

# Table of Contents

Foreword.....	2
Forgetting the Known.....	5
The Immense Journey.....	9
Making Sense of UFO Abductions.....	16
Science Does Not Exist.....	25
Human Ignorance is Infinite.....	33
UFO Abductions, Bigfoot, and Evolution.....	44
Defining the Supernatural.....	55
Intelligent Design.....	60
Overturning Copernicanism.....	66
Contradicting Christianity.....	70
Common Descent is not the Problem.....	76
Making Science into Superstition.....	78
Why Evolution Is Not Science.....	83
Truth and Darwinism.....	85
Thinking In New Ways.....	89
Darwinism and Human Freedom.....	97
Hindering Science.....	105
Running from the Battle.....	107
Darwinism and the Founding Fathers.....	110
Secular and Religious Evolution.....	115
Why America is a Theocracy.....	118
Understanding the Human Love of Tyranny.....	122
Channeling God.....	126
Science and Creed.....	128
The Authority Structure of the Kingdom of God.....	133
The Coming of the Son of Man.....	138
Exploring Unknown Territory.....	142
Why We Should Love and Enjoy Atheists.....	145
The Identity of the Institutional Church.....	156
How to Believe in God.....	160
God as Oprah.....	162
Forgiving for Others.....	166
Dealing with Guilt Inappropriately.....	167
Targeting the Distant Future.....	169
Final Summary.....	171
Discussions.....	174
Index.....	193

# UFOs, Bigfoot, and Evolution: Freeing Science from Pagan Idolatry

## Foreword

I swear I am not insane. I am fairly capable of dealing with reality, but maybe not as capable as some others. All right, maybe I am insane. But my insanity seems to me the only logical choice if one is going to be able to know anything, or even believe that anything is true.

I have been in extended dialog with materialists and atheists, and have discovered some interesting insights in the process of attempting to engage them in discussion. This book is an attempt to convey my insights in an understandable way. We will see if I am successful.

In 2003, I wrote and self-published a novel, titled *The Firefall*, ([www.thefirefall.com](http://www.thefirefall.com)) in which I explored the idea that the UFO abduction phenomenon was a proof of the action of an unknown realm, and that we were mistaking the action of that unknown realm—whatever it is—for extraterrestrial activity. I have come to believe our current understanding of the issue is just a result of an overreliance on science fiction to interpret reality for us, and a failure--or perhaps a refusal--to understand when we are faced with Ultimate Reality.

It is quite upsetting to contemplate the idea that there are vast, powerful, intelligent forces walking among us here on earth that are not under the control of humans.

Religion is often opposed simply because it reminds us of these forces. It gives us methods of dealing with them, or at least of comforting ourselves when we face them, by prayer and belief in the ultimate triumph of goodness.

The materialist understanding, the idea that all phenomena have material explanations, deals with these forces by denying them, and thereby refusing to give them full power to control humans. Yet this does not really control them; it only allows them to remain hidden so they can act at will without discovery. Now, with the proliferation of video cameras and the Internet, the forces are becoming so obvious to many that they have difficulty denying them. The materialists, if they acknowledge them at all, attribute the phenomena to materially existing extraterrestrial aliens.

For a moment, let us forget the ideas of angels, demons, religion, UFOs, extraterrestrials, grays, ghosts, faeries, Bigfoot, and even God. Let us simply look at phenomena, and let them speak to us without trying to "solve" them according to some theory of reality. I would think that true science requires looking at data about phenomena without preconceptions of their identity or meaning, and investigating them with an objective mind.

I am sorry that I am so limited in my understanding, but at least I am aware of the fact. I have observed that many, if not most, who write scholarly or popular books on this subject are not aware of how severe their limitations are.

I know that I am challenging the fundamental basis of the modern world, and those who defend it are not going to just roll over and play dead because I am challenging them.

They will continue to try to destroy anyone who points out their errors by any means possible, as they have in the past. They will quite possibly succeed. But they will not be able to destroy the truth, which will ultimately triumph, because it is defended by Ultimate Reality.

### Showing the Way

I am a pioneer, and a lot of things I do and think are wrong just like the pioneers who went before us in the American experience. But we pioneers make it safe for those who come after, and blaze the way. We break the ground, and others will plant and harvest. We do not look for respect or honor, and do not expect it. If they killed the Saviour, how can we expect better treatment? But we need to teach others the way to go, in spite of the fact that we are opposed by those very ones we attempt to show the way. Maybe, after sober thought and reflection, they will see that we are right.

## Introduction

### Forgetting the Known

Objectivity is the only way to find truth. So much of postmodern society depends on the nonexistence of objective truth, that science in postmodern society does not attempt to find truth. It is understood as only attempting to find useful information.

I have said we are trying to forget the words "angels," "demons," "aliens," and such. We are trying to forget the words, not the concept behind the words. There actually is that which is Ultimate Reality, so we cannot really forget the concepts. The words have a lot of emotional and religious baggage that hinders understanding, and we are trying to get past the baggage tied to all of those words, like angels, demons, aliens, God, and such, to the truth found beyond.

Now of course, the pragmatic postmodern definition of science as just finding useful information, not truth, ends in making science into nonsense. In order to operate a computer, for example, it has to be true that it can be expected to operate in a certain way. It has to be true that the "x" key, for example, actually makes an x, and not sometimes a y or a 0.

However, theories such as evolution do not have to be true objectively in postmodern science. They simply have to be meaningful ways to interpret reality. This concept of "no objective truth" probably developed in response to the scientific objections to

evolution. Evolution as common descent explains reality in a way that is comfortable to those who accept materialism as the only reality, so it is meaningful to them regardless of whether it is actually true because it allows materialists to control the debate about science.

Now that said, there are reasons to accept materialism as science. These reasons have nothing to do with truth and science, but they have a great deal to do with ignorance and human misunderstanding, and there are reasons for accepting them.

Every great understanding of the human race is also misunderstood by much of the race. Einstein's Theory of Relativity, for example, was thought to apply to ethics, and resulted in the throwing off of morality as relative to the observer and not objective. There are great dangers in the jettisoning of the understanding of materialism as science, as well as great opportunities.

Now religion has historically controlled the unknown forces by providing an explanation of them, but it can no longer control them if people no longer believe in the solutions of religion for controlling the dark component of the forces, such as prayer and obedience to religious teachings and law. The dark component will be allowed to run rampant and fulfill its purposes, which, religion teaches us, are antithetical to human interests. The dark component is really just those forces that illegitimately want to be accepted as the most ultimate reality, under no higher authority. Those forces deny the existence of that ultimate authority.

Now with so many people abandoning Christianity as irrelevant, and even abandoning the

idea of objective truth itself, materialism is the only control of these forces. The idea of explaining UFOs as craft piloted by beings from some planet like ours revolving around a distant star is not a helpful scenario to help us understand what they really are, it is just imposing the current materialist mythology on the subject. This may be helpful in controlling social upheavals, but it does not get us any closer to the truth.

These unknown things may be even more alien than we think. We know that maybe extraterrestrial aliens may be very different than us, like the tentacled bug-eyed things of science fiction. But they may be so strange that we don't even believe they are there when we see them. They may not even be extraterrestrial at all. They may be living on earth with us, and we have been seeing them, and calling them something else that makes us comfortable in the face of the abject terror that would result from acknowledging them.

Recognizing UFOs and other phenomena as true unknowns destroys materialism, and releases the dark component to feed on ignorance and fear. That is the argument for continuing to confuse materialism with science. It would be a difficult concept to release all of a sudden upon the public, which had been taught that only material phenomena exist, and would result in monumental social upheaval, and perhaps a return to worship of and sacrifice to the dark component to get it to leave humanity alone. But it appears that the revelation is inevitable, and the failure of materialism is apparent to all who will look.

At the same time, the revelation holds great promise. Science is hindered by the confusion with materialism, because the result of thinking that science assumes that the

supernatural does not act in the world is denial of the unknown. Science will be freed by not having to assume that there is a materialist solution to all phenomena, and will be able to actually investigate them.

The new "scientific attitude" will be boldly facing the unknown and attempting to solve the phenomena using new explanations of reality, not just mindlessly trying to make ourselves comfortable by explaining them according to known principles. This has the potential for finding principles that will allow us to travel to the stars, which is precluded in materialist science.

The danger to humanity posed by the dark component is very real. How long the dark component will remain hidden is not known, but it will be exposed in a way unsatisfactory to it if it becomes generally understood that materialism is not science. The social upheavals that follow that understanding would create chaos, as people become upset about how they have been misled. The most logical way for the dark component to reveal itself, while maintaining the illusion of materialism as science, is as a benevolent extraterrestrial society that will help us solve our problems. It is not necessary for it to reveal itself at all, as long as people mistake materialism for science. The dark forces can have most of the control they want without even making their presence known. But what they see as final victory over humanity and the forces of truth most likely will require them to reveal themselves so they can be worshiped directly.

## Chapter One

### The Immense Journey

*Ages and ages back, out of the long grass raising itself into the upright position, a creature--forerunner of man--with swift eyes glanced around.--Edward Carpenter, Towards Democracy*

Dr. Loren Eiseley came from humble beginnings to become a paleontologist at a major university. He wrote a very successful book titled *The Immense Journey* about what he understood as our origins from non-sentient life. Dr. Eiseley was somewhat of a "theistic evolutionist," that is, one who believes that God was somehow involved in the process of evolution in some way that cannot be determined by science.

His books were so well written that they were sometimes used in English classes to teach how to use the language. He painfully recounted his childhood with a poverty-stricken Shakespearean actor for a father, and a deaf mother.

Dr. Eiseley conducted a lifelong struggle with himself over the implications of evolution. He saw a kind of purpose in our development from some kind of early life (he did not believe in the natural origin of life from inorganic chemicals). He was a scientist, and absorbed the prevailing idea of mistaking materialism for science to some degree. Yet he retained a sense of wonder at what he thought evolution had created somehow through the action of the hand of God.

He tried, ever so gently, to try to convince his colleagues that evolution had room for God. He pointed out that even if the scientists succeeded in making the slime crawl, that is, creating life out of non-life, it did not prove that it happened by chance without God.

Yet, Dr. Eiseley accepted the Darwinian struggle for existence as the effective creator of man. He also expressed the strange belief that whatever you valued most in life would determine where you went after death. That sounds like the Christian belief, but he hoped to wake up after death at the time of the last ice age as a caveman, apparently to escape the bother of modern life, and live according to elementals.

He was a professing Christian, and trusted in the Redeemer to remove his guilt before God. It is important to remember that one is not required to have all of the correct beliefs to be a traditional protestant Christian, all that is necessary is trust in the all-sufficient sacrifice of Christ to justify yourself before God instead of trusting in your own righteousness. So in that sense Dr. Eiseley had it right.

Now there is kind of a nobility to evolution, if you think of it that way. Consistent materialists don't, though. Dr. Eiseley struggled with the materialist side of himself, as well with those who were thoroughgoing materialists. He pointed out that being unable to be touched by magic was not always a good thing.

This nobility is not lost on modern believers in New Age philosophy, where the goal is to achieve enlightenment and a kind of cosmic consciousness as an "ascended master" based on information provided by spirit beings through non-rational methods. They absorb the

assumption that humans evolved, and take it to a spiritual conclusion without being hindered by knowledge of, or often even interest in, the current scientific thinking.

