imperious than that of a master; for he who disobeys the one is unhappy, but he who disobeys the other is a fool.”

Blaise Pascal (1623-1662) (1)

In the beginning, there was nothing - no stars, no moons, no planets or even space. No materials, motion, energy, or physical matter that one could call something because in the beginning, there was nothing. When we think of something and nothing, we are speaking of this physical reality that exists around us and even within us. If we go backwards in sequence to a time before the universe was formed, back to the catalyst of the big bang, did a primeval atom, or even a giant ball of matter and energy, exist, with time having no meaning to this reality because time as we know it did not exist?

Science tells us this, this tale of a big bang and its possible catalysts, but what they fail to answer is where did that come from? Surely if we regress backwards through sequences of events far enough, we have to at some point come to zero or nothing.

How can something that exists come from nothing? How can something that exists create itself? If matter cannot be created or destroyed, according to science, then how does matter exist? Does it not have to have an origin to exist? At some point did it not have to be created to exist? Hmmmm, some do not like that, but what really haunts them, if they

reason deeply enough is they realize that nothing should exist, for something cannot come from nothing. The vastness of this very statement could drive a brilliant mind mad if one allowed it to, and if I did not exist, I would debate forever that it was impossible for me to exist – seeing that something cannot come from nothing. Yes, I understand that it appears that I indeed came from something, but my wretched mind will not allow me such unreasoned comforts as a sane mind trapped within a small and limited reality where things have no original origin. I am intelligent enough to see the writing on the wall that something indeed cannot come from nothing.

A catalyst for a big bang had to come from somewhere, and whatever brought it forth must of course have had an origin - so on and so forth to a virtual infinity or to eventually nothing. Some scientist and philosophers believe that an infinite regression has taken place with an infinite regression being that every cause and effect must have had a previous cause showing that regression would go on infinitely without an original First Cause. But of course infinite regression does not work, for how can you have an infinite occurrence without the numbers zero and one with zero and one depicting the emergence of something from nothing?

I do not think that anyone with common sense or even common reasoning skills could accept that you can have causation without an original First Cause seeing that all cause and effects are somehow linked and must possess an original origin. Perhaps some people's brains fry on the concept of infinity somehow leading them to believe that the numbers zero and one can be removed from an infinite sequence of numbers?

Over time, I have reasoned that many impossibilities exist in our sequences of the past with the origin of the universe and even life itself being only a few of the impossibilities. I do believe that since we have apparent impossibilities that must have taken place in our past, we must recognize as many of them as possible to further our understanding of the origin of the universe. With these impossibilities upon us, such as something cannot come from nothing, we must reason and conclude that impossibilities do

exist and have taken place for this reality to be tangible or any reality for that matter.

I believe at first glance this sounds simplistically absurd to the common mind; when in reality, this is complex beyond measure seeing that what we believe we know must be reconsidered and examined for impossibilities that may have taken place to more fully understand the reality around us. Because mankind has assumed in the past that if something takes place or exists, it must therefore be possible, does not stand to reason; in reality, it could only mean that a virtually impossible and improbable occurrence was realized through the origin of an impossibility. Many religious people are quite comfortable with this concept because they believe in God as a source for miracles which are impossibilities or extreme statistical improbabilities that take place. Science, on the other hand, does not take into account that God does or may exist, so they often try to use statistical absurdities in attempt to prove impossible or highly improbable things possible.

Science often uses what I call statistical absurdities in attempt to prove that something is possible though the chances of it taking place are very unlikely. A Statistical Absurdity is an attempt to use statistics of astronomical proportions to prove that something is possible even though the chances of the event taken place are virtually zero – an extreme statistical improbability.

A thousand years ago people flying around in a helicopter would be an impossibility to the mankind who perceived it from the ground, but this is not a true impossibility. A true impossibility would be something that is impossible in this reality at any time such as something coming from nothing. Another such example of impossibility would be if a man used only his mind to fly around from place to place, now we believe that this is impossible, but if one man did it, we would wrongfully change our logic from it is impossible for men to fly to it is possible that some men can fly. Now every time the man flew around using only his mind, it truly would remain an impossibility, yet we would change our definition of this event from impossible to possible based only on one man being able to fly. I use this example to reveal a danger that exists with science showing that science does not

aply allow for impossibilities nor does it comprehensibly recognize them. I, in no way, am attempting to close anyone's minds by allowing for impossibilities to be recognized; but rather, I am attempting to open the mind to the bigger picture of possibilities and impossibilities.

Another example of an impossibility would be if a tornado ripped through a sandy beach and left behind a perfect and intricate sand castle twenty feet long by five feet wide and five feet tall in its wake, we would naturally say this is impossible, yet someone would come forth and say it apparently is not impossible since it has taken place. Of course I would beg to differ with the person claiming the tornado event was possible only because it had taken place, and I think anyone with a reasonable mind would agree. While the tornado event might not be impossible within the realm of the Western concept of God, it would indeed be impossible for the reality we exist in, and even though the event did take place, this in no way, shape, or form would change the fact that the event is truly impossible. However, the problem remains and will remain, with many people's current limited understanding or definition of the term impossible, seeing there is an error in believing that something is no longer impossible once it has taken place one time.

The reason the tornado event mentioned is impossible is that it defies reason, and it would be impossible to calculate the chances of it happening at any time in the foreseeable future to understand the true chances of it being able to take place. For example you would have to know the force and wind directions of the entire tornado for every microsecond that the tornado took to make the sand castle and calculate every possible position where every granule of sand came from, where it could of landed, and where it did land, and then multiply that number upon a virtually infinite amount of other positional possibilities, et cetera. Only a few of the major calculations were listed for consideration, but the odds of the event taking place are truly impossible.

What constitutes an impossibility to us? One person could witness an impossibility and think that it is quite possible while another person may recognize the identical

event as impossible. A definition of impossible that I can live with is the American Heritage Dictionary's definition. The American Heritage Dictionary defines "*impossible*" as an event "*having little likelihood of happening or being accomplished.*" (3) Science's definition, however, is something is impossible if it has zero chance of occurring. The problem with sciences definition is that the universe is possible only because it exists; although, apparently it is not logically possible seeing that the origin of the universe cannot be nothing.

While we have considered briefly the concept of impossibility and the origin of nothingness for all things within this reality, I have done so to help one understand that we indeed have to account for impossibilities such as something coming from nothing and the origins of life to truly realize or comprehend our reality, our existence, as well as our origins. With the idea of impossibilities having been clarified somewhat, I believe it is important to state that a impossibility can only take place via something that is capable of creating or bringing to past impossibilities. An impossibility cannot happen by chance seeing that the odds for the event taking place are virtually zero, or are zero, and therefore impossible. The chances of a universe of complex design coming from nothing is zero seeing that zero possesses nothing to bring forth something, even less a complex something. Matter cannot create itself.

2

Sequences or Time

*“Time, whose tooth gnaws away everything else,
is powerless against truth.”*

Thomas H. Huxley (1825-1895) (1)

Time is nothing more than a measurement of sequences of events. The world rotates on its axis one full turn, and you have a day. The earth rotates around the sun one full cycle, and you have a year. A minute is a measurement of time based on the motion sequence of the earth turning on its axis while the earth rotates around the sun. We use these measurements of time because they were, and still are, important to our lives and existence on this planet.

In the beginning, according to science, time would not have existed as we know it, for the gravitational forces of a big bang catalyst would have slowed time, or the sequence of matter, to a virtual stand still. While this may be true about time to an observer within or near the catalyst, time would not be as slow the further removed one would be from the catalyst. When extreme gravity slows the sequence of matter to the atomic level, it slows time as well.

The question that now must be posed is what existed before the big bang?

Well if we are short sighted enough to think that our physical universe is the only reality that exists, the answer would then be the catalyst for the big bang was all that existed. If we decide to use regression of sequence from the point of the catalyst existing that led up to the big bang, we would

naturally try to imagine how this giant ball or catalyst came about? We would pose such questions perhaps as how did this catalyst get here? Where did the material for this catalyst come from? If the answer to any origin questions is another physical universe, then the same questions would have to be posed for those universes. As we continued to follow the path of origin for the catalyst, we surely at some point would come to a beginning, and no matter what the origin was, we would have to ask, and where did this come from?

At some point I assure you, we have to travel back to a place where an impossibility took place, such as something coming from nothing, which we know is not possible without the assistance of a being or thing that can create or make an impossibility happen. This creates a problem for science; however, some scientists do understand the quagmire they are in, so they try and suggest that the big bang catalyst existed forever. Many of them believe that the catalyst had no origin, and it just existed and always had existed – the universe just created itself. What is rather amusing is if a person were to use the same debate for the existence of God, the atheistic scientists would throw a fit and begin asking all the same questions we are asking about the origin for the catalyst of the big bang. The fact is that even if time did not exist as we now know it, one can still follow sequences backwards in attempt to understand what must of led up to the catalyst of the big bang. And of course at some final point in regression whatever existed would have to disappear into nothingness because as much as many scientist and philosophers do not like the obvious reasoning ultimately they know that nothing should exist. Many believe the big bang created all things, and if this is the case, where did the big bang come from? In reality, the universe is in a state of flux, ever changing, showing that the universe cannot be eternal since eternal means unchanging – the universe is definitely finite seeing that it is not infinite with infinite showing eternity (See Random Musings – Infinity). In the beginning there was nothing, for something cannot exist unless it came from somewhere; showing that an impossibility definitely exists.

3

First Cause, Infinite Causation, The Prime Mover, and the Big Bang

*Some people study all their life, and at their death
they have learned everything
except to think.”*

Francois Domergue (1745-1810) (1)

In philosophy the term Prime Mover and First Cause are given to the being we know as God whom many believe is the origin of all things. Great minds such as Aristotle, Descartes, Locke, Kant, et cetera, all knew that God has to exist, and they came to this conclusion through much thought and logical reasoning. These philosophers are considered super minds even by today's standard, and these great philosophers went beyond this limited perception and reality with their reasoning and logical thought just as the atomist did. The atomist were a group of philosophers that dared to believe over two thousands years ago that everything was made up of tiny particles called atoms, and they came up with this theory using only their minds and logical reasoning. It took science over two thousand years to catch up and prove the theory.

The First Cause and the Prime Mover are just two ideas philosophers have come up with based on logic to help explain the origin of this physical reality while science on the other hand has come up with the Big Bang theory based on observance of the universe. Science believes that observation is necessary; otherwise, an event or thing cannot be proven or properly understood, so they came up with the big bang theory

based on an idea and many observations. The problem with observation alone is that many times you may observe the effects of a cause without ever witnessing or understanding the original cause. With this in mind, theories based on observation under normal circumstances are beautiful things; although, many times, due to causality relationships, theories, even scientific theories, still have to hold up to logical reasoning and examination, and this is where good philosophy comes into play.

Currently science often makes theories without the help of good philosophers which in turn creates an eventual breakdown of the theories if the theories deal with more than just science such as the existence of God. In making theories, the non-philosophical minds of many scientists create dichotomies or even hypocrisies. One such hypocrisy exists in the theory of the big bang. The hypocrisy observed is that science tells us that the catalyst that led up to the big bang existed forever and the material came from no where, and then they turn around and disallow the identical answers for the existence and origin of God. In addition, science also knows and believes that it is impossible for something to come from nothing. In reality, it appears that some scientists seem more preoccupied with proving that God does not exist than actually being open minded and fair with their science. Perhaps it is time they separated religion from the concept of God existing, so they can put aside their personal biases.

What is First Cause?