Yet, as irrational as this kind of evolution is, it is nothing compared to the materialist version. Most believers in evolution depend on authority, and accept the evidence for evolution based on the authority of others. This, of course, is the way education works; you accept the word of an authority rather than verifying everything on your own. But in this case it breaks down, because the authority has used an illegal procedure. The authority has attempted to prove the theory by interpreting all data by the theory. Dr. Eiseley had a hint of this in his understanding that if God does not exist, then all is permitted. Evolution depends on the assumption that materialism is self-evident, which denies the existence of God.

This may not be so plain to the reader, but it will become apparent when one tries to present evidence for creation to a dedicated defender of evolution. We will investigate that phenomenon more fully later.

In 1970, Dr. Eiseley wrote a book about the tension between science and religion. He told us that Francis Bacon is often thought of as the inventor of the idea of modern science, by separating religion from science. This results in the ability of science to be objective in its considerations of phenomena, since it does not have to consider the possibility that God may be acting in producing phenomena supernaturally. This means that science is limited to explaining phenomena in terms of understood principles, and that it may or may not be able to explain those phenomena without finding new principles. In the Baconian understanding of science, its inability to explain phenomena in

no way means that those phenomena are supernatural, it only means that they are not yet understood. It also in no way means they are not supernatural. There is simply no way for science to consider the supernatural. We will later consider the fact that in reality only the natural exists, but only for God are all things natural.

Modernism, or materialistic naturalism, is defined here as the idea that the supernatural does not act in the world, as with the German rationalists who denied the miracles of Jesus because they were not naturally explainable.

It has become popular (what is called postmodernism) to pretend that there are measures of what should be meaningful to people other than truth. For instance, diversity, inoffensiveness, and human preferences are often used to make judgments of what is right, and truth is not given first place, and often not even considered in the postmodern *Weltanschauung*, or worldview.

Science requires that there really is such a thing as objective truth. People may have different opinions about what is objectively true, but the objective truth actually exists and can and should be found as nearly as possible, if for no other reason in order to avoid being ignorant. Truth obligates you to believe it. This is why many people deny that it exists, because they do not want to be obligated by anything that applies to all. Radical materialists like the paleontologist S. J. Gould applied this principle to science, in that he said that science does not find truth. It only finds answers that are so well verified that it would be perverse to deny them. Here, the authority of what is "verified" (true) is placed in the hands of humans who have power for whatever reason. Gould is only obfuscating, and denying human freedom, as we will show later.

Many postmodern philosophers have defined science as having nothing to do with truth. The only goal of science, in their mind, is to find solutions to phenomena that work, because there is no objective truth if you think that materialism is self-evident, as we will explain. The highest calling of science is the attempt to find the objective truth about phenomena, rather than being satisfied to just find a solution that works without attempting to find the real truth about the phenomenon.

"Deism" is the religion that says that *God* does not act in the world. It is compatible with what is called the "scientific worldview" which also says that *God* does not act in the world outside of natural laws. It allows self-evident materialism to remain unmolested, since *God*, if He exists, does not act. It is not compatible with Christianity, since Christianity requires that *God* acted (in the resurrection of Christ) and continues to act in the world (to answer prayer) and is not limited by our understanding of what we think are natural laws. Maybe one could have a "modified Deism" to allow *God* to act here and there, but the materialists would not allow it, since materialism must be self-evident and absolute in order to deny Intelligent Design. The issue is really a denial of anything whatever to which man must answer, even truth.

The "scientific worldview" is likewise not compatible with Christianity. It denies the objective truth of Christianity, and only allows it to be true in some "spiritual" realm that has nothing to do with objective reality. Compromises like theistic evolution have no meaning whatever to materialists, since they require accepting the interpretation of evidence by the assumption that materialism is self-evident, and have essentially given away the existence of *God*, which is all that the materialists care about.

The "scientific worldview" claims objective truth for the idea that humans actually evolved from nonhuman ancestors, following the presupposition that God does not act in the world. Yet scientific knowledge is tentative and limited, since later discoveries may reveal new information about a subject. The knowledge if humans did not evolve from nonhuman ancestors is unwanted, since materialists assert that God does not act, and therefore cannot have created.

In true science, the evidence for evolution is meaningless because the "scientific worldview" interprets all data concerning origins by the metaphysical assumption that evolution cannot be false, so evidence against it cannot exist. Evidence is interpreted data. Data consists of something like a fossil of a fish. It has to be interpreted by some theory to make sense. If it is interpreted by the theory that the fish evolved into humans, it is "evidence" for that theory. If it is used for evidence for the theory regardless of the questions it raises to an objective observer, however, it is invalid, since the theory is used to interpret the data. We will investigate some examples of this later.

In summary, the "scientific worldview," that is, self-evident materialism, hinders true science because it considers objective truth to be irrelevant. The "science community" decides what it wants to be true about a controversial issue by imposition of the majority position, and ignores the evidence against their position as long as it serves the purposes of those who hold the worldview. It also results in the confusion of the supernatural with the merely unknown. Unknown principles of how the universe operates cannot exist in the worldview, so they cannot be found. It reduces science to nothing

but skepticism. This confusion about objective truth extends to all of society, and results in the society losing faith in truth itself. Maybe it extended to the science community from society, but it is found in both places. It is a return to pre-Enlightenment thinking, in allowing metaphysics to influence science.

Science stagnates under this oppression. A large number of people are able to do highly technical things, but no one is able to think outside of accepted ways because of the disapproval of the "science community."

True science will break out of this strait jacket. Science is not limited to the approved community; the only thing all of this will accomplish is the humiliation of those who refuse to understand that there is such a thing as objective truth, and that it should be found as nearly as possible.

## Chapter Two

### Making Sense of UFO Abductions

*The scientific establishment does not look kindly upon professionals who stray too far from what are deemed legitimate areas of study.--Dr. Colm Kelleher*

Now this is kind of a fun subject. It brings a little comic relief into normal everyday life. It is humorous to think of aliens coming from some other planet and somehow taking people into their spacecraft and examining them, even in downtown New York City, without anyone seeing them.

But it is anything but humorous to those who are subjected to the phenomenon. Also, there is a great deal to be learned from the phenomenon if you know where and how to look.

First, we need to define a ufo abduction. This statement comes from [ufoabduction.com](http://ufoabduction.com), the website of the International Center for Abduction Research directed by Dr. David Jacobs.

"Abductions are complex series of events and procedures directed by the abductors to passive or controlled abductees. In a typical or common abduction, humans are taken out of their normal environment by aliens. The people are rendered passive and cannot

resist. They are taken aboard a UFO, their clothes are removed and they are made to lie on a table. A series of physical, mental, and productive procedures are then administered to the subjects. People's physical bodies are probed and examined. Sperm is taken, eggs are harvested."

Dr. Jacobs tells us that he looks at the world in reference to the abduction phenomenon, and it makes him pessimistic. He has written a book titled *The Threat*, in which he describes what he thinks to be an agenda which the forces producing this phenomenon seem to be pursuing. He recognizes this makes him an outcast in his profession, but he feels that honesty requires him to say it.

Now let us look at one of the classic UFO abductions, that of Travis Walton. It is described in the book *Fire in the Sky*, and on his website, [travis-walton.com](http://travis-walton.com).

To summarize, on November 5, 1975, some forestry workers in a remote location saw a large disc-shaped lighted object near the road as they drove along. Travis went out to investigate it, and it hit him with a beam of light and knocked him down. The others, who were waiting in the truck, drove away in fear. They then came back, but could not find Travis. An organized search was made for him using dogs, men on foot, and helicopters, but abandoned after a few days. Then he turned up in a town 30 miles away five days after the original event. He reported that he had been taken aboard a spaceship and examined, and then dropped off on the highway just outside the town. He had no idea that five days had passed.

Now another classic UFO abduction is that of Betty and Barney Hill. Their experience

was September 19, 1961. They were a mixed-race couple in New Hampshire. There is a good description of the abduction on [www.en.Wikipedia.org/wiki/Betty\\_Hill](http://www.en.Wikipedia.org/wiki/Betty_Hill). A lighted object flew over their car with beings visible in the windows, which Barney thought were communicating with him telepathically. They then continued with their trip, and did not recover their abduction memories until later, under hypnosis. Their recovered memories were quite extensive, and involved medical-like examinations and a reference to the beings having come from the Zeta Reticuli star system. The book about their experience is titled *Interrupted Journey*.

There are many other abduction experiences, but they generally follow the pattern. One sees a UFO or a being, they are taken into a room and examined in intrusive ways, and put back where they came from as if nothing had happened, sometimes with their clothes disarranged or having some other anomaly.

But now I want to take us into deeper waters, and there is always the danger that one suddenly finds he cannot swim. First let me describe my viewpoint on this matter. Here is your life preserver, if you need one. There is always the possibility that these are simply psychological phenomena that are a production of the mind, and the external phenomena witnessed are just some kind of multiple-witness hallucination.

I do not, however, consider this to be a likely explanation. Now let me delve into the views of Zecharia Sitchin, as a segue into mine. The website is [www.sitchin.com](http://www.sitchin.com). Sitchin thinks that the Bible and other ancient texts are the record of extraterrestrial technology interacting with humans, along with Erich von Daniken and others.

The most common example these people quote is Ezekiel, where the prophet has a vision of the throne of God, Ezekiel 1:4 (KJV)--

And I looked, and, behold, a whirlwind came out of the north, a great cloud, and a fire infolding itself, and a brightness was about it, and out of the midst thereof as the colour of amber, out of the midst of the fire.

Then there is a description of something strange, which has the appearance of metal. Now here we go into deep waters. Sitchin thinks this is a description of a UFO landing, and I don't think he is far wrong, but he is looking through the wrong end of the telescope, to use an astronomy metaphor.

But Ezekiel continues, and does not stop with the appearance; we have a definite message given to Ezekiel in 2:1 and following:

And he said unto me, Son of man, stand upon thy feet, and I will speak unto thee.

Then the vision ends, and the aftermath, in 3: 12-15.

Then the spirit took me up, and I heard behind me a voice of a great rushing, saying, Blessed be the glory of the LORD from his place.

I heard also the noise of the wings of the living creatures that touched one another, and the noise of the wheels over against them, and a noise of a great rushing.

So the spirit lifted me up, and took me away, and I went in bitterness, in the heat of my spirit; but the hand of the LORD was strong upon me.

Then I came to them of the captivity at Telabib, that dwelt by the river of Chebar, and I sat where they sat, and remained there astonished among them seven days.

Now note that we have certain similarities with the UFO abduction experience here. We have the appearance of a UFO and beings, an interview with the recipient, a taking away by the abductor, and astonishment felt by the recipient.

This is not the only example of experiences with similarities to UFO abduction in the Bible. There are actually several. Some include the removal of Lot from Sodom, Moses and the Israelites following the Pillar of Cloud and Pillar of Fire in the wilderness, the catching up of Elijah by horses and chariots of fire, the transfiguration of Jesus, and the conversion of Saint Paul, just to mention a few.

Now there are also certain differences from classic UFO abductions here. Rather than remaining hidden, these abductors readily identify themselves. There is no sexual content or medical examination, as in the usual UFO abduction. They also have a definite purpose in mind, as a reading of Ezekiel will show.

So that brings us to my definition of "UFO abduction." I think it is better given a broader meaning to include these Biblical phenomena for our purposes here, and we might call it "a meaningful or puzzling experience of close interaction with unknown

beings."

It is my contention that these modern UFO abductions show us that unknown phenomena happen all around us, and our materialist worldview does not allow us to see them. We are immersed in a materialist mythology which is no more likely to be actually true than Greek mythology with all of its gods and heroes meddling in the affairs of humans, but we have come to accept it and often cannot see past it. It is simply a comfortable way of interpreting the world, and can be demonstrated to be objectively false.

Now, of course, this does not mean that we must see supernatural beings operating everywhere. But it *does* mean that the natural is not what we think it is. A mythology is simply a way of interpreting the world and making sense of it. Many Christians believe that God acts in all events, and that God has set up the universe so that it acts in predictable ways, not chaotically according to the whim of some morally deficient superhuman being. But that does not mean that humans *understand* everything about how it operates, which is the assumption of materialist mythology.

UFOs and UFO abductions are a reminder of the fact that there are principles of the universe that we do not understand. Some might say that they are produced by angels or demons, but that does not give us any useful information. The terms "angel" or "demon" are loaded with religious baggage, and cannot be objectively considered because of that baggage. Also, the assertion that they are produced by extraterrestrial beings does not give us any useful information, since that term comes out of materialist mythology. There is no material evidence whatever of any kind of extraterrestrial being. They may exist, or they may not, but there is no more evidence for them in

science than for angels or demons. At least there are ancient texts that testify that something human-like other than humans exists on earth, and UFO abductions verify that.

So we cannot say, in science, that UFO abductions are produced by angels, demons, or extraterrestrials, or that they are only psychological. To do so is simply to import our metaphysical viewpoint into science. But we *can* say that something is producing the phenomenon, and that we do not know the principles by which the phenomenon operates.

Now my view is that this phenomenon holds great promise for science. Science has been under the thumb of materialist mythology for the 150 years or so since Darwin, and many, even most, scientists think that materialist mythology *is* science. This is shown by the phenomenon of "debunking." Rather than attempting to gather all possible data about a phenomenon, debunkers have a particular natural explanation of the phenomenon, and ignore all contrary evidence. This results in the huge lighted UFOs over Israel, witnessed by many people on consecutive nights, and videotaped in 1998, being dismissed as out-of-focus videos of the star Sirius.

It should be apparent that if you ignore evidence that conflicts with your theory, you can prove that it is true, but your proof is meaningless. Doing away with this hindrance to science will allow it to find new principles of the universe that may take us far toward the stars.

Now what do the UFO sightings and abductions mean in science? They may have no understandable meaning, except to show us that there are unknowns that we still need

to find. We may have to turn to other means in addition to technology if we are going to progress toward a better understanding of the universe.

We can imagine what things were like in the ancient world, and what the legends of things like sea monsters and flying gods might really mean. These people may not be simply ignorant and describing natural phenomena that they mistook for gods, but they may really have known what was happening better than we do.

Imagine for a moment that a UFO might come and interact with you, and make you amazingly uncomfortable, as happens in UFO abductions. You might wish to pacify the being by sacrificing to it, or doing some other thing that would remove his attention from you. Suppose he might give you information about what he wanted you to do, like some contactees (a willing abductee) claim that they are warned about stopping war or global warming.

Now we have an explanation of the ancient gods of the Maya and Aztecs and others. The feathered serpent Quetzalcoatl was perhaps more than just a manifestation of too much maize liquor. There was something actually there, and it demanded things. He was an intelligent being, but not an ET. There is no reason to postulate that materialist mythology is more true than Mayan mythology.

The God of the Israelites was real, and He actually directed them. If we had seen the Cloud and Fire, we would recognize it as a UFO. There was an Intelligence behind it, but it was not ET. That is simply a materialist mythology. We are not wiser than the ancients. They knew what they were seeing, and just because it does not fit our

mythology does not mean they were wrong and we are right.

The Bible records the interaction of other gods with humanity, (which it calls "devils") but declares there is only one true God. This is obvious if you realize that there is only one Ultimate Reality. The earth goes around the sun, or it doesn't. The other gods are less than God, and desire worship so that they can enslave humanity. The materialist god is no different. Materialism destroys freedom, since it asserts that God does not exist in the material world, and there is no objective reference point for authority. The materialist god is much more subtle than the ancient gods, but it nonetheless enslaves humanity. It prevents science from being able to investigate the world, because it convinces man that materialism can explain the world, and he does not need to look for principles that he does not understand so that he can expand his knowledge.

## Chapter Three

### Science Does Not Exist

*Materialism is a philosophical opinion that is closely connected with science. It grew up alongside of science, and many people have a hard time distinguishing it from science. But it is not science. It is merely a philosophical opinion.--Physicist Dr. Stephen Barr*

An error that becomes obvious in discussions about science with scientists is that the scientific method is often mistaken for an entity that has a will and personality. This is particularly evident in discussions about evolution and creation. It is often said that science excludes the possibility that God is acting in the world to produce phenomena. This means that no data can be interpreted by any theory of origins except evolution, since it is the only scientific theory, and there is therefore no scientific evidence against evolution. Creation, then, can only be anti-scientific ignorance, and any evidence that seems to support it can be logically dismissed if there is any other interpretation possible for the data, no matter how unlikely.

Science, however, is only a method. It is the Baconian method of observation and experiment, and cannot exclude any solution to a phenomenon before it investigates. Scientists, who are actually personal entities, can exclude solutions that they don't want to know about, but that simply limits their objectivity, it does not mean that the solution is false. If they do so, they will simply be using the method improperly. Confronting them about this results in all kinds of fun. They have no rational defense, so their statements will be unpredictable, but uniformly irrational and impossible to defend.

Those who think that science is an entity with will and rights refer to "investigations by science" and some say "science does not allow the action of the supernatural." But those investigations are done by a method, not by an entity that somehow exists apart from the people that do the investigating. Science cannot exclude or include anything, it is simply a method that does not consider the supernatural in any way.

They speak of science as if it had an independent existence. They seem to be saying that an idea can exist without a mind. I don't think that is possible. Certain ideas may have an existence independent of humanity, but they may be in a nonhuman mind that does not allow humans to discover it.

Nonetheless, most materialists are arguing as if science were an entity, not a method for finding information. Even those who have a fairly good understanding of science, are confused in certain ways that they do not want to discuss. Science is based on an assumption that human perceptions are true and correctly represent objective reality, not on objective reality itself. Objective reality is not perceived directly by anyone but God. Materialists refuse to define science in words. How can one be sure his definition is right if he can't even state it?

God alone knows objective reality fully, and there can be no such thing as objective truth without a mind to know that a proposition aligns with reality. Without God, there is nothing but subjective reality, not just about the nature of God, but everything. God is required in order to have reality at all. There is no objective evidence of God simply because objective truth requires God in order to exist. Reality cannot be known without truth, and there can be no truth without God. Materialists just illogically ignore the

contradiction. Materialists have simply a subjective, irrational belief that God is subjective. Here they again confuse science with an entity. Methods do not have existence in objective material reality. Science is simply a method that can be done correctly to find truth, or incorrectly to provide propaganda for a cherished idea. God is the Mind that knows the objective truth that science can find.

Science simply attempts to find objective truth based on the assumption of the reliability of our senses. There is no reason for those senses to be reliable if you assume that man evolved by chance and natural selection. Atheism and Darwinism make nonsense of science.

Ernst Mayr was an evolutionary biologist; it might be helpful to quote him here. Talking about the stories of creation in the Bible, "We still treasure these stories as part of our cultural heritage, but we turn to science when we want to learn the real truth about the history of the world." This is from "What evolution IS" in 2001.

This exemplifies what I am pointing out. Western society is based on mistaking pagan idolatry for science. Here he claims science alone can give us REAL TRUTH about the history of the world; in other words, that it alone can finally answer the question of our origins. Just because people are well educated, they are not other than pagan idolaters if they do pagan idolatry. He is carving his own god out of the scientific method as surely as if he were carving it out of wood.

Atheists, or those who are confused by them, deny objective truth about reality. Look at Daniel Dennett's book about evolutionary psychology, *Breaking the Spell: Religion as a Natural Phenomenon*. He subjectively decides that there is no reality that he does not

understand, so God cannot act. But he does not realize that his ignorance is infinite, just like that of all humanity, as we will see later.

It is said by materialists that science cannot have omnipotent deities running amok throughout the method because an omnipotent deity acting upon the method would make it invalid. In Richard Lewontin's review of Sagan's *Demon Haunted World* he says: "To appeal to an omnipotent deity is to allow that at any moment the regularities of nature may be ruptured, that miracles may happen."

Yet, science is a method, not a superpowerful entity that can dictate conditions to omnipotent deities. People can use the method by ignoring the existence of omnipotent deities and assuming that they do not act, but that does not affect the omnipotent deities' action in any way, it just assures that the people will not be able to objectively investigate phenomena.

It is said that Lewontin explains why science cannot address creation as a manifestation of an omnipotent deity. Lewontin supposedly explains why a method that has served humanity well for all these years cannot work if it is to be accepted that creation is a manifestation of an omnipotent deity.

Lewontin's statement is technically correct; he just misunderstands how. Objective natural science cannot say that God is responsible for a phenomenon because natural science does not deal with Ultimate Reality, it only deals with observation and experiment according to limited human perception. When you are using the method of natural science, you cannot invoke Ultimate Reality. That in no way means that God

cannot be producing phenomena. The method of natural science just does not deal with Him. It has to look the other way because it is incompetent. In the same way, it cannot come to the conclusion that He is not acting. That is where Lewontin makes the mistake. He thinks that science can deny the action of Ultimate Reality.

I once had a discussion with a materialist who claimed science was an entity with a capital E. I never could get him to explain what he meant, but I told him that he was mistaking science for a substitute for God, in that it could exclude the action of God from consideration. He was quite articulate and apparently well informed, although very upset by the discussion. He understood that science does not have a separate existence from the humans who engage in it, but he somehow thought it was an entity. This is a common mistake among scientists; they think that science can DO things, whereas it is only a method, or a body of systematic knowledge. It is the humans who practice the scientific method who do it correctly or incorrectly. When they make invalid assumptions, like thinking that God cannot act to produce a phenomenon like creation, they are simply doing the method improperly.

Most people, maybe scientists in particular, don't appear to know what their words mean. If science can exclude the possibility of the action of Ultimate Reality from knowledge, it has to be an entity with individuality and will. I don't know of anyone who claims that science is a living entity. However, for science to perform the actions they attribute to it, it has to be a living entity with individuality and will.

Materialists say that the scientific method does not accept "God did it" as an explanation of how the world works. But here is where they make their mistake: The

method cannot work if you accept anything--not just God--as the final answer to how the world works. Then you would be claiming to know how Ultimate Reality operates. There is always more to know. The method of science is always tentative and cannot come to a final conclusion.

As such it is not really different from how we do many things. A car mechanic when trying to figure out what is wrong with a car does not consider "God did it" as a viable answer. Neither do scientists when they are doing the method properly. Yet, the mechanic also cannot solve the problem if he makes a final and unquestionable assumption that the problem is the spark plugs and cannot consider the possibility that the problem is misprogramming of the computer in the factory. So, likewise, scientists cannot assume that humans HAD to evolve from nonhuman ancestors, and ignore the possibility of creation.

You can't expect the materialists to just roll over and play dead. Their worldview depends on misunderstanding science, and mistaking materialism for science, and they will protect it at all costs. The rational action would be to abandon the materialist worldview because it has been shown to be nonsense, and that will eventually happen. It will be a long time coming.