First Cause is the idea that for something to have an apparent purpose, there had to be something intelligent to give it that purpose for the creator chaos (chaos would of existed for a period of time after the big bang) could of not done so. Basically for something to have a cause, something in return had to cause it. The first and original Cause, the Cause that gave meaning to all effects and causes that would follow, had to be something that possessed the abilities to create such a causation. If intelligence, complexity, order, and meaning are evident, then the First Cause would have to be capable of bringing forth these realities. An example would be for a computer to have any function not only did it have to have a creator to create a machine that was capable of the

desired function, but it had to have a programmer as well to program the function. Seeing that life and the universe are creations of far more complexity than a computer and a computer is created by the highest form of life currently known in this reality, this definitely reveals that even the most intelligent of known designers in the physical world are still light years behind the original creator of the universe and life. Now if the creator of the universe and life was an explosion and then primordial ooze or magic dirt, man should be rather ashamed of himself for being so far behind non-intelligent designers.

Why is First Cause important?

First Cause is important because without knowing or understanding First Cause we cannot truly know the meaning of our existence, and at best, we can only make uneducated guesses. For thousands of years, First Cause has been attributed to God, or in some society's cases gods, with science recently throwing into the mix of theories a Big Bang.

First Cause has been the subject of debate since Aristotle first mentioned the concept in his writings some 2300 years ago. To me, it only makes logical sense that everything has a beginning if you regress back far enough and follow sequences in reverse until one comes to its origin. First Cause is the belief that everything had an initial beginning, even the universe, and this First Cause had to be the origin of this beginning and all other beginnings. The First Cause is often seen by theist as God and by atheist as the big bang or some parallel universe. However, the big bang or a parallel universe cannot truly be a first cause seeing that something had to create the catalyst for a big bang or something would have to create the catalyst for a parallel universe.

An idea that I created and coined that is in association with First Cause is Infinite Causation. Infinite Causation is the idea that an infinite occurrence is necessary for finite occurrences to exist seeing that finite occurrences are reliant upon an original origin and an infinite occurrence does not. An infinite occurrence requires no beginning while finite occurrences do. In understanding that something cannot come from nothing and all things have a beginning, an infinite occurrence must exist that brought forth, or was the origin for,

all other occurrences, and the infinite occurrence must be God since the universe and matter cannot create itself. Infinite Causation also shows that God must exist and that He must be eternal. (See Random Musings Chapter – section on Infinity)

What is the Unmoved Mover or Prime Mover?

The Unmoved Mover/Prime Mover is the idea from St. Thomas Aquinas and Aristotle that whatever created the original universe and all things, must in its self have been capable of causing all motion and creation necessary without any need of borrowing power or ability from any other source. A Prime Mover would not only have to be capable of bringing about original motion (could not be the big bang or catalyst for the big bang seeing that motion would have been required even before this such as putting the catalyst for the big bang in place), but the Prime Mover would also have to give meaning and order to the motion. Infinite Motion must exist for finite motion to exist, seeing that finite motion must have a beginning and origin. God would be unmovable, as St. Thomas Aquinas proposed, seeing that if he possesses infinite motion, a finite motion could not move him. Logic dictates that something must of always existed that possessed motion or the ability to set things in motion, and this something must be Infinite Motion or the Prime Mover. Infinite motion could only be God seeing He is the only being that has existed eternally.

Aristotle and Aquinas both thought that God must be the source of original motion and the source of all power, making God unmovable and all powerful. Of course God would be all powerful if He created the universe seeing that He would be responsible for all power and motion of all things from the beginning. Considering the power that has existed from the beginning of the universe and all of the future and latent power that exists, we would certainly qualify the creator of all things, all powerful.

What is the Big Bang?

The big bang is the theory that a giant ball of matter and energy existed in the beginning of the universe, and at some point the ball, with great energy, exploded and expanded making the universe and everything in it. Most atheists believe the big bang was the origin of all things while some

theists believe that God could have used a big bang in making the universe. Ultimately something had to create the catalyst that led up to the big bang; and of course, if anything existed before the catalyst of the big bang, something must have created that as well. These are all finite occurrences within small realities that require an Infinite Causation to bring them about. Once again, an Infinite Causation would be an infinite being that eternally exists who is necessary to bring about, directly or indirectly, all finite existences. If all the power in the universe, latent and actualized – past, present, and future, is finite, then imagine, if you can, what infinite causation and infinite motion would entail.

The universe and life, no matter what created it, has truly spawned complexities beyond the imagination and even our understanding. Is it possible a large explosion (big bang) could have created and brought forth so many complexities? Of course the common sense answer would be “No!” Because our common sense and even our higher reasoning screams out against the absurdity that complex life and the universe was created by an explosion, many have turned to believe that a higher being (God) must exist to have brought about such a creation.

Since God in the past could not be proven or disproved, a gulf has been created between two main schools of thought: theist and atheist. Many scientific theists believe that a big bang could have been used and even an evolutionary process, but they would both require God to make them possible.

If God could be proven at some point in time or even presented as a much more likely possibility than no God, then many of the divisions in our societies and fields of study could be healed. Society can only continue to go down hill if it continues to base its understanding of life on false or partial information such as God does not exist. Believing that God does not exist or God does exist becomes a foundation for virtually all other beliefs, and if the person has a faulty foundation at the core of their programming, then their programming will possess great flaws manifested by undesirable behaviors and scattered unrelated ideas.

“Never reason from what you do not know.”

*If you do, you will soon believe what is
utterly against reason.”*

Andrew Ramsay (1686-1743) (1)

4

Intelligent Design versus Nothing



*Humpty Dumpty sat on a Wall.
Humpty Dumpty had a great fall.
All the King's horses and all the King's men,
Couldn't put Humpty back together again.*

Nursery Rhyme, Humpty Dumpty

I used a nursery rhyme to point out to the reader that all of science can not put a man together from parts and bring it back to life; nor can science evolve a man from scratch taking it through all of its origins and different species until it becomes a man. And if they are honest with themselves, they know that even with all of their future science they will never be able to create life from basic elements.

Let us now continue our journey through time and leap from the origin of all physical things, including the creation of the universe, to a time when the world had no life. We have a world consisting of salt water, fresh water, dirt, sunlight, some gases, basic elements, and lightening with nothing living whatsoever. No plants, no bacteria, no viruses, no seeds, no molds, and most importantly and required for life and for life to evolve, we have no living programming DNA (DNA - the

most complex programming known in the universe) or RNA. Now what happens? To the reasonable mind, you have nothing but lifeless elements.

What is life?

Life is not a biological mechanism or machine, the mechanisms or machines only house a life force that is more than mere electrical impulses. You cannot destroy or create a life force, for it enters in and then escapes these biological machines that only house the life force for a temporary period of time. Because of this, lightening, sunlight, and elements cannot create life, for there is no life that exists within lightening, sunlight, and elements.

Man over time has shown that he is truly an intelligent and clever designer, though he cannot create life and does not even understand the origins of life. Is it reasonable to suggest that unintelligent environment and basic elements can create life that evolves into highly complex organisms, when all the king's horses and all the king's men cannot do so? Is it possible, now or in the future, that science will be able to take existing chimpanzees or apes and evolve them into a man using environment alone?

What is evolution? Evolution is a scientific theory based on some physical observations of life and past life and how life is all interrelated. Because of the apparent relationships between different species, a theory was created in attempt to answer how life began and how it evolved from lower life forms to higher life forms. The theory is hotly debated because life in all its forms is highly complex, and since the theory states that life began and then evolved blindly from basic elements, gases, sunlight, lightening, and water, many believe the theory is at best a shot in the dark.

Let us skip even further ahead now from a time of no life existing to a time when the first creature that had no eyes or programming/DNA to spawn eyes, spawned an eye, or even a photocell. Rather absurd I must admit seeing that the machine/creature had no way of even conceiving that a visual apparatus would greatly improve its ability. Absurd I say since eyes did not exist and the creature had no way of even knowing that an eye would be useful for it to perceive its environment or to survive - nor did it have a blue print for the

initial apparatus or for a final apparatus, but rather its evolving would be wildly stabbing in the dark. How could blind evolution even know that a world existed that could be perceived thru vision?

Now science believes that in the evolutionary process there are two types of mutations that occur for a creature to evolve. One is a random mutation, which would be a single mutation event in one generation of a species life; with the second being cumulative mutation/selection which is a single or group of random mutations and non-random selections, building on previous mutations and selections, taking place over multiple generations leading towards a greater, or lesser, unforeseeable non-existing goal of blindly creating a new system or a greatly improved system with the help of natural selection.

So we now have two choices. Did the creature spawn a fully integrated operational visual system in a random single mutation such as two fully integrated eyes suddenly appearing out of the side of ones head (by integrated I mean a system that is linked into all other related systems such as the circulatory system, brain, eye lids, lashes, tear ducts, etc., with every cell interacting with the rest of the eyes system's cells to form a common purpose)? Or did it happen over generations with one mutation building upon the next using the cumulative effect which still remains highly unlikely and even impossible, though science believes this is the answer?

The problem is some scientists did their math backwards, and while they believe that cumulative selection makes it far more likely for a new apparatus to evolve, in fact, when creating a totally new system, the cumulative selection is still impossible. To give you an example, for one creature to randomly mutate a few integrated cells towards the greater goal of a billion cell apparatus such as a vision system and then to continue on blindly, generation after generation, mutating a few more cells based on previous cell mutations and selections with each passing generation, in reality, would be far greater than the equivalent of winning the lottery not once but over a billion times virtually consecutively – the odds of course are zero chance or at best it is a virtually infinite statistical absurdity.

Remember there is no eye that exist, no conceptional thought of an eye, and no DNA/blueprint or plan even for a single eye cell or photo cell. One should also keep in mind even with cumulative selection the creature's system, without possessing a plan for the final apparatus or form, would mutate blindly towards a greater, or even lesser, goal. In addition to the creature having no programming to spawn an eye, the living system would have no way of knowing whether to mutate any other cells into the eye such as cells of no design, no mutation, bad design, cancer, feet, or hand cells, et cetera; and for a new cell to mutate, virtually all other systems or cells in the being would have to mutate as well to accommodate the new larger fully integrated life form. If you do the math, you see that the system is still blind when attempting to build on previous mutations to create new cells or even to create an overall complex design where no goal exists. Cumulative selection may work with natural selection to improve an existing system, but it will not work in creating a totally new system.

Science estimates that the human body is made up of approximately ten trillion cells with every complex cell in exactly the correct place performing a dependant and independent function. Ten trillion cells is equal to well over ten trillion random/blind mutations while the number of cumulative selections for a ten trillion cell creature without a goal would be unknown but logically astronomically high. However, we do know the number of mutations and selections per generational life cycles needed does not decrease dramatically thru cumulative selection because you have blind mutations and blind selections where no design and no goal exists with location of each dependant/independent cell remaining just as important as the cell mutation itself.

To find out exactly how long it would take for a human to evolve, one would not only have to calculate the mutations/time of a human evolving from a missing link, but one would also have to calculate the mutations/time of a missing link evolving from an ape while taking into consideration every random mutation and selection that would have to occur. In reality, evolution is full of missing links which would have to be considered in the evolutionary

trail as well. It might be easier to just calculate a human evolving directly from dirt or bacteria. Even with bacteria (1 cell) evolving and directly improving towards the final form of a human (10 Trillion Cells) at a rate of 100 cell improvements a generation, with the average generation being one year, it would take 100 billion years for the bacteria to evolve into a human, not that this is possible to begin with. The universe according to science is only 13 billion years old. The magic trick of one species evolving by turning into another, then another, then another, then another, then another, et cetera, would take even longer if it is even possible to begin with.

It appears that species have a final form that is reached at some point not allowing for serious further mutation; and when this point is reached, virtually all future mutations are negative mutations. Final form is evident throughout life seeing that there are distinct lines or separations between species and even within genres of species. If a possum evolved from a rat, or vice versa, then logically there should be multiple life forms within the evolutionary chain between a possum and a rat, unless final forms are evident. Further more, no species within the same genre that has reached its final form can evolve into a higher species; for example, an ape (final form) cannot evolve into a modern human (final form). If there is a final form, which is virtually self evident otherwise there would be far more transitional species between species of the same genre, then there should also be an initial form which would be the lowest form of life within a species that is capable of evolving to its final form. Because of this, it would appear that all life that exists today is not a trail of evolutionary linkage, but rather it is a trail of final forms. In effect we do not see causes, but we only see the effects, like shadows on a wall.