Phillip Johnson, in an article called "The Unraveling of Scientific Materialism" tells us: "Darwinism is based on an a priori commitment to materialism, not on a philosophically neutral assessment of the evidence."

Materialists have a faith in non-supernaturalism which they describe as believing in the

natural world and laws. It is a faith, just like a faith in the gods on Olympus. It is a faith that humans know everything about the operation of the universe, which is demonstrably false and is a positive hindrance to objectivity. If one denies the supernatural, he is not able to acknowledge that unknown principles of the operation of the universe exist and therefore he cannot find them.

Faith in God is faith in the existence of Ultimate Reality. Faith in non-supernaturalism really amounts to a faith in nothingness. It is a denial of the relevance of truth to life on earth. This is really what is going on here. There is a struggle between those who believe in the relevance of truth and those who don't. It is not just a struggle between "religious" people and "secular" people. Those who do not believe in the relevance of truth will necessarily lose the struggle in the long run, because they are denying Ultimate Reality, and think they are just denying something they call "God" which is just an old-fashioned religious idea.

Materialists also say they have seen no evidence of the supernatural. I am sure that is also true, since evidence is interpreted data, and they interpret all data by the assumption that only the natural exists. However, the supernatural is just that which is not natural, and there is vast evidence for it. There is much that just does not make sense according to known natural law in quantum mechanics, for example. Human ignorance is infinite. We cannot even conceive how that light can be both a particle and a wave, we just have to accept it because that is what the experimental evidence shows.

Many scientists make the mistake of thinking that evidence is objective reality. Evidence is not a reality; only the raw data is reality. Evidence is an interpretation of

data by a mind that may have prejudices. For instance, the Laetoli prints of supposed human ancestors discovered in Africa (data) are interpreted by first assuming that the theory of evolution is self-evident, rather than being seen objectively as human prints in a layer laid down at a time that does not fit the theory. Evidence only has meaning if it is objectively interpreted. That is why the evidence for evolution is meaningless. All data is interpreted by the assumption that evolution must be true because materialism must be true, as is shown by the assumption of self-evident non-supernaturalism that most scientists make.

The National Center for Science Education tells us that the Council of Europe approved a resolution opposing the teaching of creationism as science., " This European assertion of the usual view of science as limited to materialist philosophy is an example of the anti-religious orthodoxy trying to reassert itself, even though its time is past. Intelligent Design strikes at its heart, exposing the error of mistaking materialism for science. The reason that ID is opposed is that it does not require a materialist explanation of origins, but allows scientists to follow where the data objectively leads. This is a hated idea for materialists like Dawkins, Dennett, and the NCSE. They do not want to know the truth about origins, and will fight the truth any way they can. THEY want to ESTABLISH their own "truth," not discover objective truth.

## Chapter Four

### Human Ignorance is Infinite

*Two things are infinite, the universe and human stupidity, but I'm not sure about the universe.--Albert Einstein*

Many scientists would agree that human ignorance is infinite, since it is considered possible that the universe extends out infinitely, or that there are an infinite number of universes and, by chance, we live in one with the right conditions for human life and consciousness. This is required by the anthropic principle, the appearance of the universe being designed for humans. We just happen to be in the one of the infinite number of universes that has the right conditions, and therefore it gives the appearance of being designed for humans, but actually it is just random, according to the theory.

So, if the universe is infinite, there is an infinite amount of information for us to know. No matter how much we learn, we will never get any closer to knowing everything, because of the nature of infinity. Human ignorance is not all that is infinite, however. As Einstein points out, there are an infinite number of ways for humans to be stupid. I would suspect that he was not talking so much about his fellow man, but about his stupidity in being unable to come up with a Grand Unified Theory of reality. Scientists have to realize their own stupidity in order to find ways to overcome it. Einstein was smart enough to do that, but he was too smart to realize that God was infinitely smarter, and that Einstein did not have much more than the faintest hint who God is.

If human ignorance is infinite, humans have to decide where they will be educated, and where they will be ignorant. For instance, if materialism and the consequent evolution of humans from nonhuman ancestors is assumed to be true, it allows people to ignore Biblical Christianity and consider it irrelevant. People just choose where they want to be ignorant, depending on what is important to them. Western literary society thinks you are educated if you know lots about western literature, but you don't have to know anything about nuclear physics. Nuclear physicists, on the other hand, don't care all that much about whether you can quote *Beowulf*.

There are lots of things that people just don't want to know. These, of course, are different for different people. Quotations from Shakespeare are not all that important for oil well roughnecks, but they had better know how to handle a drilling pipe. The trick is knowing what to know and what to consider irrelevant.

Darwinism is totally irrelevant to the lives of most people. That is why so few people know or care much about it, in spite of the efforts of the science and education establishments. They are trying to convince the public that something called "science," which has no objective existence, can replace God.

The public is not fooled, because they know with a kind of gut feeling, that what is called "science" is a positively harmful substitute for God. Those who don't want to know something that affects them at the very root of their being (evolution is false) are making bad choices about where to remain ignorant.

Kim Komando the computer guru ([www.komando.com](http://www.komando.com)) tells us that the human brain can contain not much more than 100 megabytes of information over one's lifetime. I see that my laptop's memory is almost a thousand times that. Most of us are not really able to use that memory very efficiently, so we have to be careful what information we reject. The knowledge that evolution may be false is too important to ignore. It causes us to make disastrous mistakes, like the people who supported Stalin did.

Materialists say they want an explanation of creation that they can understand without changing the way they think. This is not necessarily possible. The assumption that it must be, is called "materialism." The materialist also says he wants material evidence of a Creator, but ignores the material evidence of design because it does not fit with his occult philosophy of materialism.

Creation is not a non-scientific notion. It is a non-MATERIALIST notion. Materialists are mistaking materialism for science. Science is only a method, and cannot exclude the idea of God or Creation as a possible solution as if it were an entity with a will. They are mistaking science for an entity that can replace God.

Materialists say they want us to present the scientific evidence for ID and creation, and we have no scientific evidence. No, we have no *materialist* evidence. There is plenty of scientific evidence for creation and ID. Materialists are incapable of interpreting any data in the field of origins by the assumption that evolution can be false. The Laetoli prints are fully human, but are interpreted as the prints of a human ancestor because humans did not exist 3.6mya according to evolutionary theory. The modern grebe-like bird found in 110mya rock was interpreted as a transitional form instead of a modern

bird. The dinosaur tissue found in dinosaur bones just *had* to survive in the environment for 70 million years. The human prints found in the Permian Trackways just *have* to be fake because we *know* that humans did not exist in the Permian. There just *has* to be some explanation of the carbon-14 found in diamonds because we *know* diamonds are millions of years old.

No, we don't know any such things. Human ignorance is infinite, and we can't pretend that we know things because we don't want to know the fact if they are false. This is the case with evolution of humans from nonhuman ancestors. The evidence for evolution has no meaning in science because all data concerning origins is interpreted by the assumption that evolution is true. This does not even address the problem that *truth cannot exist if evolution is true, so evolution self-refutes and causes knowledge to degenerate into nonsense.*

The materialist wants evidence to demonstrate to him that God exists, on his terms. The evidence has been provided, it is just not evidence that the materialist wants to accept. The materialist is setting himself up as the judge, jury, and executioner of God, and the sole determiner that Ultimate Reality does not exist. He is challenging God for the rule of the universe, by telling Him what He should do. Remember, if human ignorance is infinite, humans have no standing whatever to tell God what to do. Materialists can only assert that Ultimate Reality is meaningless.

The materialist who claims that God is not just if he allows suffering in the world, as an admitted infinitely ignorant being, is judging God to be unworthy on his terms. He is showing God to be absolutely just in rejecting such a person from His presence in

Heaven.

The materialist cannot blame God for the lack of evidence of His existence. He does not want to know the truth, so he does not see the evidence He has provided. The materialist assumes that materialism is self-evident, and he requires that God be proved based on that assumption. Of course, there can be no evidence of God if you interpret all data by the assumption He does not exist.

The materialist cannot even logically believe that the objective truth is that there is no God. There can be no objective truth unless God exists to establish it. Otherwise, all you can have is human opinion.

It is said that there are different kind of truth, like subjective truth, objective truth, and religious truth. I am speaking of objective truth, as the only real truth. The others are not really truth, they are qualified by an adjective which reduces their objectivity.

If a person is committed to misunderstanding, one really can't convince him otherwise. It is the responsibility of everyone to find truth, not of the believer in truth to force feed him with it, like a fussy baby who won't eat his carrots.

Maybe this illustration will help. Suppose that a person dies. He will be dead for the infinite future in atheism or Deism. (he won't be in Christianity, but we are not dealing with Christianity right now.) After two years dead, he will not have only infinity minus two years to be dead. Likewise, if there is an infinite amount to know, if you learn how

to tie your shoes, there is still an infinite amount for you to know. If you know everything humans have ever learned, there is *still* an infinite amount for you to know. So human ignorance is infinite.

Materialists are choosing not to know anything about the non-material. If one decides he won't learn that he is wrong about a subject, there is no point in debate, except to demonstrate to others their error by seeing his.

I am not really talking about people BELIEVING there is such a thing as truth. Many a materialist believes in truth, they say. The problem is, his materialism does not allow for its existence. It is irrational for him to believe in truth. He is simply not aware that he is importing his beliefs from other worldviews. In materialism, the strategy to promote the materialist worldview is to keep definitions as unclear as possible so that the truth can be hidden.

Many materialists use the word "scientist" but what they really mean is "materialist." They are making the usual evolutionist error of mistaking materialism for science, perhaps consciously, perhaps not.

### Earth as a Science Experiment

Some materialists think that life on earth is kind of a grand experiment run by super-intelligent beings who are from some star system like Zeta Reticuli, which is supposed to be a billion years older than our own, and must be highly evolved.

Some people, like Dr. Nick Bostrom of the philosophy department of Oxford University, say that we do not really exist at all, we are just creations of the imagination of an alien technology that is playing with us as characters in a kind of video game. This might be true, but we could look at it in this way: "Technology" is not the word. We do not know *what* is going on here. The eternal, Almighty God is the creator of the video game, so to speak, and we are his characters, to whom he has given free will and responsibility in some unimaginable way. The whole of the Universe exists in His Mind, and fully depends on His action. He is not dependent on technology, and he is actually separate from His creation in some unimaginable way and not dependent on it in any way. Some people are beginning to understand what is going on, but they don't know what it all means—yet.

The Bible tells us that life on earth is a kind of grand experiment run by super-intelligent beings under the control of an omnipotent, omniscient Being. It also tells us the intentions of this Being, and why He made us. The materialist is making the mistake of assuming meaning can exist without that Being, only because it now exists. There can be no meaning, if we evolved by natural causes from inorganic matter, because meaning cannot come out of nothing on its own, any more than anything else can.

Zecharia Sitchin and the others are telling God that He is an alien because of their faith in the myth of science fiction. They have it exactly backwards.

The materialist who thinks that aliens created life gets to the heart of the matter here, but maybe does not realize it. If you assume aliens created life, the aliens had to come from somewhere. The problem of origins is not solved, it is just pushed back to a point where it can *never* be solved, because we *certainly* cannot know where the aliens

came from. Were there even more intelligent aliens that created them? The problem can only be solved by realizing that there is a self-existent Being who was not created, but always existed from eternity past, and Who created time itself, and will perhaps end it at some time in the future. This is Aquinas' argument of the uncaused cause, which Richard Dawkins dismisses in favor of infinite regress. Aliens created us, other aliens created them, etc. ad infinitum. The problem with Dawkins' argument is that it denies the existence of truth, which requires Ultimate Reality, which does not exist if regress is infinite. Dawkins is simply confused, thinking that something can be true without having the concept of truth.

The materialist claims that his life has meaning without God. That is because materialists piggyback on the meaning that God provides, by asserting that the universe is materialistic, and denying God. They find meaning in negation of reality. They do not understand the concept of self-existence. God is the One who created time itself, and is not subject to it. Likewise, He provides everything in the universe, including meaning. He is not a human like you and me. Human ignorance is infinite. God, on the other hand, is omniscient, and there is nothing He does not know. When you deny God, you also deny everything else in the universe, including meaning.

The dedicated materialists have shown that they don't want to know the truth. Most of their questions and challenges are attempts to obfuscate so that they won't have to face the fact that their perspective is objectively wrong.

Scientists like to protect comfortable ideas because they don't want to think in new ways. They are still human. The difference with evolution is that it has a religious (or

anti-religious, which is still a position based on a supposed knowledge of religion) component, i. e., the supporters are committed to materialism. This makes it far more difficult to change.

Often, when talking with a scientist, a disagreement results in the comment "you don't understand science." Of course, what the scientist means is that you don't have his understanding of science.

Actually, often the person in the street, the scientific layman, has a better understanding of science than the person with an advanced degree in a scientific field. The reason for this is that, in the process of getting an advanced degree, the student may very well absorb the assumptions, not to say the prejudices, of his instructors.

Scientists are often highly specialized, and know a great deal about one aspect of reality, like the mating habits of the spotted tiger beetle. They create theories of reality, and as long as they make sense rationally and cannot be refuted, they are accepted as useful.

In the process, they learn not to ask too many questions. They accept what other scientists tell them about aspects of reality that they have not studied. There is often a "herd mentality" that develops; when enough scientists accept an idea then dissent is discouraged, and even ridiculed. If a member of the public protests against an idea held by most scientists, he is told, "apparently you don't understand science."

Scientists come to mistake debunking the unknown for science. For this reason one will see a report of a huge rectangular UFO with multicolored lights dismissed as a misidentification of the star Sirius, although none of the details of the sighting fit the explanation.

Now this is really not a scientific attitude, it is the application of the philosophy of naturalism, which asserts that only natural causes (which means causes currently understood by humans) are responsible for all phenomena in the universe.

The member of the public, however, realizes that there are things he does not know, but he may not know that, outside of her narrow specialty, the scientist is no more knowledgeable than he is. She has to depend on an authority to provide information about other areas, and although she may know what the scientific consensus is on a subject, she is not in a position to evaluate the evidence on that subject for herself any more than the member of the public. She may actually be in a poorer position, since the outsider is not hindered by the current prejudices of the scientific community.

It is often said that science is self-correcting. This is true, over the very long term. However, the more closely the prejudice is held, the longer an error can persist. In the case of some valued theories, the prejudice is so deep that the error persists for decades. In spite of the public understanding of the subject, the scientific community insists on teaching it as fact.

Here the science community sees itself as opposing ignorance, and continues to express puzzlement as to how so much of the public will not accept what they consider as having

so much evidence supporting it that it cannot be questioned.

The science community, like the NCSE and AAAS, may assume the problem is that since so many people oppose the theory on the grounds that it opposes what some religion says, this is a religious issue. Promoting the theory, in the opinion of these people, is the same as promoting the idea that health can be improved by drinking clean water instead of drinking from a polluted holy stream that a religion says will make one holy. Promoting the erroneous theory is thought to be fighting ignorance, and rolling back the superstitious religious beliefs of the unenlightened.

This, of course, is the result of thinking that science necessarily conflicts with religion, and that there is a "scientific worldview" which completely explains religion as a natural phenomenon. Science is not a "worldview," however; it is simply a tool to be used to understand the world. Theories in science cannot be protected from disproof on the basis that the only alternative to the theory is religious.

Now the science associations should be fighting this concept of science, that it assumes that the supernatural does not act in the world, since it is a hindrance to science. We will explore that in the next chapters.

## Chapter Five

### UFO Abductions, Bigfoot, and Evolution

*Reality isn't what it used to be.--George Knapp*

Ideas have meaning; they do not simply exist with no connection to what happens in reality. They affect the actions of people who believe in them, and in that way they create reality. For that reason it is important to act according to what is actually objectively true, not what one wants to be true.

#### What, Exactly, Is Bigfoot Anyway?

Cryptozoologists often discover new animals, like the okapi, the Tasmanian tiger, the giant squid, and the mountain gorilla. That is why the search for an undiscovered animal to fill the role of Bigfoot makes sense to many people. Still, the number of sightings reported all over the world make it seem like something else is going on. A small, isolated population of animals cannot account for these sightings. That is why many scientists say that Bigfoot is just a big fable. There just is no unambiguous evidence for its existence. All we have is sighting reports, which can be hoaxes or misidentifications. But what if there are undiscovered KINDS of beings inhabiting the earth? What if they are not like the animals with which we are familiar, but have entirely different traits that are bizarre to the common understanding? And what if they are--smarter than humans? In order to find these beings, it may be necessary to operate in an entirely different way than just to assume they are our inferiors, subject to investigation at our whim. Maybe there is some new way other than the scientific method that should be used, but no one yet knows what it is?

Then again, maybe all that is needed to investigate Bigfoot phenomena is actually using the scientific method, and no longer mistaking materialism for science. Mistaking materialism for science insures that certain phenomena must remain unknown, since it requires that humans understand all of the principles of how the universe operates. It allows for things to be unknown, but when explained they have to be explained according to known principles. It makes no allowance for the possibility that there may be principles we do not know. This is obviously false, since if advanced aliens existed they could no doubt do things we could not understand. Also, all principles are necessarily known only to God. Materialist scientists are mistaking themselves for those who know Ultimate Reality.

I conjecture that Bigfoot is a kind of nonmaterial being, maybe like an idea that manifests itself. If one allows depression to take over his mind, for instance, he feeds it by failing to resist it, and he thinks about how bad he feels. The more he feeds the depression, the more real the depression becomes to him, until it gets to the point where it can only be overcome with drugs. So it is with Bigfoot. He has been fed by people who give him power, like the native Americans who worshiped and honored him, and they finally fed him to the point where he manifested as a visible being. Or perhaps he was earlier an actual spiritual being that could interact with people, but that lost his power to become visible as people no longer fed him by their worship, and depended more on a scientific view of the world. Now this sounds like he really only exists in people's minds after all, but that is not what I am saying, because he appears to people. I am saying that he is a real being that can interact with people, and not the only one. How he exists, and how he can become visible, is not clear. But I think that is what the

evidence indicates.

The postmodern idea that nothing is actually objectively true is damaging to society and to science. Politics may be defined as the art of convincing people that something is objectively true regardless of its reality or lack thereof. Science, on the other hand, requires hard data to insure that a proposition is actually objectively true. It can never achieve final truth about the proposition because human understanding is limited, so it must always be open to revision. Science is a good basis for planning action on some physical problem, since it makes a serious attempt to find the objective truth about the subject.

Postmodernism conflicts with science, in that it assumes that all viewpoints are equally valid. In postmodern ethics, morality is just what a society decides is moral, and there is no objective truth about morality. In science, the apple falls down, not up, and the viewpoint that it falls up is not equally valid.

People may mistake politics for science if it uses the language of science. For instance, there may be a controversy about some topic, such as the theory that human action causes global warming. Those who want to control human society may say there is a consensus among scientists that humans cause global warming, so governments should limit human action.

Now, of course, this is not science, but simply a political use of science to attempt to promote a particular view of reality that may or may not be true, in order to achieve predetermined results, and it will not likely be successful for any useful purpose except

bringing people into subjection.

We humans do not perceive reality directly, but only through our senses as moderated by our brains. Science allows for the possibility that we may not be able to understand a phenomenon, but allows us to make use of things we do not understand by making observations and experiments that determine what happens in a particular situation. For instance, we can make use of transistors even if we do not fully understand the principles of how they operate. All we need to know is to fit them together according to a particular formula, and if we do so they operate in a predictable manner.

Even such a common thing as gravity is not clearly understood. We cannot reproduce it in the laboratory, although we can observe it and find that it operates in a predictable manner, so we can make use of it even though we do not fully understand it.

This principle is demonstrated again, more instructively, in the case of spontaneous human combustion (SHC). The phenomenon has been denied by scientists, and still is by many. However, those who were not afraid of the unknown have investigated it and reproduced it with pig carcasses. It has been found that, under the right conditions, bodies can reduce to ash with very little flame. This still leaves open the question of how they ignite, but it is obvious that they do ignite. That part is still unknown.

Now this brings up the question of the "scientific worldview." The scientist is presumed to have the view that all phenomena have an explanation that is understandable in terms of the known laws of the universe. But it is not necessary, or even desirable, for the scientist to think that way. If he does so, he cannot find NEW principles of how the

universe operates.

Now we are ready to look at the UFO phenomenon. There seem to be mainly two, or maybe three, explanations for people seeing UFOs. First, they are known objects that are misidentified. Second, they are hallucinations only in the mind of the observer. Third, they are outer space aliens.

Now, obviously, we know that some objects will fit in the first two categories, because science tells us that some objects are misidentified, and that some people see things that others cannot observe, and that therefore are assumed to not exist in reality.

The third category, however, may not fit any of the objects. Now, even though there may be no outer space aliens visiting earth, this is an explanation in accord with the presently known principles of how the universe operates. We exist on a planet revolving around a sun, so it makes sense that there are other civilizations existing on other planets, which revolve around other stars. We seem to have even found such planets, judging by the tiny wobbles we can see in some stars that astronomers postulate to be the indications of planets revolving around them.

This accords well with the idea that humans arose from inorganic chemicals, since if life evolved here, it must have evolved elsewhere in the universe since there are so many stars out there. The famous equation proposed by Frank Drake is often quoted to express this hope.

Some scientists take this hope to the extent of searching for sentient life elsewhere in the universe with expensive equipment and lots of time. The Search for Extra Terrestrial Intelligence (seti.org) is conducted by listening for any complex radio signals from the universe, with no success since its inception in 1984. As a side note, one might point out that the extremely complex information in DNA is not recognized as a sign of the action of intelligent life.

Now the SETI organization dedicates a considerable amount of time and money to a search based on speculation about the nature of the universe, with no results for almost a quarter of a century. On the other hand, data concerning non-human life with equal or superior intelligence (NHeOSi) is found in the UFO sightings that have been accumulated over the last several years, and the alien abduction phenomenon.

Now it is time to look at the NHeOSi phenomenon, as it might be called, to avoid the characterization of the phenomenon as necessarily explained by reference to extraterrestrial civilizations from other planets, or angels, or demons.

This brings up another possibility concerning the identification of the UFO phenomenon. It may be seen as simply a manifestation of the unknown, in accord with principles of the universe that we do not now understand.

Many scientists do not understand this concept. They do not want to acknowledge the unknown, because if there is an unknown it may be supernatural. They think that science assumes that the supernatural does not act in the world, so if you admit that there are unknown phenomena you are allowing room for the supernatural to act, and you are not

doing science.