Is it possible for bacteria to evolve thru many biological species arriving at a highly complex human? Of course the answer to a rational mind would be no! I believe confusion arises due to man's understanding that a biological mechanism possessing some abilities to adapt via natural selection does not imply that all life forms could have evolved from bacteria without many impossibilities taking place. Yet, some in science believe that every living species evolved

blindly from bacteria. Because of the simple fact that there are not many existing transitional life forms between life forms and the next highest life form, this shows that evolution according to current theory did not take place.

On a different note, there are many statistical impossibilities and absurdities that exist within the theory of evolution with some of them being false statistical equations seeing that science's figures are definitely towards the lower end, and thus showing a higher probability for evolution than truly exists. If a statistical impossibility exists showing that life could not have evolved without the assistance of an intelligent designer, then man is irresponsible in teaching current evolutionary theory without informing its students. At what cost does man keep truth out of the classroom based only on the erroneous excuse of separation of church and state? Ultimately we have one field of study dominating and dictating to all other fields of study which I must profess is a serious and grave error. We have a few bones and some ideas about life and how it evolved - next thing you know we are cranking out the masses from public schools doubting everything but science. In effect, atheistic scientists and their theories have become like gods, virtually forcing man to alter his entire belief and knowledge system to accommodate a few egotists.

We have only mentioned the eye apparatus up until now as one highly complex integrated system, and I chose the eye since it has always been the most popular biological system to debate. However, let me mention one other system while leaving the rest of the systems for others to critique. The reproductive system is a bizarre system that has to be answered for. Almost all species of life have a male and female of the species. The problem of this is that at some point almost all living things separated into male and female while the evolutionary trail has no evidence of how and when this happened? Did the male and female evolve separately which would make current evolutionary theory even more absurd, and if they did not evolve separately, then how does one answer the fact that the male and female separated at some point and both possess compatible but not repetitive reproductive systems with the other?

Another strange phenomenon is that the male of virtually all living species at some point had to create a sub-life form we know as semen to carry all of its genetic life information and even life itself to a female who would have a compatible receiver system that works in unison and agreement with the male system.

One final idea on the reproductive system is that it is of course a highly complex system which would have required more than a single generation random mutation for any creature to ever reproduce. Because of this, it is unknown how any life form could have lived long enough to mutate a reproductive system seeing that a reproductive system would be necessary for the species to continue to exist; otherwise, the living organism would have died out on the first generation without ever having evolved or reproduced. The likeliness of cell replication and species reproduction taking place is of course zero seeing that life could not have survived, without a system for reproduction already in place, even one generation thru evolutionary means. The reproductive system is a complex system, science tells us, that could not evolve using random mutation alone but would require cumulative selection as well. The problem is the random mutation could not make a complex reproductive system, and cumulative selection is not possible unless reproduction takes place – so science is in a Catch 22 they are not prepared to admit.

Biology has so many impossibilities to consider such as any new integrated system evolving without any previous DNA information for that system existing with all the cells of each system not only working in unison within each system but working with the other systems of the entire machine/body as well. A foot, a hand, an eye are all definite designs, yet no design existed for any of them according to evolutionary theory. At some point did a heart just pop out some arms, legs, brain stem and brain, mouth, digestive system, et cetera, and just start walking around? Every system is reliant on all of the other systems for survival of a species. Are we to believe that every system that makes up each living thing randomly mutated spontaneously without design at the same time as all other systems? Are we to believe that every biological system of each living organism

evolved simultaneously using cumulative selection? Calculate the statistical chances of that one happening. Cumulative selection does not work seeing that a living creature could not exist without all of its systems in place simultaneously. So with cumulative selection you not only have to estimate the chances of one system being blindly created, you have to estimate the probability of all systems blindly beginning and evolving simultaneously and in conjunction with all other systems. You can not have a creature walking around without legs or any other system for that matter. Statistically science can prove that evolution is false though they seem rather content waiting in hope that some new evidence will arrive that will keep them from having to come out of the closet to reveal that current evolutionary theory is false or only partially true.

In addition to the impossibilities already mentioned, another impossibility for consideration would be the variety of not one biological or organic machine/creature having evolved, but over one million different complex life forms existing all unique from the next. Now remember to keep in mind that every living organism in its own right is a unique highly advanced biological machine, and if we use current evolutionary theory, no blueprints/planning/DNA existed in the beginning for anything, it all was blindly designed from nothing – yet these living biological machines are far more complex and far beyond anything mankind can design and develop making primordial ooze higher on the evolutionary scale of ability than man himself.

In reality, evolution without intelligent design (intelligent design is the idea that living organisms are highly complex organisms therefore a designer capable of highly complex designs must of created them and this designer could only be God) is the story of some ooze that aspired to be bacteria, whom aspired to be fish, whom aspired to be rats, whom aspired to be apes, whom aspired to be men, whom aspired to make a jet fighter. The fruit of a tree is seen as a direct result, offspring, or production of a tree. In affect we are asked to believe by atheistic biologist that primordial ooze not only created all life to include man, but it also over time created all of his fruit and creations as well. I ask, “*when do*

the lies stop?" Ultimately to teach or believe that all life blindly evolved from bacteria, or any other simple life for that matter, is absurd beyond comprehension.

On a philosophical note, does the existence of extremely complex biological mechanisms (life in all its forms) suggest that a creative force must exist that is capable of creating such complex machines? Are noncomplex environmental forces and stagnant elements such as lightening, sunlight, gases, water, dirt, and minerals enough to create over time complex designs? Does an intelligent design suggest or demand an intelligent designer? Does an intelligent/highly complex design suggest or demand it is more probable that an intelligent designer exists than one does not? If creation suggests that an intelligent designer is statistically more probable than not, does this provide further evidence that God does in fact exist?

It appears that God may have used what appears to be an evolutionary process or method, and it is quite possible God did this for good reason. I do not believe however that life could have evolved from bacteria up thru to humans, for prior programming must exist to give life the capability of adaptation with even more programming to allow evolution to take place. Certainly I disagree that a primate can evolve into a human, and I strongly disagree that life can start without a life giver. Certainly I would hope that people can see that bacteria over any amount of time could not evolve into a human, for this would be completely absurd and unreasonable.

The fact remains that the field of biology has no idea how life really began or how it truly evolved, for there are too many impossibilities and unanswerable questions that exist. For man to truly understand the mysteries of the universe, he must first understand the purpose of the machine and the meaning of life. And while there are fields of study that man uses to examine things such as the purpose for creation and the meaning of life, with religion and philosophy being two of the fields, many of these fields are dwarfed by the many partial truths and assumptions of evolutionary biology and irresponsible science. Perhaps man should work to show how many false assumptions and how little evolutionary biology

really knows or how little it can prove, so he can begin correcting all of societies issues that have been created based on false information.

Dawkins states in his work, “The Blind Watchmaker,” that “*evolution reveals a universe without design,*” (5) well this could not be further from the truth – design is evident in all life. If something possesses design, then design is evident. The debate is not if the universe and life has apparent design because this is obvious. The real debate is who or what designed it - God or an explosion and some magic dirt? Once again with atheistic evolutionary theory we have something (complex design) coming from nothing (no life, no designer, no DNA). The fact is current evolutionary theory is one of the biggest and most destructive mishaps ever created.

If in the beginning there was no life or zero life, then it would stand to logical reasoning that life could not evolve from nothing or zero. In more plain words, life could not evolve when no life existed to evolve.

Part II – God, Religion, & Reason

*“Philosophy, when superficially studied excites
doubt; when thoroughly explored, it dispels it.*

Francis Bacon (1561-1626) (1)

5

God Defined

*“There is a beauty in the name appropriated by
the Saxon nations to the Deity . . .
They called him “God” which is literally
“The Good” . . .”*

Charles Tennyson Turner (1808-1879) (1)

We have been discussing God for some time now without really clarifying anything about God. Where did God come from? No one knows where God came from, but it is believed that He has always existed and is a spirit being. Is there an impossibility that exists for God to exist? The answer is it appears so, but if it is impossible for God to exist, then all other impossibilities would have no origin or source. No matter what you believe the origin of everything is, at some point you get back to apparent impossibilities. Because of the numerous impossibilities that exist and that have occurred over time, the only reasonable conclusion is that God must exist. The alternative possibility that God does not exist is not truly a possibility seeing that as I said before we must have a mechanism for numerous impossibilities. With this said, let us discuss a few of the qualities that God must have to be God.

To be God, God would have to be all powerful which is apparent to create such a universe. God would be all knowing, which is also apparent if the universe is really 13 billion years old; and if the universe is 13 billion years old, then God is at least thirteen billion years ahead of us in knowledge and understanding. God would have to be good seeing that most people approve of good over evil with evil being a self defeatist

attribute (we will discuss good and evil in a later chapter). God would not be omnipresent though he probably could be, seeing if he were omnipresent, He would exist in evil as well as good. God would be just seeing that he would be far wiser and knowledgeable than man due to his apparent eternal quality. God would also be eternal seeing that an infinite occurrence must exist to bring forth finite occurrences. Something cannot come from nothing.

While God has many other qualities, we just covered a few that are usually discussed in philosophical discussions. Now let us turn to another age old question, does God exist?

6

Does God Exist?

*“When the mind of man looketh upon
second causes scattered, it may some times
rest in them, and go no further. But when it
beholdeth the chain of them confederate
and linked together, it must fly to
Providence and Deity.*

Francis Bacon (1561-1626) (1)

Can God be proven via logical reasoning? I believe so. I believe if you can identify impossible occurrences in our universe such as something coming from nothing and the many impossible biological occurrences that exist, you can at minimum find that it is more probable that an Intelligent Designer exists than one does not.

I questioned a staunch atheist one time, and I asked him if he thought it was more possible for a complex design to take place with an intelligent designer or without one? He said obviously a complex design taking place is more probable with an intelligent designer than without one. I was happy with his honesty because I am sure he well knew that he was saying that Intelligent Design is more probable than current evolutionary theory.

To continue on in this line of thinking, percentage wise it is more likely that God does exist than He does not; seeing that if God exists, you have a source for all other impossibilities and for all of the astronomically high statistical absurdities; while if He does not exist, you have many

impossibilities having taken place without a possible origin for them.

Is it impossible for God to exist seeing that something cannot come from nothing? Well if I had to choose between God coming from nothing and matter coming from nothing, I would choose God seeing He is the only possible source for impossibilities. Most theists believe God is eternal and had no beginning while Infinite Causation supports this.

God can be proven to exist using a variety of methods. Logical reasoning, First Cause, Infinite Causation, The Prime Mover, The Meaning of Life, and The Origin of Impossibilities/Improbabilities all suggest that a God must exist when examining the big picture. One example would be if you have a virtually infinite sequence of events, a Prime Mover had to set the virtually (finite) infinite series of events into motion at an original point such as a person setting up a group of dominos (sequences) that go on forever and then moving or striking the first domino to create a domino effect which would continue forever and thus show that all finite causation is originally reliant upon a First Cause, Infinite Causation, and a Prime Mover. The idea is threefold – one, the dominos had to have a person or First Cause to set up the dominos by design for some designed goal (exp. - the universe); and two (Infinite Causation) the dominos had to come from somewhere; and three (Prime Mover) you had to have a means to set the dominos into motion/action by moving or striking the first.

I am confident that once science examines deeply the possibility of what appears to be an infinite occurrence without an origin (the universe), they will find that an impossibility exists, for all finite things, even if they appear infinite, must have an origin or beginning. All finite occurrences existing reveals that God is necessary to exist as an origin, First Cause, and Infinite Causation. Since logic dictates that all things have an origin, God is necessary as an original origin (Infinite Causation); and He must exist not only as an idea, but as a reality as well, for something cannot come from nothing.