On the contrary, however, you are really doing science if you recognize the unknown, since you have to realize that something is unknown before you can find the solution to how it works. The hypothetical caveman knew that he didn't understand what really caused lightning. Science gave him tools to explain it according to known principles, but first he had to find out what those principles were. He could not deny that lightning existed, and still be able to find those principles.

It is not science to deny a phenomenon, or to explain it by principles that don't fit the phenomenon, like misidentification or hallucination. That is materialistic naturalism, not science.

Materialistic naturalism is the philosophy that states that the material universe is all that exists, and all phenomena can be explained according to natural principles. Like Carl Sagan, for whom the Institute for the Study of Life in the Universe is named, (<http://www.seti.org/site/pp.asp?c=ktJ2J9MMIsE&b=178919>) said, the cosmos is all that is, or was, or ever will be.

Now the NHeOSi include the possible, but non-evidential, extraterrestrials. We cannot assume, in science, that we know what a phenomenon is; otherwise we have no chance of understanding it. It is good to be skeptical, but the persistence of unexplainable reports indicates that there is something to be understood here. It is good to be skeptical of our explanations as well. Skepticism is not limited to proving there is no unknown, in science.

Instead of calling the phenomenon UFO or alien abduction, let us call it NHeOSi interaction. For the moment, let us consider that there may be a real phenomenon here, although it may not be strictly physical. On the face of it, it seems ludicrous that a person can be physically taken out of a bed in downtown New York City by any kind of creature, examined, and replaced without anyone else knowing about it. However, this is exactly the claim that some people are making.

Now the phenomenon may be explained by some sort of brain chemistry workings that we do not understand. But we are not going in that direction; we are assuming that there might be a real, objective phenomenon. There is no evidence that it is simply brain chemistry; that is only a naturalistic assumption, which we have shown to be subject to skepticism.

We might broaden the scope of our understanding of NHeOSi interactions. Religious experience also has some aspects in common with the phenomenon, as in St. Paul's experience on the Damascus road. He saw a light that blinded him, and heard a voice that only he understood, among all those with him. He was given quite specific instructions, and his life was changed. Many of the Biblical experiences of humans with God seem consistent with UFO appearances and NHeOSi interactions.

This has led many to speculate that the Old Testament God was actually a UFO alien from some other world. I think we can say that He could be better defined as a NHeOSi. Assuming He was an actually an extraterrestrial is imposing the modern understanding of the world on phenomena that are not understood. It is an imposition of

the modern mythology onto reality; it is not science.

Practically all religions have their own NHeOSi. The NHeOSi of the secular religion, materialistic naturalism, are the extraterrestrial aliens, which have no more evidence of their existence than those of other religions.

Visible UFOs are another phenomenon associated with the NHeOSi. The Bible has at least one visible UFO that is identifiable as such, in Ezekiel, which is associated with appearance of the Biblical God, who at the very least is a NHeOSi. Other Biblical UFOs might include the Pillar of Cloud and the Pillar of Fire that guided the Israelites, the Presence on Sinai, and the Star of Bethlehem.

Some further indications along this line might be found by searching on the internet for Israeli UFOs. The History Channel presented a program covering a number of spectacular instances of unexplainable UFOs, especially ones in the Holy Land.

Now we come back to Bigfoot. Bigfoot is also what may be defined as a NHeOSi, in that he is thought to be a human-like creature which is not actually human. At the same time, there is no physical evidence of his existence, even though there are thousands of sightings, some quite credible, and even photos of him. Now many scientists think that skepticism of his existence is required, and it is certainly justified.

Again, there are thought to be three explanations of Bigfoot: Misidentification of known creatures, hallucination, and an actual flesh and blood creature like the Mountain Gorilla,

which was unknown for a time.

But another explanation suggests itself: this is an unknown phenomenon, like UFOs. This would cover the facts as we know them, that there are an amazing number of credible sightings, but no physical evidence except footprints.

What this means for science is that there are unknowns, and that there may be more unknowns than knowns. Science requires unknowns, and the recognition of them so they can perhaps someday become knowns. We will very likely have to think in new ways if we ever hope to get to the stars, and discover many things that are now unknown to us and would seem supernatural.

Now on to the problem of evolution of humans from nonhuman ancestors. This is a materialistic, naturalistic explanation for the development of life on earth. It cannot account for the origin of DNA, or for the development of additional information in the case of the higher animals from simpler life. It is nonetheless the dominant explanation for the existence of life in modern society. It is dominant for one simple reason; many scientists mistake materialistic naturalism for science, and think that science assumes that the supernatural does not act in the world.

This assumption means that the only other alternative to evolutionary development of humans is removed. Creation cannot have occurred, since it is an action of the supernatural. No amount of evidence against evolution can disprove it; it is true by definition.

Yet, it should be quite understandable that just because creation is not science, it in no way means that evolution actually happened. Just like UFOs and Bigfoot, there is another option in science. That is the acceptance of the fact that the details of human origin are actually still unknown.

This kind of tension, the existence of the unknown, is necessary for science to function. Skepticism of that which is thought to be known, not just of the unknown, is required for science to progress. We are only limited human beings, not God. Our solutions to problems can never be complete, unless we learn to see what God sees, however it is that we do that.

## Chapter Six

### Defining the Supernatural

*After all, naturalistic science and history have decreed that miracles and other supernatural events are impossible.--Nancy Pearcey*

Technology is not the final answer that some people seem to think it is. We are able to do things that the ancients could not, like text messaging and other kinds of instant wireless communication based on silicon chips and electricity. But this is not an unmixed blessing. It may be that the ancients were not unable to create technology, they just chose not to do so. Technology requires certain things of people, and provides a kind of background activity of the mind that precludes other kinds of mental activity that may be more substantial.

We have been conditioned by the science fiction mythology to think that all kinds of things are possible with technology. But there are unknown problems that we can only glimpse, and one is the vulnerability of silicon chips to electromagnetic pulse. EMPs are not limited to nuclear explosions; they can occur in nature as with the incident at Tunguska in the early 1900s.

There is an infinity of things humans do not know. We often lose sight of this fact because of the expansion of knowledge in the recent past.

Some people think that we have now discovered what UFOs are: Technology produced by

advanced civilizations from elsewhere in the universe. But it might be proposed that there are things beyond technology that do not depend on material existence of a silicon chip or some other reality. What if *God* actually exists, in the exact way proposed by the Bible and traditional Christianity? Why would He and the angels and demons be more limited than some advanced civilization a billion years older than humanity?

It is not difficult to imagine that a civilization a billion years older than ours might have a better understanding of the principles of the universe, since we have only had writing for five or six thousand years to allow us to record our observations. It is not difficult to understand that that civilization might be able to do things that we would consider miraculous. It also should not be difficult to understand that they might have passed beyond what we would recognize as technology. Their understanding would not be false because we did not understand it.

This is the case with *God*. He has understandings we don't. We think of His actions as "supernatural" because we cannot understand them, but all things are natural to *God*, and *only* to *God*. The idea that only naturalistic explanations exist in science is misunderstood by many to mean that only naturalistic explanations exist. This results from the natural human desire to *be God*, to whom all explanations *are* natural.

When the statement is made that there is no supernatural in science, it is with the understanding that the definition of "supernatural" is meaningless in science. The supernatural is just that which is beyond science, so, since science only deals with natural explanations, there can only be knowns and unknowns. Science cannot say there is no supernatural, only that an explanation is not known. Many scientists think that it is

required that an explanation *MUST* be provided for phenomena, otherwise science has failed. No, only human understanding has failed, for reasons that may have nothing to do with the method used.

The term "supernatural" is just that which is beyond that which is known to be natural. There may be natural laws that we do not currently understand, like, for instance, many of the things we have developed would not be understandable to a person from a hundred years ago. It is quite reasonable that there may be applications of natural laws in another hundred years that we do not now understand.

"Science" has more than one meaning. It can be a systematic body of knowledge, or a method (Baconian natural science). Evolution is not a body of knowledge, or a method of understanding the world. It *is* a way of interpreting the world according to materialist philosophy, or hidden (occult) knowledge available only to initiates, or true believers in materialist philosophy. Materialists claim to *know* that all phenomena have solutions that are totally materialistic, requiring no action of principles that are unknown to the initiates. Evolution explains the world without resorting to the necessity of an almighty, omnipotent, omniscient, meddling God of the Bible, who demands obedience, and Who tells us not to have anything to do with the occult.

There can be gods in evolution, however. The more highly evolved creatures that have been around a billion years longer than humans could know things that would seem supernatural to us. So the supernatural is accounted for in this science fiction occultism. The occult is that which God has not revealed to us, and cannot be discovered by the scientific method of observation and experiment. Evolution is an attempt to assert that

which is occult, or hidden, and to know for a fact that which cannot be known. It is a dependence on the forces other than God for knowledge.

That is why occultists are so interested in UFOs and aliens, and expect them to contact us and help us solve our problems. It is a dependence on occult evolutionist knowledge in the place of the knowledge God provides for us by His revelation in the Bible, and of that which we can find out by objective investigation.

It is said that evolution requires an "openness." Yes, it does. It requires an openness to the occult, like channeling and Tarot reading. It requires an openness to the nonexistence of objective truth, so that highly intelligent nonhuman beings can substitute their own mythology for truth, and create some nonexistent entity called "science" to take the place of God.

It was back in 1977-78 that I went to Majorca with an Earthwatch expedition searching for the traces of interaction of early man with an ancient antelope. As I remember, there were fifteen or so of us on the expedition. It was there that I first learned that there was no definite evidence of evolution, it was just an assumption based on interpretation of fossil data by the assumption that humans evolved, and the only way to be sure that evolution happened was just to assume it and interpret all data by the assumption. I was unwilling to make the assumption, but I still thought evolution was probably true, until I realized that the assumption was based on accepting human authority as final, and, as we have seen, human ignorance is infinite.

I was somewhat shocked to find out how many on the expedition claimed to be atheists.

I can't remember if Dr. Waldren, the leader, claimed to be an atheist. Looking back, it makes a lot of sense, because so many scientists mistake materialism for science. Of course, you don't have to be an atheist to be a materialist, you just have to believe that whatever your faith is, it doesn't affect the world in a material way. I have had discussions with some who claim to be members of a fundamentalist Christian denomination, but who somehow think God does not act in the world in a material way. Of course, this is a denial of the resurrection of Christ, but one can reconcile any contradiction by simply ignoring it.

Evolution is part of a wider belief in occult materialism, which is essentially irrational. Materialism is simply assumed to be true regardless of its rational contradictions, and they are simply not acknowledged and it is pretended that the contradictions do not exist. This occult faith is promoted by pretending that there are some highly intelligent humans somewhere that understand the evidence for evolution, and how it shows that humans really did evolve from nonhuman ancestors. But there are no such humans.

This is why occultists, like atheists, witches, Satanists, and New Age believers, uniformly believe in evolution. It is a faith in the ultimacy of human knowledge, and a denial of the ultimacy of God.