God is the origin of all things for people who believe in the existence of God. While science, on the other hand, must

have an origin for the beginning as well, just as many fields of study do. Reason dictates that nothing should exist, not the world, not the universe, not even our very conscience if not considering Infinite Causation. Reason also dictates that at some point thru regression you arrive at nothing or God. By understanding that nothing is not a possible origin for all things, you must arrive at God.

Once you have arrived at the conclusion that God must exist, the next obvious question that is often asked is, where did God come from? The answer is nobody knows, but this does not change the fact that God's existence is necessary for anything to exist if the universe is examined deeply enough via logical reasoning seeing that something cannot come from nothing.

We have two choices, our reality exists having no origin, or our reality exists via God whose origin is unknown but necessary and eternal. We should by now understand that the existence of our reality is not possible without God seeing that the universe and life must have an original origin. Catalysts leading up to a big bang must have an original origin as well.

7

God on Trial

It goes against reason to judge God, seeing that if He does exist, you will be greatly sorrowful in the end; and if he does not exist, you will have wasted your time.

I would like to now go forward quite a ways in time from the prehistoric up unto recorded history. Over time man has used information from holy books and what they believed to be logical arguments to put God on trial. I have heard arguments for God not existing, as well as arguments that if He did exist, He must be evil. Up unto this point, we have been examining the existence of God while we have not addressed at all the incorrectly perceived ethics of God. With this having been said, I will address a few of the misconceptions that I am aware of about God.

There is one argument I have heard many times, the debate that God must be egomaniacal to demand that man worship Him. In American English the word “*worship*” also means to swear allegiance to. I am not concerned with the original language meanings as much as I am the English word definitions for spiritual and philosophical reasons I will not give in this work.

Is God egomaniacal? Such debates are easily cast aside if one asks, “*what positive results could come from such a belief or instruction for man to worship God?*” In truth, God is not egomaniacal but rather man is; and because of this, God had to put forth ideas and requirements to instruct and help man to humble himself for the better. In truth, for God to be

God, He would have to be much better than I am as a human, and if I would detest people worshipping me, then I am certain God only supports it to help man and not to further his own ego or selfish desires. With this being said, there are probably many other arguments against God's Ethics; however, I think if one asks why or how something could be good for man or for the greater good, as I did in the previous example, many of these debates could be logically put to rest.

If God is good, which He would have to be to be God, then God would most likely be infinitely more wise, good, knowledgeable, et cetera, than man. In other terms this would mean that man, if God does exist, would be foolish to even accuse God of any wrong doing, seeing that God is virtually infinitely more wise, knowledgeable, and good. I would use a comparison between a three year old child thinking he is more wise than his parents, but this comparison would be to generous. In reality its more like a literal maggot questioning and accusing Einstein on making errors in his scientific theories. I am not trying to infer that Einstein did not make errors or even that God did make errors; but rather, I am pointing out that a maggot would have no way of ever conceiving or understanding at a high enough level to bring forth accusations against Einstein. Man would be wiser to conclude his reasoning must be faulty when finding error in God than to believe that God is somehow evil, seeing that God must have good reasons for things to be as they appear.

On this note, it is probably wise to know that the existence or even understanding of God is not reliant upon holy books, though some holy books seem to help mankind greatly. The misperception of the information within the holy books appears to be a continuous problem, and this is where good reasoning skills become useful. I've heard the religious say that man's logic is foolish to God, then they turn around and deny reasonable thinking if they cannot find it in a holy book. In reality, throughout history man's logic has been full of errors only to be pointed out by the next generation of thinkers. One thing is certain though; while man's logic may be faulty at times, this does not mean that man is incapable of understanding God through logic and reasoning, seeing that God, to be God, would be the ultimate mind and logical being.

8

Religion

*“Religion would not have enemies,
if it were not an enemy to their vices.”*

Jean Baptiste Massillon (1663-1742) (1)

There are so many religions in the world today; however, I do think it is possible to analyze each one and come up with an idea which religion is closest to what must be truth. First, you would have to find a fully integrated religion with integrated meaning all of the required concepts are present to consider the religion as a viable possibility.

Does the religion answer what is the meaning of life? Is there a justice system in the religion seeing that man requires one? It would make sense that God would have a justice system as well. If the purpose of this universe is a sorting device, which all of the major religions teach in a sense, then of course God would have a justice system? When examining the justice systems of each religion, does one find that the system makes sense in the larger scheme of things?

When everything is said and done, most religions have many logical flaws that exist within them, so they can not be taken as serious considerations. An example would be the God of the Deist is probably not an accurate conception of God seeing that if He made the effort and spent the time on creating such a universe, He probably would not only have had a very good reason for creating it, He would be an active participant in its workings as well. Religions believing in reincarnation are probably false too, seeing that retaining

extensive past lives knowledge would be necessary to improve a being within the sorting device.

Religions without an after life would infer that the purpose of the universe is not for sorting, and in fact, it would also infer that life is a vain pursuit. If life was a bed of roses, I still could not swallow this.

Any religion that could not pass the Jesus test has to have serious issues with the Jesus test being the golden rule since he was the one that is first noted with saying it – *do unto others as you would have them do unto you* (paraphrase). The reason I bring up the golden rule is it is probably the closest religious teaching to absolute truth (Absolute Truth being a truth that holds true under any reasonable circumstances). If you put yourself in the place of the other person on any circumstance, the golden rule should shed light on whether your actions are good or evil. At one point I believed that the golden rule was absolute truth and still do, but a sick mind asked me once, “*what if I am a sadomasochist?*” The logical problem arising from the sadomasochist would be that the sadomasochist enjoys pain; therefore, if they desire pain they in turn should give you pain if following the golden rule. I am confident though that the golden rule will hold up as absolute truth under reasonable circumstances better than perhaps any other religious or philosophical concept.

As far as Islam is concerned, if I had a religion that inspired me to fly planes into buildings or even cheer people flying planes into buildings, I would seriously consider how do I feel about this if my wife and children are in the building?

Another idea is it is obvious via logic that only one God can exist, so if the religion has more than one God, one might run for the hills. There can only be one all powerful being, or all knowing being, because logic dictates this. If two all powerful God’s fought, one would have to win showing the other is not God nor all powerful; or if it was a stalemate, then this would show that neither being is all powerful.

Judaism has the flaw in its justice system allowing for animal sacrifice in return for forgiveness of sin. The logic flaw in this is an animal sacrifice is not an eye for an eye or a tooth for a tooth. If all men are born into death and sin because of

Adam, then it makes logical sense they can all be bought back by replacing Adam with a sinless human sacrifice which the Christians believe is Jesus Christ.

Hinduism is flawed as we discussed earlier because reincarnation does not work, and Hinduism believes in a caste system.

Personally I find Christianity the most appealing. Perhaps it is because I find Christianity as the only logical choice? Western civilization is founded on Judaic/Christian principles, and since I am from the West, these principles do seem most natural to me. Because of this, along with much study and reason, I hold the belief that the Judaic/Christian religions are superior and stand up to the test of extensive reasoning.

This section was not meant to be comprehensive by any means; but rather, I wanted to throw out some logical reasoning on the ideas of religion and how one can reason them thru using logical thinking, so in turn others could do the same. The work is more of a sampler platter to give people ideas on how to use their minds to reason out many things – something to get the motors running.

9

Good and Evil

“Selfishness is the root and source of all natural and moral evils.”

Nathaniel Emmons (1745-1840) (1)

Good and evil - are they just concepts of religion or are they concepts of logical reasoning as well? We hear about good and evil virtually daily in all of our lives. Everyone seems to have their own definition of good and evil, so I thought it may be helpful to try and dissect the ideas and attributes of good and evil to arrive at their core. If we possess an atomic level, so to speak, understanding of good and evil, then we can help not only purge mankind of his ignorance, but we can dissect people's behaviors more extensively in hopes of helping eradicate undesirable behaviors; and in turn, we can make society better as a whole.

On this note, I would like to point out that selfishness appears to be the motive for all evil while selflessness appears to be the motive for all good. So to make a long holy book shorter, you can understand virtually all of its teachings on good and evil by seeing evil as selfish desire with good being selfless desire. Pride would be one such evil. Pride appears to be nothing more than the selfish desire to elevate one's self above others for selfish reasons. Racism appears to be mainly pride disguised as hate for another race; when in reality, it is once again the selfish desire to elevate one race over another by believing or trying to show one race as superior to another. Lying appears to be the selfish desire to hide or misrepresent the truth for personal gain. Stealing of course is the selfish

desire to take another's belongings for personal gain. Murder is the selfish act of taking another's life for personal gain. Et cetera

Motive also appears to play a big part in understanding human behavior with selfish motive being bad and selfless motive being good. When we use the term selfless, we are saying that one puts others' needs, or the best needs of mankind, before their own while being careful to not be so selfless that one can not go on helping others because they gave away all their personal belongings such as food and shelter. The selfish need of eating, as well as other selfish necessities, is required for survival to continue in helping others. If you are a selfish person, then by eating you are eating for self; but if you are a selfless person, you are eating for others as well as for self.

I find it strange that by human nature it seems to be so easy to do evil while doing good seems to be more difficult. I had a boss one time tell me that everything you do should be able to pass the front page of the news paper test; meaning that if the action showed up on the front page of the newspaper, you would be totally comfortable and within legal, moral, and ethical boundaries. I would take him one step further seeing that thought leads to action, and I would say do not even think anything that you would not want to see on the front page of the newspaper.

I also learned something in an economics class that stood out to me which was the concept of "*Opportunity Cost.*" Opportunity cost is defined as – "*what are you willing to give up in order to gain something?*" Opportunity cost appears in everything we do. For example – am I willing to give up going to the ballgame to read poetry to dying children, or how much time and effort am I willing to give up to obtain a paycheck? Et cetera

When all is said and done, there appears to be recurring themes or concepts that apply to virtually all the things that we do or even do not do, and it appears that these recurring themes always come back to good versus evil at some point. One idea I am still pondering is what Voltaire the French philosopher once said, "*Every man is guilty of all the good he did not do.*" (1) Voltaire definitely makes one think

with this saying as to how good a person really is? All of a sudden being good is not just abstaining from doing evil, but being good is also doing good.

Recurring themes of good versus evil, such as selfishness versus selflessness and opportunity cost, further the idea that there is strong evidence that there is a higher meaning to life and higher purpose for existence.

10

The Problem of Evil

*“A good man is kinder to his enemy
than bad men to their friends”*

Horace (65-8 BC) (1)

What is evil and why does it exist? What we consider as evil is often consistent from society to society, and because of this, the definition of evil does not appear to be reliant on any particular religion. In every society whether secular or religious, murder is evil, stealing is evil, selfishness is evil, and lying is evil, et cetera. The fact that all societies have the same basic laws and disdain condemning evil, shows that man, even outside of holy books, knows the difference between right and wrong.

There are two possible sources in humanity for what most agree is evil. The first source is selfish desire with all evil being closely related to selfish desire, and if one takes the time to reason this out, they will certainly see the connection between selfishness and all of evil. The second possible source for evil, which tends to complicate the overall picture somewhat, is alien sources that interfere with our existence by creating more evil than man would otherwise accomplish on his own accord. These alien sources, sometimes known as demonic sources, can affect this reality from parallel dimensions/realities or even universes. There has been overtime much evidence that demonic sources exist with many people witnessing such occurrences. It is my understanding that the Catholic Church alone has performed many exorcisms in attempt to rid places and people from what is often known as demonic possession.

Having clarified that there are two possible sources for evil, I believe it is important to understand that mankind is possibly much less evil than it may appear at times. I myself have witnessed many possessions with one possessed and sedated individual, upon being ordered to draw a picture of his self, drew a perfect picture of a Pan (hoofed legged creature that appears to be half goat and half human with small horns protruding from the skull). Medical science has evidence for possessions such as some cases of epilepsy and the extremely bizarre and rare cases of Alien Hand. Alien Hand is a rare side effect of epileptics who have a certain brain surgery done that helps lessen the seizures. The rare side effect that happens is the epileptic loses control of one hand during seizures, and the hand of the epileptic tries to kill its owner. The hand will pick up knives and try to stab the person to death or choke the person while he is sleeping. The Alien Hand has tried to kill its owner in many different ways and not just with choking or stabbings, but the hand will also try to steer the person into a ditch or into a wreck while driving. During the seizures, or Alien Hand episodes, the person often uses his other hand and his other body parts to fight the Alien Hand to prevent it from causing much damage.

On a different note, did God create evil and why does God allow evil to exist? Did God create evil or does an infinite evil exist? Neither, for evil to exist only an infinite being is required to have created a finite being capable of producing evil. All finite causes or beings require an infinite being to exist even though the infinite being may not directly cause all beings or all causes to exist such as procreation and free will. Once again because all finite things are finite and have a beginning, an original origin is required for anything to exist while some things exist thru finite creations.

In addition, if God is good, which he has to be to be God, God's perfect desire would be that no evil should exist showing that God is not the original author of evil. Evil was created by finite creations that possessed free will.

Why does evil exist? It is apparent that if this reality is a sorting device for an afterlife, then the choice between good and evil would be necessary to exist. Since so much evil has existed throughout mankind's history, such as Adolph Hitler

and the Nazis, one would have to conclude that there must be an extremely important reason for the purpose of the universe; otherwise, God would have eradicated evil some time ago. I will go into this further in future chapters.

Why is evil considered bad? The problem of evil is that it is self defeating, self serving, and destructive to others. Evil is self defeating because evil actions such as lying destroys trust, murder damages many and creates fear in society, and pride elevates oneself while debasing others and has many horrid side effects (racism, anger, abuse, murder, lying to mention just a few), et cetera. Evil is also self defeating because good does not require the existence of evil, but evil requires for good to exist to prevent evil from consuming itself.

In addition to evil being self destructive, evil is self serving because evil only serves to fulfill a person's selfish desires. Evil is destructive to others because evil manifests itself in most cases as selfish actions towards others.

A good measuring stick for reasoning out evil is the Golden Rule – *Do unto others as you would have them do unto you*. Suddenly you have a reason behind why murder is bad because it is plain to see that a good person has just as much right to exist as the next person. If you would not like to be killed, you should not kill someone else.

11

Plato's Cave

"Ideas control the world."

James A. Garfield (1831-1881) (1)

The Greek philosopher Plato had a theory that there were actually two realities. The first and predominant reality is not the world we live in; but rather, the primary reality is a much more perfect world that possesses a greater and a more true understanding of all things. Plato wrote that he believed the universe we live in is just a shadow or less perfect version of a more perfect reality. He believed that in the world we live in we are only capable of knowing shadows of ideas thru our physical senses, but thru reason we can more readily see more perfect ideas. Based on this concept that he called forms, there would be a perfect chair (or idea of a chair) that exists in a more perfect reality while in our reality we only possess a shadow or bad imitation of the perfect chair. Plato made an allegory elaborating his theory, and this allegory is known to the world as *The Allegory of the Cave* – or *Plato's Cave*.

The Allegory of the Cave goes something like this. A group of people exist in a cave shackled in chains, so they can see nothing but a wall of the cave. They were born in the cave and were always shackled never seeing anything but the cave wall in front of them. A fire was kept behind them by their captors, so the captive could only see the shadows of things caused by the fire and the shadow of things passing in front of the fire. On occasion something would pass in front of the fire such as a horse, and though the captives could not see the actual horse, they were able to see the horse's shadow on the

wall. After much time, one of the captives was able to escape, and the captive went out of the cave and was able to see the real world with all of its reality such as real horses, grass, birds, flowers, sunlight, and so on. Plato argued that it was the moral responsibility of the freed captive to return to the cave after gaining knowledge. The freed captive would then be responsible of trying to convince the other captives that a more true reality exists and if possible set the captives free. Plato also believed that even though the captives probably would not believe the freed captive, it was the freed captive's responsibility to try and enlighten the captives anyway. The captives shackled in the cave represent mankind, and the cave and its shadows represent our physical perceivable reality; while the real world outside the cave represents the more perfect spiritual world only perceivable thru reason and enlightenment.

On this note, if you take a few bones and observations and make a theory that does not take into consideration all fields of study, by using only one field of study, you end up shackling the minds of mankind and the many other truths that exist. A few bones and some observations – shadows – become the foundation for all other fields of knowledge leading to extreme and definite error. Plato's theory points out the danger of using shadows as the highest means of knowledge. To show this, Plato's allegory points out cause and effect such as the captives seeing the shadow of the horse (effect) instead of the true cause of the shadow made by the horse passing in front of the fire (cause). Seeing that the universe is made up of almost entirely observable and non-observable effects and not true or original causes, man, by not utilizing reason as his highest tool of understanding, most certainly forever shackles himself into the cave. Thus showing that science is a less trustworthy form of knowledge than reason seeing science almost always observes effects and rarely true causes.

In addition to Plato's theory of forms, most religions hold a similar concept to Plato's Allegory of the Cave. Most religions believe in a more pure and true reality known as a spiritual world. Based on the decay of all physical things within our reality, we can see that the reality we currently

share is not the highest possible reality. With all of the ignorance, war, hunger, poverty, crime, bad behavior, et cetera, we can further see that the reality we exist in is greatly flawed. The world has always been in transition but appears to be improving over time. Initial and final forms are evident throughout history with ideas and inventions evolving from lower forms to higher forms, thus showing that initial and final forms most likely exist in all things. Seeing that initial and final forms appear to exist, this idea lends credence that a Perfect Form must exist somewhere as well.

Because of Plato's theory, if examined through reason and is followed to an obvious conclusion, we once again have to ask ourselves is the universe we live in a sorting device of sorts? Up unto this point we not only have logic that gives credence to the sorting idea, but we have the other fields as well. Philosophy, science, biology, psychology, and religion all possess reasonable evidence, if properly reasoned, that there is more to the world and universe than can be measured by instruments and physical observations.

12

The Matrix

Matrix – A situation or surrounding substance within which something originates, develops, or is contained.

American Heritage Dictionary (3)

It is apparent that if there is a God, He did not want to leave an obvious trail of logical or scientific clues that He does exist or did He? It appears that if one were to use pure reason, he could figure out many not so obvious truths. If God did leave some clues that He existed, He devised it where mankind would not be able to discover or prove these truths/clues for some time. Creation using what appears to be an evolutionary method definitely helps hide the fact that God would have had something to do with creation. With this said, it appears to me, with such underlying themes being predominant for all behavior and choices such as good versus evil, selfishness versus selflessness, and opportunity cost, then this physical reality was created as a sorting device. While these appear in some ways to be macro-concepts, in reality, I believe they are also micro-concepts; the very building blocks of all other concepts.

Why, if there is a God, was it so important to hide the fact that this reality is a sorting device? Was it so man would remain objective or perhaps his ignorance of these things does help to discover one's true nature? God's existence being proven could tend to change the reality and perhaps the effectiveness of the sorting.

Ultimately my theory is that it really does not matter that much in the scheme of things if man can prove the existence of God or prove His divine plan because I truly believe evil men will remain evil and good men will remain good. I can see, however, an advantage for proving the existence of God, or at least in having logical reasoning for the existence of God and in understanding the purpose of creation, seeing that so many sources currently exist that claim He does not exist - why not have even another reason to believe in a greater good? The belief in God for some does appear to help them be better people and citizens which leads to a better society; although, at times many religious people do appear quite evil when they fly planes into buildings full of innocent people and then claim it was God's will. I am sure if God wanted or needed someone dead, it would be well within his capability to make it happen without the help of fanatics.

Along with the universe appearing to be a sorting device for an afterlife (afterlife being necessary otherwise there would be no reason to sort and no reason for creation), the universe appears to be an information matrix with good, evil, and neutral information. On this train of thought another concept I call trinary code (-1, 0, 1) is another recurring theme. The universe appears to be made up of antimatter, absence of matter, and matter. It appears this trinary code also exist in many other things such as negative, absence of negative or positive, positive; Anti-light, absence of light, light; Good, absence of good or evil, evil; et cetera. The reason this is important is that it helps one look for hidden pieces of information that is not necessarily apparent like the recent theory of anti-gravity.

Could the universe be a Matrix of sorts? If one had the programming skills, computer/matter system necessary, and energy source, it is conceivable that this reality could be a created program brought into physical reality by the necessary systems and skills. Of course man is insufficient to an infinite degree compared to any being that could perform such a feat.

Another idea that appears to consistently recur is that the information within the matrix, or this reality, appears to break down into trinary code as well which leads one to wonder about deeper things – negative information (false or

negative), absence of information, and positive information (true or beneficial). All information is true or false, black or white, with grey consisting of different portions of black or white. An example of the information matrix would be the idea of final forms. If the idea is true and valid, it should apply to many, if not all, fields such as evolutionary biology and not just philosophy.

In the end, the world does appear to be a matrix system that hides many things such as our true purpose for existence. The idea of sorting continually reoccurs with even evolution teaching that lower life forms evolve to higher life forms through sorting. We have good versus evil, selfishness versus selflessness, opportunity costs, trinary code, et cetera, all revealing that a matrix system exists.

13

If There is no God

“They that deny a God, destroy man’s nobility; for clearly man is of kin to the beasts by his body, and if he be not kin to God by his spirit, he is a base and ignoble creature.”

Francis Bacon (1561-1626) (1)

I am saddened to say that if there is no God, then our meaning of life is survival of the fittest, get all you can while you can, and mess over your fellow man. Something inside of us tells us this is wrong, but if there is no Intelligent Designer, then the people in history who were the most evil were actually the most good because they were the ones who were the most true to the basic concepts of evolution.

Hitler would be a hero for ridding the earth of millions of people vastly helping out the ecosystem. Jeffrey Dahmer would have been a model citizen for eating other humans which ridded the earth of more people who are like viruses on the ecosystem. Mother Theresa would be a criminal for helping dying people to live longer, people who would only burden the world even more.

Doctors would also become some of the most evil people who ever lived based on their saving lives versus helping out the natural process of evolution and the ecosystem by letting as many weak and diseased people die as possible. According to the atheistic line of logical thinking, we are all just taking up space and using valuable resources only to die and rot in a coffin. At the current rate of population expansion, the ecosystem will only be more and more

burdened and over used. Mankind can only go downhill from here unless we have another hero like Adolph Hitler to rid the planet of most of its human inhabitants. Maybe a few killer viruses are in order to balance out the ecosystem once again? Bring on the hurricanes! Bring on the tsunamis! Bring on the wars! Mother nature save us from ourselves! You better pray there is a God; otherwise, this existence has been a living hell with no meaning or apparent reason.

I hope we can see how logic is turned on its head with just one lie such as God does not exist. Suddenly the most evil people in history would become heroes while many of the good people would become evil. I believe this is an important understanding since it reveals that a serious error has occurred somewhere in the process of determining truths and errors while using reasoning.

14

Free Will & Puppets

*“Men often make up in wrath
what they want in reason”*

William Alger (1822-1905) (1)

Do humans have free will, and if so, what constitutes free will? Is free will the ability to take an action that is no real continuation of a previous action meaning that in no way the action taken can be linked or considered a reaction to a previous action or environmental occurrence? Understanding that virtually all human action is based on previous learning and previous environmental occurrences or needs, this definition of free will, with free will being based on being able to take an action that is free from influence of all previous actions, is probably a stretch and not a good ruler to judge whether a being has free will or not.