## Chapter Seven

### Intelligent Design

*If you survey the experiments to date, designed to simulate the conditions on the early earth, one thing that stands out is that you do not get ordered sequences of amino acids.--Dean Kenyon*

You often hear the complaint that Intelligent Design is not science, and presents no scientific theory that can account for origins or be tested scientifically. ID is not really a scientific theory. It can be stated as "a designer acted in creation of modern life." There is no way to refute this, just as it cannot be refuted that "modern life is the product of natural forces." Neither is scientific; both are metaphysical. ID avoids the error of naturalism: the idea that science assumes that God does not act in the world. That is why it is opposed as if it were full blown creationism, even though it allows common descent. It is opposed because many people want naturalism to be mistaken for science. It is considered an "opening wedge" for creationism, because once the possibility of any kind of designer is allowed, there is no longer any logical necessity to exclude God. Of course, there is no logical necessity to exclude God in the first place; the Darwinists have just succeeded in confusing enough people by their argument that science cannot allow the action of God. In reality, science is just incompetent to consider God, either to exclude or include Him as an explanation. Saying that God is acting or not acting really gives no useful information about phenomena.

Intelligent design is stated to be the same as creationism by the scientific

establishment. The reason for this is that ID means, essentially, that some NHeOSi must have actually designed things. The scientific establishment makes the error of thinking that science assumes that there are no unknown forces acting in the universe to design things, since they would have to be intelligent, and could be the supernatural or God, and therefore must be denied by materialist philosophy, which they mistake for science.

It is totally irrelevant to such establishment persons that there is actual evidence for design in the universe. Although SETI thinks that a complex radio signal would be evidence of an intelligent extraterrestrial civilization, the same people do not see evidence of design in DNA, which is infinitely more complex than even a radio signal that they would accept as evidence of ET.

This is all evidence of an anti-scientific attitude at the highest levels of the scientific establishment, and a consequent hindrance to science.

Now all of that having been said, there is more to say here. It is understandable that there is a UFO cover-up carried out by the government, and it might not be all that bad. There are reasons that the government would not want it generally known what UFOs really are, and what they really mean, and they have to do with saving lives and the stability of society itself.

Times of upheaval and reformation are not always smooth; as a matter of fact they are usually the opposite. Breaking the postmodern grip on society would probably come at a price. A realization of the truth, and that the Bible was right all along, would cause

terrible distress for many, and the disruption of many lives. Many misunderstandings would ensue, with dire consequences for many. The governments of the world would want to postpone this time of anarchy for as long as possible. But it is probably inevitable.

Intelligent Design simply *does not exclude* the possibility that unknown forces acted in creating life. Exclusion of that possibility is called "materialism," and the possibility is excluded because it allows room for the action of God. The materialist simply does not want to know the answer to origins unless it fits his preconceptions.

ID acknowledges that there are forces that humans don't understand. As an example of those forces, I don't think we understand gravity all that well, and it stands to reason there are probably other forces we have not yet discovered.

Such objects as jet engines and autos have been designed, and give evidence that they have been designed. Yet the one that designed them was not designed? That is irrational. Humans give evidence that they were designed, and that means there had to be a designer.

No matter how much we learn, our ignorance will always be infinite. If the universe goes on into infinity, it will still go on into infinity after we travel a trillion light years. Remember the hymn "Amazing Grace?" "When we've been there ten thousand years, we've no less days to sing God's grace than when we first begun."

If God exists, knowledge has to be infinite, because God is infinite. God knows about the

infinite past and the infinite future. Even if it were possible for God not to exist, and the universe is finite, even atheists concede that the universe will continue to exist in some form into the infinite future. So there is an infinite amount to know about what will happen in that infinite future. Whatever humans learn, the amount to know continues into infinity. So human ignorance is infinite.

Christians like Ken Miller mistake materialism for science, and he does not understand that he is denying that Christianity is objectively true. Human ignorance is infinite.

Miller is promoting the view called "Deism," which denies that God intervenes in the world after the initial creation. It is a denial of Christianity, since if God does not intervene, He did not raise Christ from the dead, and He did not redeem mankind.

Materialists complain that creationists want people to believe the same way they do. This is very deep. Remember, there is objective truth, and Christianity (the redemption of mankind by God) claims to be objective truth. What people believe is irrelevant. *You must find the truth.* So everyone must believe in the same way, if they believe the truth.

Some people believe that God created all of the properties needed to create human life inherent in the first matter he created. They are called "Deists." This is compatible with Intelligent Design, but such people somehow do not want to identify with ID. They seem to think that science requires full-blown atheism.

The IDers realize that materialism is not science, so there has to be an intelligence behind life. Deism is a religious view which ignores the scientific fact that there is no organizing principle known in matter. Matter is observed to disorganize over time rather than organizing. Iron rusts. Any supposed principle of organization is just based on a faith in materialism.

Science is not materialism; it simply has to use natural explanations if it is going to explain the universe by natural laws. Science is simply incompetent to give anything other than natural explanations. It cannot say there are only natural explanations, however. That is done by materialist philosophy, which most scientists mistake for science.

It really does not matter all that much to me if common descent is true in some way, or if the world is billions of years old. God could have done a special creation of humanity by rearranging ape genes. But it matters a great deal to the Darwinists. So much, in fact, that they cannot consider the possibility that origins did not happen in a way understandable by known principles.

Common descent is not the issue here. The issue is the preservation of the myth of the supremacy of human intellect. If there is some force that operated in the origin of life and humanity that is unknown in nature, then there is something more intelligent than humans operating in the universe. This is why the idea of intelligent design is ridiculed, even though common descent is acknowledged by the IDers. Materialism requires that humans must be ultimate, *regardless of any evidence to the contrary.*

Darwinism is an essential part of the attempt to preserve this myth. It is becoming evident to a growing number of people that humans are not alone in the universe, and the space alien myth has grown up to explain the evidence, in order to attempt to preserve Darwinism. The vast amount of evidence that seems to support Darwinism is a trick based on interpreting all data by the assumption that Darwinism is true.

Darwinism is bringing down society, however. Thinkers like Dawkins and Dennett are taking it to its logical conclusion. Everything is a result of an evolutionary adaptation, and nothing can be trusted to be objectively true. This is simply stupidity put into action. The whole idea is just objective stupidity, and has no rational basis whatever. It is simply a trick played on humanity by smarter forces that are hiding here on earth and want to overcome humanity.

### Why Intelligent Design is Invalid

After all that has been said in favor of ID, more remains to be said. Intelligent Design is not a valid replacement for evolution. Both ideas depend on an invalid theory of reality. While ID does not mistake materialism for science, it makes the mistake of assuming that evidence can prove the existence of God. This is the common Western error of thinking that one can begin reasoning at a point outside of God, or ultimate, final reality, and come to valid conclusions. Such conclusions require assuming a self-evident God and beginning to reason from that point, and one is necessarily led to the revelation in the Bible if one is to have the concept of truth and science. If one is willing to abandon the concept of meaning in the universe, then other views are possible.



## Chapter Eight

### Overturning Copernicanism

*Copernicanism means that there is nothing special about the earth.*--Dr. Richard Wolfson

Copernicanism is not just the idea that the earth goes around the sun. Copernicanism extrapolates that knowledge to the idea "there is nothing special about the earth." The reason for this is the loss of faith in a divine plan for the universe, and earth having some meaningful place in it. If we are all just the product of hydrogen atoms bonding together, there is no reason for any divine plan to exist, and we are all just chance productions of hydrogen atoms. Therefore, of course, earth is not special. It is just one of many planets where life evolved, and most likely does not even have the most evolved life, since star systems such as Zeta Reticuli are supposed to be much older, even to the point of a billion years.

Copernicanism has become a philosophy, not just a scientific observation that the sun does not revolve around the earth, as the ancients thought it did, expressed by the Ptolemaic view. Materialists used heliocentrism as a wedge to destroy the Roman Catholic Church's worldview in the popular understanding. In the process, they extended it beyond science into metaphysics. This view needs correction, because it is unwarranted. It is an unscientific assumption that leads to all sorts of disastrous consequences.

The idea that "there is nothing special about the earth" is obviously false according to

the evidence, because we know of no other place where life exists, and our largest telescopes see galaxies as far as they can reach in all directions. It appears to be an assumption based on materialism with no experimental verification.

It has never been proved that the earth is not the reference point for the universe. You see, the problem can be stated thus: Relativity says that if a spaceship went to the nearest star and returned at near the speed of light, the people in the ship would be younger than those who stayed behind. But if motion is relative, why do just the ones who traveled not age as rapidly? The ones on earth travel at the speed of light relative to the ones on the ship, so why do they not age at a slower speed relative to the travelers? It appears that there must be an absolute reference point. Something basic is being overlooked here, just like in the case of evolution, where materialism is being mistaken for science.

The evidence shows that there IS something special about the earth. Also, the evidence of our largest telescopes shows us that we are in the center of the visible universe. Maybe the scientific understanding is right somehow about relativity, but one cannot verify it without making assumptions that seem unwarranted. The assumption that there is nothing special about the earth is based on mistaking materialism for science, just like in evolution, and this indicates that something is wrong here, but it is difficult to know what. One can have doubts that scientists in the field understand this very well either.

Einstein said, "Relativity is for physics, not ethics." Now relativity is often used to justify relative morality, and this justified the quote attributed to Einstein about the infinity of human stupidity. But even in physics, all things are not relative. The laws of

physics are assumed to be absolute: the same in all uniformly moving frames of reference. But this does not appear to be the case. Particle physics is often used to verify relativity, but the laws of physics are not the same in particle physics. So there seems to be a lot of unknown territory here.

Relativity might just as well be called "absolutism," because there are absolutes in relativity. Time and space are relative, but the laws of motion and inertia are absolute.

The Christian church has always promoted the idea that God created and maintains the universe, and that man has a special place in it. God has a plan for the lives of humans, and has provided a place for them in the present and future worlds. Materialism, and Copernicanism, denies that there is any such plan, and that there is nothing special about the earth or humanity, and God is just a creation of the human mind. Copernicanism, as such, is a denial of Christianity.

This is not to say that the idea that the earth goes around the sun denies Christianity. It is the extrapolation of the observation that the earth goes around the sun to "there is nothing special about the earth" that denies Christianity.

Copernicanism requires a totally different and antithetical way of looking at reality from that of the Christian faith. If we are products of a purposeless interaction of atoms, then there is no meaning in the universe. Since there *is* obviously meaning in the universe, then Copernicanism is false as Dr. Wolfson has stated it. It may even be possible that in some way that we do not now understand, but will in the future, the sun does go around the earth. The ancients were not stupider than we are.

## Radioactive Dating

What are we to make of the dating of rocks by various methods to millions of years? The various methods are said to agree, so the implication is that they are valid. Maybe they are, but there is a basic error being made in the process. That is that the great age of the earth is simply ASSUMED in order to allow time for evolution by natural processes to happen. Again, the self-evident nature of the theory is assumed before the data is examined. This can be illustrated by the fact that no careful study is ever made to date rocks blind, to see if the result of the process gives meaningful information about age. If rocks could be dated reliably by the method without knowing their source, then it would be valid. But the scientific community does not want to know the answer. The process contains various fudge factors and dating rocks from unknown sources would result in a finding that the ages found did not correspond to a statistically valid degree with the expected ages. The "ages" are just some kind of artifact of radiation which truly exists, but it really does not have much to do with age.

We would do well to remember that when geological ages like the Pleistocene or the Cretaceous are mentioned, that is just a reference to the current idolatrous mythology based on a hatred of the idea of an ultimate reality, or God. The idea that this is mythology may be hard to accept considering how widespread this interpretation is, and how deeply it penetrates scientific and popular literature. But once an improper basis for interpretation is accepted, the errors to which it leads are unlimited.