According to Harper Collins Philosophy Dictionary, free will is *“initiating uncaused actions.”* (4) Based on Harper Collins definition no one but God probably has free will for virtually all actions are in response to one’s desire or one’s environment. An example would be that a person almost always eats in response to a desire to eat caused by hunger. Because Harper Collins Philosophy Dictionary definition is too broad, I think the definition of free will in The American Heritage Dictionary is probably more appropriate, *“Done on one’s own accord: voluntary.”* (3) With voluntary being the key word, is free will a being having a virtually infinite amount

of possible voluntary response options to choose from in reaction to an occurrence or need in one's environment?

Does one play video games in response to the desire to play video games due to boredom or the lack of anything better to do? The person could just as easily read a book or go for a walk, so such actions and options would appear to show that a being has free will. The free will we are speaking of is the basic concept of free will and not the religious version of free will with the religious version of free will taking into account an all knowing (Omniscient) God.

Now that we have decided to use "*voluntary*" action as our measuring stick for free will, we have to examine what are the main catalysts for all human actions. For a human action to take place we have two foundational sources: Desire and Thought. All actions that a human does take or can take arise from desire and thought.

Desire is the underlying catalyst of all actions. A person eats because they desire to eat for whatever reason. A person may choose not to eat because they feel they are getting to fat, and their desire to not be fat is stronger than their desire to eat. Another example may be a person thinks it would be nice to have dinner with a friend, but no action will take place unless the person desires to have dinner with the friend based on whatever motive he might think of.

In reality what we have is desire is the catalyst for all human action while thought helps shape and decide which desire is the greatest at any particular moment. An example would be, do I go to a ballgame because I desire to go to the ball game or perhaps because I desire to make some friends happy by going with them to the ballgame? Understanding that desire is the catalyst for all human action is important in understanding the human psyche and is important in improving society as a whole.

Understanding human behavior at the most basic level may also show the purpose of life and give further credence to the idea that the universe was created as a sorting device as well. In addition, if we add to our understanding that all desires and motives are either selfish or selfless, we can even more readily see that the reality we do exist in appears more and more to be a sorting device for some greater purpose.

With this having been said about desire being the catalyst of all human actions, desire would have to be taken into consideration when examining whether one does have free will or does not? If every action a person takes is an action to fulfill their own selfish desires, one would have to consider if they are a voluntary slave to their selfishness or an involuntary slave? I believe thru life experience and much thought that desire is a powerful task master, but this is not reason enough for one to be a slave to selfish desires. One always has the choice of an unselfish option. While desire is the apparent motivator for all action, thought is the vehicle to decide how to fulfill the greatest desire at any particular moment. A good analogy would be, desire is not unlike the wind and sails for a ship to move while thought is the rudder that steers the ship in the desired direction.

Let us now turn to free will in the religious sense. Does a man have the moral sense and strength to resist evil without God choosing or doing it for him? I believe the answer is yes. Every person seems to be born with something inside them that tells them right from wrong. If we try and remember as a child back to the first lies we told, the lies appeared to be much more difficult to tell when we first began to lie with lying having become easier as we resisted our basic nature to do good. It appears, at least to my recollection, that over time people learn to be evil and go against their original programming and go against their fear of doing evil. Can a being resist evil and do good? If not, what basis would a legal system or even a judgment day be founded upon?

Another idea of freewill is if God has foreknowledge and created you to be you, then you will be exactly as He created, and in turn you would not have free will because you were created with God already knowing all the choices you would make. So in turn, does a person have free will if God already knows what choices they are capable of and will make based on God's foreknowledge design? Once again "*voluntary*" actions come back into play which tends to show we do have free will. If God created one to be good and another to be evil, this is a moral and planning issue for God more than an issue of can one make an unselfish choice over a selfish choice? I would hate to reason out an excuse for evil to

be evil; therefore, I will stop and be content with having said what I have. In the end when all is said and done, I am sure it is reasonable to believe that everyone can make a conscious choice to do good or evil – or to think good or think evil.

Now let us turn to another but related idea, the idea of puppets. Do puppets have free will? The answer is yes - they can choose how they react to their puppet master if the puppet has the ability to take a free will action to override the puppet master. I use the term puppets and puppet master in a sense of the cause and effect relationship that people appear to have with their environment. The more buttons one has to push, the less a person is in control of themselves and their free will. The puppet is always reacting so frantically to the daily problems and people in their lives with every event taking place being as a string attached to a puppet so that he or she may be yanked about virtually at will. History, being as early as a second in the past, or even a shorter time period perhaps, is always the master. You would think action then reaction, but for most it appears environmental action, personal and environmental reaction, and finally environmental and personal action built upon a giant pyramid of previous action and reaction - a giant macrocosm of events and actions with their virtually infinite reactions building one virtually impossible yet somewhat normal and orderly environment.

In reality, everyone is a puppet to some extent, so the goal would be to not let ones environment and the people within it cause one to react unfavorably. Someone, who gets angry all of the time or is always speaking of or doing negative things, is a serious puppet that is not in control of their environment; but rather, their environment is in major control of them. Road rage would be a good example. A person can control their emotions such as getting angry when being cut off by another driver, or they can be a puppet and get yanked about. In the end, the more puppet like a person is, the less they appear to be in control of their own lives and free will.

Desire and thought once again comes into play – the more one orients their desires and thinking to achieve a greater goal and to do good, the more one becomes a master of their environment and themselves. Some thoughts along this

line would be if one has self confidence instead of pride, then a person will not get hurt or angry when their pride is attacked. If a person does not get proud or angry, then a myriad of secondary feelings or actions do not surface such as conceit, abusive behavior, road rage, racism, et cetera.

Part III - Society & Issues

“Wise men are instructed by reason; men of less understanding, by experience; the most ignorant, by necessity; and beast by nature.”

Marcus Cicero (106-43 BC) (1)

15

Homosexuality

If all of mankind were homosexuals, mankind would cease to exist in about a hundred years; showing God and nature's true opinion of it.

Homosexuality is a hotly debated topic in today's society. It appears that homosexuality is even a fad for some seeing that its popularity is on the rise. The truth of the matter is that homosexuality is not a natural behavior, and if it is not a natural behavior, then in turn it is not a natural desire as well.

I have heard homosexuals debate that since homosexuality is witnessed on occasion in some lower evolved species that this somehow makes it natural and okay for man to practice it. In reality, a bear may attack a dog, kill it, and then eat it, but our reasoning tells us this is not a good practice for humans to participate in. Another example would be, primates like to sling their feces at others around it; however, once again this is not a desirable behavior that humans should practice.

A man may want to have sex with an infant, but this does not make it a natural behavior only because the desire is there, nor does it make it natural because an animal attempts to practice such behavior. In addition, a man or woman may desire to have sexual relations with an animal, but once again the desire alone does not make it a natural behavior or desire. The list of undesirable behaviors in animals that humans should not practice goes on and on, so I will not continue in this line of thinking having already shown that just because an

animal does something does not mean that it is a desirable human behavior.

Biology and common sense teaches us that it is natural for a man and woman to have sexual relations and not man with man or woman with woman. The sexual organs of a male and female are often referred to as the reproductive organs seeing that the natural function of these organs is for survival of the species. In addition, the male organ naturally correlates to the female organ like a hand to a glove.

In reality, we have three logical reasons that homosexuality is not good. The first reason is homosexuality violates the obvious design and compatibility of the reproductive organs easily revealing that the behavior is not natural, nor normal. The second reason is that homosexuality violates the survival of the species concept seen in natural biology. The third reason is that if homosexuality was an attribute caused by DNA, then the gene would be a self eradicating gene. Since homosexuals do not reproduce naturally, their gene would never become predominant and would eventually self eradicate. Because the gene would be a self eradicating gene, this also tends to show that it is a defective gene if it is a gene at all. Ultimately the genetic evidence of the genital is overwhelming genetic evidence as to what one's sexual orientation should be. It appears now that not only religion has an issue with homosexuality but reasoning, biology, and the blind watchmaker do as well.

The truth of the matter is that homosexuality is a learned behavior brought about from unnatural desire and defective programming. There are many debates over homosexual rights and benefits throughout society today. Would you give rights to people with other unnatural desires as well? How about child molester rights if the child enjoyed the molestation? How about rights for people to marry farm animals? Homosexuality at best is a mental illness, or disease, that requires rehabilitation and reprogramming and should not be encouraged with any rights other than basic human rights.

16

Materialism & Free Agent Slavery

“The man who gives me employment, which I must have or suffer, that man is my master, let me call him what I will.”

Henry George (1839-1897) (1)

Materialism is a word that is often used to describe the behavior of collecting and consuming material things that are not necessary for one’s existence. Many people who are not hedonistic (the belief that the ultimate goal and obtainment in life is pleasure) seem to take issue with people who amass too much wealth. Whether there is a God or not, it appears to me that pursuing wealth is a rather vain pursuit seeing that you cannot take it with you when you die. At some time there would have to be a point of diminishing return. Considering opportunity cost, one would have to ask, *“how much life am I willing to give up in acquiring material things seeing that work hours is directly related to purchasing power?”*

It is strange to me that a man will work very long work weeks his whole life only to retire at an age where he cannot truly enjoy the fruits of his labor. It is even more strange to me that a man can work sixty hour work weeks and amass much wealth only to be run over by a bus. The more time one spends working at something that does not help others or that they do not really enjoy, the more it stands to reason that they are wasting valuable time that could be used in other more valuable ways. Beware of spending too much of one’s life to obtain material things that do not matter in the end – a

mansion brings a dying man little comfort from his deathbed.

Free agent slavery is the concept of working for wages or hire out of necessity, so one may survive and accumulate desired goods or services. Since most people do not enjoy their employment and are forced to work to survive, I do not think that the term slave is too extreme considering it is forced labor. In truth, the only difference between working for a wage or fee and being a slave, in the traditional sense of the word, is that a slave is not allowed to go to their bank owned home at night or own properties and belongings obtained thru debt, and a slave is not allowed to change its employer. Another way a man is in bondage is by material possessions. The more material things a person collects and consumes in turn forces them deeper into slavery. A man's material possessions and desires soon become his hidden task master as if the boss he does not like was not enough. The free agent slave is always consumed with worry and concern over their belongings with much concern being given over how one may maintain and protect whatever temporary miniature kingdom they may have built.

Responsibility of Government

“The less government we have the better – the fewer laws and the less confided power. The antidote to this abuse of formal government is the influence of private character, the growth of the individual.”

Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803-1882) (1)

Much has already been said throughout time on the subject of government; and though democracy appears to be the best form of government today, I believe at some point some form of a democracy/communism hybrid will probably win out since this allows for man to make the difficult choices like minimizing the cost of necessary evils such as medical, housing, and energy costs. I also believe that since man is corruptible, a perfect system of government is not currently possible with democracy being necessary to correct known corruptions and shortcomings within a government.

The responsibility of government is to protect the freedom of mankind in his pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness. Society’s needs are greater than that of the individual while a society is no more free than the individual citizens of the society. A man is not free as long as he is forced into maintaining an undesirable employment. A man is not free as long as he is required to pay taxes seeing he must labor in direct proportion to the burden that the government places upon him in the form of taxes. The greater the tax burden in what ever guise it may take, the more burdened and less free the citizens are.

In addition to protecting the freedoms of society, the government should also be responsible in finding more and more ways to remove unnecessary expenses from the people. High energy costs does nothing but ruin economies and burden mankind even further while keeping him from his pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness. Some industries at some point should be deemed as necessary evils, and once an industry is deemed a necessary evil, the government should realize this expense should be as little as possible to the people. Then the government can figure out how to fix the industry by such actions as research and development and even regulatory actions. On this note, the natural resources of a nation or state should be owned by the people and not by an individual or business.

An ineffective justice system is a great burden to freedom and society as a whole. The more laws, courts, lawmen, lawyers, lawmakers, judges, criminals, prisons, jails, et cetera, that you have, the less effective the legal system and society are. A huge justice system definitely shows that the people in charge are not smart enough to fix the problems of society. A legal system cost money and is a necessary evil. Good people do not need a legal system to be good, and good people do not break laws intentionally unless the laws are unjust.

The more laws that a government makes the less free its people are. I have a saying I use every time the governing body makes a new law, "*one law closer to Fascism.*" If the government based all of their laws on the basic concepts of evil, it would be able to clear out its massive volumes of laws and in turn make basic clear and concise laws. An example could be Theft Law: Any action that could be considered theft for \$500 or less carries this penalty. Any action that could be considered theft between the amounts of \$501 and \$10,000 dollars incurs this penalty. It does not matter if its white collar crime, theft from a store, or even a store stealing from a citizen, the penalty remains the same.

The entire tax system in most countries should be overhauled as well, seeing that personal income tax seriously complicates, frustrates, and burdens the people. A sales tax on finished products is the only answer, so the government

can streamline its system greatly and remove the frustration and burden of the personal income tax.

The crux of the idea I am attempting to communicate here is that the government has to get out of the business of burdening the people and get into the business of removing the burdens of the people. This can only happen by the government working much smarter and even much harder.

18

Responsibility of Citizens

*When government burdens society,
citizens become discontent.*

*When citizens become discontent, governments
begin to topple.*

A citizen is responsible for becoming a value to society as a whole. If a citizen only performs selfish deeds day in and day out, then the citizen is not a member of society, but a self serving individual. It should be the goal of every man and woman to help further mankind's pursuit in making the world a better place.

There are many ideas that exist as to what is helping mankind and what is not helping mankind. Art is a noble pursuit if it does not create controversy for the sake of creating controversy and if it does not glorify evil. Art is not angry rock singers spewing hate and anger, for these are just puppets who have no answers only questions.

Charity work is another form of helping amongst many other forms of helping. Teaching true information that furthers understanding for the greater good is good as well as the study of philosophy for the enlightenment of others. The list can go on forever perhaps, so I will stop here.

The world I live in is not too bad, but I guess I am lucky enough to live in a good state in a good country. I have witnessed church women sitting on the side walk of the city I live in sharing a sandwich with a homeless person. I have witnessed church people taking the homeless into restaurants and buying them dinner. I have witnessed the poor giving

money to the poor. I told a friend once that if the poor did not feed the poor, the poor would never eat. I guess this is not entirely true, but I have yet to see a rich man stop and hand a homeless man money. I am sure it probably happens on occasion, it is just something I have not seen personally.

19

Responsibility of the Church

*“Religion is a process of turning your skull into a
tabernacle, not of going up to
Jerusalem once a year.”*

Austin O’Malley (1858-1932) (1)

The responsibility of the church is to spread its message of good while helping the poor as much as possible. The church is also responsible for assuring that God is not disproved or removed by irresponsible science, philosophy, and government. The church in recent years has done badly at this for several reasons.

One reason the church does badly in defending the faith is it does not attempt to educate itself in the matters of science and philosophy eventually allowing the atheists to take control on the intellectual world, schools, and teachings.

Another reason is that the church insists on using bad interpretations of holy books to prescribe what should be taught in schools and to prescribe what is true and not true in science. Intelligent design advocates fight to have creationism taught in public schools when in reality they should be content with the school programs stating evolution is a theory and is far from being proven, and it is possible that God, if He does exist, created life using an evolutionary method.

Another option in the school programs could be to teach that an Intelligent Designer is more probable in the creation of life than not, and it is possible that God used an evolutionary process to do so. At some point, the governing body may have to pass a constitutional amendment to ensure

that science in schools does not infringe upon freedom of religion with speculative information and theory.

On the line of thought of creationism, a day to God could be a billion years or even longer. A day in God's reality may be much slower than a day in our reality. A day is like a thousand years to God does not mean a day is a literal thousand years, but rather it means time has little meaning to God because He is eternal. On the other hand, God could have used six to eight days of His time to create a 13 billion year old universe. There is an example of a concept based on Einstein's theory of relativity that states that a person by a black hole could blink and it would take people on earth a thousand years to see the person blink, even though to the person blinking only a second passed. If Einstein was correct, then there are a lot of possibilities that seem far fetched to man even though they should be quite understandable or within reason. Another idea may be that since we observe time relative to all things perceivable in our universe, it is not unrealistic to believe that the universe could be in fast forward compared to another reality. It could also be possible that our existence is in slow motion such as the person by the black hole blinking. A God capable of creating such a universe as ours and complex life surely would be capable of placing the universe on fast forward for 13 billion years to make it appear 13 billion years old; when in reality, the universe may be much younger. However, if the universe appears to be thirteen billion years old, we should respect science's findings unless we have very good reasons not to do so.

The church should seriously consider funding and supporting a task force of scholars and great minds from all major scholarly fields of study to work on combating atheistic science, philosophy, court rulings, legal groups, government, schools, and media, et cetera.

One issue that appears to exist is that many in the church see philosophy and other fields as unwise and undesirable pursuits. I remember my philosophy 121 teacher in college telling the class that right wing Christians would come into her class on occasion and heckle her and disturb the class. I believe this is part of the problem with the church -

the church sees philosophy and many other fields as issues instead of tools.

20

Responsibility of Science

“There was once a golden age because golden hearts beat in it. If it comes again, it will scarcely be through scientific progress.”

Louise Guiney (1)

It is the responsibility of science to create things that help relieve the burden of mankind such as breakthroughs in medical science. It should not be the responsibility of science to make unnecessary widgets that only make wealthy investors even wealthier while the poor only get poorer.

It is also the responsibility of science and the scientists to present theories and ideas in a manner that the information will not cause unnecessary rifts between the different fields of study. I believe many scientists have used their great minds as a tool to attack religion as if they had a personal vendetta. Atheism appears to be a religion of sorts seeing how devout its followers try to destroy the beliefs of the church. With no evolutionary biology or astronomy information that disproves the probability of an Intelligent Designer, and with a highly complex design being far more probable via an Intelligent Designer, scientist could easily keep an open mind and say that evolutionary theory and the creation of the universe without an Intelligent Designer appears to be absurd.

Part IV – In the End

Daniel 12:3

*And they that be wise shall shine as the
brightness of the firmament; and they that turn
many to righteousness as the stars for ever and
ever. - KJV*

21

Freedom and Corruption

*“If God did not exist,
it would be necessary to create Him.”*

Francois Voltaire (1694-1778) (1)

Within a democracy a man is free to pursue happiness and the meaning of life within the boundaries or laws of the governing system. Without a belief in God, man tends to be selfish and more corrupt. Should a man possess the right to corrupt and destroy himself? This is debatable. Should a man possess the right to corrupt and destroy others? This is absolutely an error! An example of this would be pornography or even current evolutionary theory.

False or partial ideas help corrupt mankind and the individual, with one such idea being current evolutionary theory - seeing that in the end, it helps no one but monkeys to have low self esteem. Many people realize this, so debates begin when science makes claims that appear to disprove the existence of God. The government must be careful when allowing the teaching of partial truths in the public funded education system seeing that the partial truths only work to make man more corrupt and confused. It is strange that a legal system would uphold the science fields teaching in schools that God does not exist while not allowing equal time for religion and philosophy to say science is wrong, especially seeing that our country was founded upon religious and philosophical principles and not upon scientific ones. A belief system and knowledge are programming for the mind's

computer, and faulty programming leads to undesirable citizens.

If the foundation of morals and a higher good are directly related to God existing, then God is a necessary being. God is a necessary being whether He exists or not. Many rely on the belief in God for comfort during hard times, hope during even harder times, and an extra reason to do the right thing. The fact is the religious, the majority of the time, make better and more law abiding citizens than the nonreligious. Everyone can use a little extra motivation and support during the struggles of life, even if that motivation is an unseen force or idea.

22

The Philosophy of God

*“There are more things in heaven and earth
... than are dreamed of in your philosophy.”*

William Shakespeare (1564-1616) (1)

The philosophy of God is simple. Virtually all of the teachings of God on the concepts of good versus evil can be summed up in selfishness is abhorred and selflessness is rewarded with selfish desire being the foundation of all evil and with the foundation of all good being selflessness.

God is not egomaniacal and “*to worship*” means to “*swear allegiance to.*” With God representing all that is good, a person is not only swearing allegiance to God, but they are swearing allegiance to good as well. God appreciates communion with man, so worship in the traditional sense should be practiced seeing that it greatly benefits man to be more humble by doing so.

God is the most qualified to be the leader of those who are good, so God is the leader. God’s ultimate law is “*love thy neighbor as thyself,*” – with the golden rule, “*do unto others as you would have them do unto you,*” following closely behind.

To be sorted cheerfully seeing that this sorting device appears to be a democratic solution for the woes of heaven - democratic seeing that God and reasonable minds were apparently against this sorting device if you take logic and scripture into account. If you take reasoning into account, God would be against the sorting device as well seeing that thru foreknowledge God would already know who should be

spared and who should not be spared. Thus the sorting device shows that God listens and allows his creation to have a voice.

23

The Meaning of Life

“Life is a long lesson in humility.”

Sir James Barrie (1860-1937) (1)

It stands to reason that the meaning of life is to be sorted. The primary function of the universe being a sorting device is obvious when all things are considered. There is no way around the fact that all actions, and even inactions, are selfish or selfless showing that these two foundational pillars of all human actions help reveal the true purpose of existence within our reality.

In addition to the most basic concept of reality being selfishness or selflessness, we must also ponder the reason for sorting. Since the world has been full of trouble from its very beginnings, it would be safe to assume that the world was created for a very important cause seeing that God is good and that God would not allow for so much evil to exist without a great reason.

To borrow some ideas from the Judaic/Christian writings, I believe we are sorting out the residents of the spiritual world, with many of them, if not all of them, coming to earth for their individual turns in the sorter. A great war took place in the heavens, and since it was not clear to everyone what punishment should be meted out, the sorting device was created. The one third who fought for God would be the one third predestinated. The one third who were evil and followed Lucifer have no chance for redemption. And finally we have the one third who sat on the fence and hence we have a sorting device to determine the outcome of the

fence sitters. Man was made in the image of God and the angels according to Judaic/Christian scriptures.

Will God's good creation win out over His bad creation? The stakes are unbelievably high. Your loved ones could be hanging in the balance. With all creation possessing free will, in the end it is up to us.

24

Renaissance or Enlightenment?

“The golden age is before us, not behind us.”

Saint Conte de Simon (1760-1825) (1)

Two of the greatest historical periods of man are the Renaissance and the Enlightenment periods. The first because man suddenly came out of a thousand years of darkness as if God rediscovered a previously forsaken world. The thousand years of darkness we know as the dark ages because the church got into the business of meddling in the affairs of government to the point of determining what people should die for, such as ideas and things that went against the church’s desires.

The Renaissance was basically the period where man rediscovered his creativity in science, in arts, as well as in other fields. The Renaissance was a breath of fresh air that came not from the sciences and arts alone, but it came from religion also. In the late thirteen hundreds, a man named John Wycliffe, the first church reformer, slammed the church of Rome and all of its doctrinal errors as well as the church’s many superstitions. So in reality, it was a church reformer who began the Renaissance seeing that the Renaissance would not have been possible if the absolute authority, superstitions, and errors of the church had not been seriously challenged. One reason the Renaissance was beautiful and possible is that all men not only believed in the greater good of man, but they believed in God as well. You had science, arts, and reason in harmony with each other because they were coming from the essence of God and from an underlying belief by all that God exists.

The Enlightenment period is probably the greatest pinnacle of achievement that man has ever realized. While today we have many widgets and scattered unrelated ideas, in the enlightenment period we had many beautiful ideas, reasoning, and actions coming forth harmonious with the others. We had Descartes, Locke, Mozart, Franklin, Washington, Whitefield, Wesley, and Jefferson, and I believe the list can go on and on - super minds and men of great character and reasoning. These were men who were capable of revolutionizing whatever field or position they were in and men who held a strong belief thru reason that God must exist. These were men who saw reason and logic above the shadows of bones and fallacies of ideas.

My point in all of this, in discussing the Renaissance and Enlightenment periods, is I hope that one day man rises above his selfish nature and his narrow understanding, to once again bring about a period of man that is beautiful with arts, philosophy, science, music, and reason that all cry out together in one accord showing a causality relationship between all things when a belief in God is held by all. Many ideas are beautiful, and the belief in God creates a harmony between man and his ideas allowing for all fields to admire the beauty in every other field instead of competing and degrading the other fields - a harmony that no longer allows for atheism to create fallacies and schisms. The atheistic thinking is full of foundational errors in reasoning that brings forth a chaotic understanding of causality relationships between all things.

May man reinvent these historical periods of beauty, not by trying to reinvent them, but by good reason and good living. God is the conductor of the symphony; we just have to play our instruments of ideas and actions for a greater good while seeking a harmony of ideas, of reasoning, and of existence.

25

In the End

“The pious man and the atheist always talk of religion; the one of what he loves, and the other of what he fears.”

Charles de Montesquieu (1689-1755) (1)

At some point the world as we know it will no longer exist. The world will be destroyed somehow, and man will probably have his hand in it. If a man dies, as far as he is concerned, the world ended at that moment, so in effect the world is ending every few seconds for someone.

An atheist dies and two possibilities happen - he either ceases to exist, or he meets his maker. If he meets his maker, chances are he is in deep trouble. If he ceases to exist, then his life was in vain. Either way the atheist at best only has a very bleak future to look forward to.

Pascal’s wager comes into mind when I think of atheists – *“If God exists, then to believe in him is to receive eternal life, while to deny him is to suffer damnation. If he does not exist, then to either receive or refuse him is to lose nothing. Hence, the wise gambler will choose to accept God, since to win the wager is to win all, and to lose is to lose nothing.”* (2)

In the end, what do we believe? Can something come from nothing such as the origins of the universe and the origins of life? Is selfishness versus selflessness being evident in every desire we have and in every action we take, enough to show that the world is a sorting device for souls? It is strange that even evolution teaches that life evolves from lower to higher based on sorting. Is an evolutionary method just

another means to show mankind that the universe is one huge device for sorting? All major religions suggest and teach in a sense that the world is a sorting device for souls and for an afterlife, and now we have psychological evidence that all behavior is driven by the concept of good and evil that manifest itself as selflessness or selfishness. Does the Origin of Impossibilities also suggest that God does exist? Perhaps the First Cause and Unmoved Mover do as well? If God does not exist, does logic get turned on its head showing that man needs God as a foundation for society and to prevent its inevitable decay? Does Infinite Causation and Infinite Motion demand that God must exist; with all of these ideas combined revealing that God must exist as well?

When all is said and done, what does a person or society gain if they do believe in God? When all is said and done, what does a person or society lose if they do not believe in God? The choice is yours. If you choose unbelief, one day you will wake up to the stars falling from the sky, and as the moon turns to blood, you'll realize that you have been part of a system that was designed for the sorting of your soul and to justify your damnation. Or do you choose God and the greater good and continue to reason out your reality while understanding that one day you will have sorrows no more - finally meeting your just and inconceivable reward!

In the beginning, there was nothing - no stars, no moons, no planets or even space . . .

Part V: Random Musings

“Why?”
Everyone

26

Random Musings

“How can finite grasp infinity?”

John Dryden (1631-1700) (1)

Infinity – Infinity within finite bounds would be the occurrence of an infinity within boundaries such as the number 10 divided by the number 3. The answer of course is 3.33 to infinity. In reality this is not an occurrence of a true infinity seeing that a 10” pie can be cut into three equal pieces without losing any of the pie. What this does show, however, is that basic math possesses errors; and you witness one of these faults when you multiply your pieces back, and you do not arrive at your original number. For example, 3 multiplied by 3.33 to infinity is never equal to ten.

A diminishing infinity can happen between the numbers 0 and 1 or any two numbers for that matter. Mathematically a digressing infinity is the dissecting of a finite amount within two boundaries, and since it has boundaries, this would imply it is not a true infinite occurrence. A diminishing infinity would take place when you continue to dissect a number into smaller and smaller parts. While the size of the individual pieces shrink, in turn the number of the individual pieces increases, but once again the number is between two finite boundaries. On the other hand we have what appears to be an increasing infinity. However, since an infinity cannot increase due to the fact that it would violate the definition of an infinite occurrence seeing that a true infinity cannot have boundaries, this would tend to show an

increasing or diminishing infinite are not true infinite occurrences. It would also show that an infinite occurrence with a beginning is not an increasing infinity but an increasing finite, and thus revealing it is not a true occurrence of infinity.

It appears you can never have a true infinity when dissecting or reducing a number, and I believe that Zeno's Paradox of Motion proves this. In Zeno's Paradox of Motion, we have a reducing infinity instead of a true infinity seeing that Archilles and the tortoise were traveling between finite boundaries; and though the boundaries change, in reality the event still ultimately took place between two finite points, though one point continues to increase. The increasing finite and diminishing infinity suggests that Zeno's Paradox of Motion is not a true infinite occurrence since Archilles can pass the tortoise in the real world. These false infinities only tend to show that there is an error in the math process or an error in trying to produce an infinite occurrence between finite boundaries. While a reducing infinity appears to be a mathematical error or an infinity within bounds, true infinity is an already existing infinite occurrence which cannot have a beginning or an end seeing that a beginning or an end are boundaries. True infinity appears to not be logically possible, but it is still necessary for finite to exist (see Infinite Causation). While an infinity is necessary for finite to exist, I believe man's mind could never quantify it seeing that for mans mind to quantify something it must possess boundaries. Boundaries of course, once again, imply that something is not infinite. Along the same line of thought can you have an increasing infinity or an infinity + 1? Are there any known cases of an increasing infinity? The answer would be that if an event is truly infinite, it would have no boundaries in which to add anything else to include +1. If God is infinite and a infinity plus one symbolizes creation, then God having the ability of creation would show that in the case of God an infinity plus one is possible though under the circumstances of our reality an infinity +1 is not possible. However, God creating would in reality be infinity plus finite and not infinity plus infinity; thereby showing, that an infinity plus one may not exist in God's reality unless He is creating infinite things.

Man creating material things is taking finite creation and remolding it.

There is no evidence that infinity exists in the real world, except by the fact that finite exists which shows an infinite occurrence must exist. The closest possible infinite occurrence that we know of existing is the universe. The universe, however, is not infinite, seeing that the universe is still expanding which implies that the universe is finite. The universe can be no larger than the speed of the expansion of the universe multiplied by the age of the universe showing another reason that the universe is not infinite. The universe has a beginning also revealing that the universe is finite.

Can an infinite occurrence have a beginning or an origin? An infinity implies that it has no boundaries; otherwise, it would not be infinite. An infinity with a beginning would not be a true infinite occurrence because it has one boundary or more plainly stated, it has a beginning. An infinity with a beginning reveals an increasing infinity and thereby not a true infinite occurrence.

Since the universe is not infinite and had a beginning, this suggests that something infinite had to create it seeing that something cannot come from nothing; and if nothing is zero, this would imply that in reality the universe had a beginning and is an increasing finite at best and not a true occurrence of infinity. The universe being finite requires an infinite to create it.

Statistical Absurdity – A statistical absurdity is the point where the chances for an occurrence taken place become so small that it is not a realistic possibility. Man has not really defined an exact number or equation for statistical absurdity, but I am confident that one day he will.

Statistical Errors - A statistical error in processing takes place when probabilities of an occurrence are calculated based on a single occurrence. If the event (not like a lottery seeing that a lottery has odds within boundaries to begin with) could not take place twice, it probably would not take place the first time without an impossibility taking place. Therefore to recognize and understand the true probability of highly

improbable occurrences or impossibilities, the math should show the probability of the event taking place at least twice. If an event takes place once and it is not an anomaly or phenomena, then the event at some point should logically happen again.

Time Travel – Time travel is only possible if both realities exist simultaneously. For a person to travel back in time from the present (Point A) to May 7th, 1945 at 7am (Point B), both places must exist at the same time. Because of this, it appears that time travel is not possible seeing that a virtually infinite number of universes/realities would have to exist simultaneously. If time travel is possible, this would lend credence to the fact that God must exist seeing that a virtually infinite number of realities/universes would have to exist simultaneously.

Human Machine – The brain is a supercomputer with a vast memory and processing capabilities. The brain stem is a sophisticated auto pilot computer that operates all of the machinery that makes up the machine to include regulating all systems within the machine at all times for maximum performance. The eyes are a complex high definition color video camera system with depth perception (two eyes and other factors) that interfaces with the brain and the other devices of the body as well such as hand to eye coordination and visual pleasure. The nose is a highly complex sensory device that uses smell to enhance eating as well as using smell to sense the environment for information that assists in survival, pleasure, and displeasure while being integrated into many other systems as well. The mouth, lips, glands, tongue, throat, stomach, intestines, etc all integrate to make up not only a digestive system but are included in the reproductive and pleasure system as well. The digestive system is a highly effective matter to energy transfer system. The skeletal system is a highly complex self repairing structure that supports all other systems. The skin is a protection and cosmetic device that incorporates a liquid cooling system among other features. The legs and hips are effective transportation systems that require interface with the mind as

well as the balance system located in the ears. The ears make up a complex audio system with surround sound and location/depth perception that helps in survival and in daily needs and pleasure. The hands are gripping and pleasure devices that allow for man to survive, build, and obtain pleasure. The reproductive system allows for survival of the species, waste dispensing, and obtaining pleasure. The immune system is a highly complex intelligent, intelligent because it learns, system that prevents many biological enemies from destroying the machine. The circulatory system takes blood, oxygen, food, and waste throughout the machine to wherever it is needed and decided upon by the overall integration and intelligence of the machine. The nervous system allows for basic function of all integrated systems while allowing for pain as a defense and alert mechanism for the well being of the overall machine while also allowing for pleasure and stimulation. The heart is at the center of the machine, and it is responsible for the overall life force of the machine and its mechanisms, while using its pumping mechanism to distribute oxygen, blood, food, and waste to the entire and fully integrated mechanism. Creativity allows for the machine to create things to help in survival and to obtain meaning and pleasure. Reasoning allows for an even deeper understanding of the machines environment to include allowing for the mechanism to improve its overall existence. I believe I could on for quite some time; however, I will be content with concluding that I do not see how anyone could see design in this (sarcasm for the atheistic thinker that believes in a universe without design)? Ask an engineer to build such a highly complex mechanism or machine and watch him laugh at you as you suggest he can do so without a design. And if you desire further scorn from the engineer suggest that he can in fact build over one million highly complex designs (all biological species) for you without a design. Truly design not only suggests a designer, but it demands one.

God Paradoxes – Can God create a stone to heavy for Himself to lift? Yes, God could create a stone so heavy that

his physical body could not lift it, but he could use his God powers to lift it if he chose to.

Can God make $2+2=5$? Yes, because you do not really know what 2 or 5 represent. Two could be equal to two portions of 1.25 for example.

Can God make a square a circle and then a circle a square? Yes, take a square piece of paper and put the ends together forming a circle, and then let the paper unfold again.

Bibliography

1. *Edwards D.D.*, The New Dictionary of Thoughts. Standard Book Co. 1955. New York, NY.
2. *Rohmann*, A World of Ideas. Ballantine Books. 1999. New York, NY.
3. American Heritage Dictionary. Houghton Mifflin Co. 1982. Boston, MA.
4. *Angeles*, The Harper Collins Dictionary of Philosophy. HarperPerennial. 1992. New York, NY.
5. *Dawkins*, The Blind Watchmaker. W.W. Norton & Co. 1996. New York, NY.

* Any quote in italics without a source listed is an original quote from the author.

Available Now

**Hallowed Ground:
Fundamentals of the Christian Faith**

By

Michael Dean Taylor

www.zurpublishing.com

Coming in 2008

**Seven Thunders: The Mystery of God
By Michael Dean Taylor**