## Contradicting Christianity

Dr. Alvin Plantinga tells us, "Modern science was conceived, and born, and flourished in the matrix of Christian theism. Only liberal doses of self-deception and double-think, I believe, will permit it to flourish in the context of Darwinian naturalism."

Theistic evolutionists do not claim objective reality for Christianity, but they do claim it for evolution. Some of the supporters of evolution claim to be Christian, even fundamentalists. Yet, if science assumes that God does not act in the world, that means that science assumes that Christianity is false. They seem to get around this difficulty by claiming that Christians are only saved in a spiritual sense, and that although humans evolved in material fact, the Bible is still true in a spiritual sense. So human salvation is only subjective, not objective. So, as well as the observer can tell, they are saying that Christianity is not objectively true, but somehow Christians are still saved in some non-objective realm. The problem, of course, is that Christianity claims to be objectively true, and Christians await the resurrection of the body, as in the Apostles' Creed.

A literal Bible is required for Christianity to be true. This spiritualizing of Christianity has many problems, not the least of which is how it makes Christianity no different from a fairy tale. It assumes that the Bible is not literally true in *Genesis*, because science contradicts it, and it depends on actions of God that we do not see in the world. This destroys the authority of the New Testament as well, since we do not see virgin births happening, angels appearing to people, people being supernaturally healed, or people rising from the dead. There is no basis for believing that Christ even existed without taking the Bible literally, let alone that He was God, or that He rose from the dead to save us from our sins. Many theistic evolutionists assert these things are true, yet deny them implicitly by their acceptance of evolution.

Christianity has a basic difference from paganism, and the offshoots of Christianity like Islam and Mormonism, and its precursor, Judaism, also demonstrate this difference to some degree.

This difference involves the view of God that Christianity provides. In paganism, the deity is to be manipulated by incantations or placation. In Christianity, it is necessary to determine the will of God and align oneself with it, and thereby change one's own mind to agree with God.

Modern science uses this pagan view of the world, that reality can be changed by human desires. It can be assumed that the supernatural does not work in the world, and it is thought that such an assumption can actually change reality. Of course, human desires do change reality in the sense that humans work to accomplish those desires, but they cannot change the way reality operates, which is what modern science is assuming.

In the evolutionary understanding of science, the basic assumption of all natural science is that there are no supernatural beings or forces operating in the natural world. This is not the Baconian understanding of science; this is actually a return to the pre-Enlightenment view of science, that the supernatural can be considered in explaining phenomena. Science cannot exclude the supernatural, there is simply no supernatural in science to exclude or include. Excluding the supernatural is tantamount to considering the supernatural. A moment's thought should suffice for the open-minded, objective observer to realize that science cannot assume that the supernatural does not act because science knows nothing about the supernatural.

All that excluding the supernatural does is to make sure that scientists cannot find new principles of how the universe operates. In practice, it means that scientists try to be comfortable by assuming that they know all of the principles of the universe and there are no phenomena that they do not understand. If they do not understand a phenomenon, they can ignore it because it is "not science." Many scientists, for instance, think that the origin of life has actually been explained by natural processes, and cannot consider the possibility that it is really unknown. Many evolutionists misunderstand science to the degree that they think that science requires that there are no unknown principles in the universe. They actually think that if there are unknown principles, they are supernatural. This results in denying reality, and failure to be able to investigate the unknown. They even oppose those who try to investigate the unknown, which results in a crippling of science. They make the mistake of confusing science with a non-theistic worldview. This is a problematic view of science.

It is often asserted that there is a "scientific worldview" that looks at the world without reference to *God*. This is said to be a rational view that does not depend on religion, since it assumes that the supernatural does not act in the world. In this view, of course, creation need not be considered by definition. This is why no evidence can ever be presented in what is called "science" that indicates that creation is true and evolution is false. But science is not a worldview. The "scientific worldview" is simply another religion, or a concept of *God*, in that it assumes that *God* does not act in the world. It is a return to pre-Baconian science, or more properly to pre-Aristotelian paganism.

One of the advantages of the internet is that it allows access to all kinds of forums for discussion of the creation-evolution question. The author has taken advantage of some of those forums, and has used them to investigate the thinking of those devoted to the idea that humans actually evolved from nonhuman ancestors. The forums are quite difficult to deal with, and those promoting evolution on them are quite dedicated to the idea, and are often PhD scientists or workers in the scientific field. It has been discovered that many, but not all, of the promoters have the view of science, as stated by a retired Professor of Anthropology, that "the basic presumption of all natural science (is) that there are no supernatural beings or powers operating in the natural world." Some, on the other hand, understand that science makes no assumptions whatever about the supernatural, but do not consider that an important understanding. They make no attempt to correct the assumption that the others think is made by science. They think that the evidence for evolution is valid, even though it depends on interpreting data by this false assumption.

Evolutionists point to the "massive and diverse" evidence that supports evolution, and it must be admitted that there is much evidence that has been accumulated for the theory. Of course, this evidence shows that there is change in species, and that is not in dispute. However, the data claimed to support extrapolation of change in species to evolution of humans from nonhuman ancestors, like the fossil record, cytochrome, the GULO gene, the Laetoli footprints, and the hominoid and hominid line of fossils leading to man, is interpreted by the assumption that evolution has to be true because science requires that creation is false. No data can ever be interpreted by the assumption that evolution can be false, due to this incorrect assumption about the nature of science.

Christianity provides a solution to two problems. It allows the existence of truth, and also accounts for the existence of the unknown forces, and a solution to their attempt to control society. Christianity has a claim to actual truth, unlike materialism. While materialism depends on human perception for its authority, Christianity claims objective revelation from God in the Bible. Science not only is not materialism, it cannot exist in materialism. Simply put, if there is nothing above man to establish objective truth about reality, objective truth cannot exist and "truth" DOES depend on human perception. The concept of objective truth itself depends on the objective revelation of God and Christ given in the Bible. God, quite frankly, is not what most people think. The nature of God is infinite, and there is always an infinite amount more to know about Him, no matter how much we already know. This is because of the meaning of infinity. Christ is not some kind of add-on who can be taken or left, but is an essential part of God, along with the Holy Spirit. When you talk about God, you are necessarily talking about Christ and the Holy Spirit at the same time. Otherwise you really are left with a God that does not matter in the world.

Many people think that God is religion. This is not the case. God is ultimate, absolute, final reality. Religion is only the human response to God. That is why it is so imperfect. We are not aware of reality; we only are aware of our perceptions of reality, which are limited by our senses, interpretations of those senses by our brains, and our experiences and prejudices.

Christianity reveals what God wants us to know about reality without giving us everything we want to know. The dark forces trick us by seeming to promise complete scientific understanding about reality while destroying the concept of truth itself by

allowing us to mistake materialism for science. We think that science assumes that the supernatural does not act, but science assumes no such thing. The assumptions that we make simply allow us to be objective or not; they do not affect reality.

Christianity is not just a system of dogma. It is an objective method provided by God to deal with the infinity of human guilt before the demand of God for perfect justice and righteousness from humanity. Only God Himself can satisfy the demand for perfect justice, since He is the only sacrifice acceptable to Himself on behalf of humanity. Only Christianity provides a pathway to God that is acceptable to Him. All other pathways depend on the illusion of human righteousness, and the deception of the dark forces that deny the need for God Himself to provide the pathway.

In a fundamental sense, Darwinism contradicts Christianity because it consists of ancient pagan idolatry. In paganism, humans save themselves by heroic effort, while in Christianity, God must save humanity by providing a sacrifice of Himself for them to remove their guilt of disobedience for those who will trust in that sacrifice instead of their own righteousness. It is centered in God, not man, rather than the pagan centrality of human effort. Darwinistic theology requires a god that does not act in the world, and man struggles up from the unawareness of the animal kingdom to become godlike by his own effort and natural processes. The idolatry is clearly seen if one sees that pagans carve something out of wood, or stone, and ask it to answer ultimate questions for them. Here we have something created by man, the scientific method, which is made into an entity called "science" which is expected to give a final answer (humans originated by natural processes) to questions about human identity and origin.

## Common Descent is not the Problem

We can all be descendants of one-celled creatures and it does not disprove Christianity. The materialists are making a further mistake. They are thinking that common descent somehow destroys Christianity. This is another aspect of the modern and postmodern mythology, and it is, quite frankly, just stupid. It is wishful thinking.

There is practically nothing in the Bible that is *required* to be false if we are results of common descent. The only thing would be that the traditional understanding of the chronology of the Bible is not correct. Adam and Eve could still be humans created by God out of the common ancestor with chimps, and the story of the Fall and the Flood could be literal (although maybe not global), as well as the Resurrection. The problem with Darwinism is that it *assumes* that God did not act, based on nothing but wishful thinking that materialism is self-evident. It is the product of a *desire* that God does not act in the world, in flat contradiction of all the evidence. Some people may have wanted Christianity to be true in their youth, but were convinced that it was false based on the evil influence of *others* who *wanted* it to be false. This confusion of materialism with science is why ID is opposed as if it were creationism, since it allows the action of God, even though many IDer's accept common descent. The real struggle here is between materialist philosophy and Christianity.

Of course, once you realize that, Darwinism no longer makes any sense whatever. There is no longer any reason to interpret all data by the assumption that God does not act, and all of the evidence accumulated for evolution is seen to be meaningless because it was accumulated by assuming that common descent *must* be true and cannot be false.

Then Darwinism is seen as simply an occult attempt to manipulate reality and destroy science.

## Chapter Nine

### Making Science into Superstition

*With me the horrid doubt always arises whether the convictions of man's mind, which has been developed from the mind of the lower animals, are of any value or at all trustworthy. Would anyone trust the conclusions of a monkey's mind, if there are any conclusions in such a mind?--Charles Darwin*

How can science become superstition? By trying to make it solve problems it cannot solve. Science observes, measures, and records data in an attempt to make an understandable explanation of the data. Many people in the scientific field, degreed scientists and others, think that science assumes that the supernatural does not act in the world.

This is not a true view of science. It is an attempt to make science solve the problem of God, and the consequent idea of His demands on His creatures. The problem is solved by thinking that science disproves the idea that God can act in the world. If God does not act, then He makes no demands, and humans are not accountable to Him.

Now theoretical science can assume all kinds of things. For the purpose of understanding reality, it can be assumed that invisible beings are pulling down on objects to create gravity. It can also be assumed that there is no supernatural, or that nothing is unknown. But theoretical science is not experimental science.

Theories can be created that work, but are completely wrong or irrational. For instance, there were the crystal spheres of Ptolemy that accounted for the movements of the

stars and planets. Those have been disproved by more accurate measurements and the travels of spacecraft, but the theory worked for a long time.

Theories must be testable, and Ptolemy's spheres worked to explain all observations that were possible before the Copernican era. The Ptolemaic theory worked, and passed its tests.

The idea that science assumes that *God* does not act in the world is an assumption, not a theory. It is not testable, and leads to certain conclusions. No judgment can be made as to whether those conclusions are right or wrong, since the assumption is not evaluated, and indeed cannot be because it is based on a desire to exclude *God* from reality, not on a desire to explain reality.

A superstition is a fear of the unknown. Scientists who are dedicated to materialism are fearful of learning things about the world that they do not want to know; namely, that the world is different from what they expect. They want the world to be accounted for by natural processes, and don't want to know if there are processes acting that could be called "supernatural." Now, as we have seen, there is no supernatural in science. This is simply because science only deals with the known, and the supernatural is that which is outside the known. In science, there are only processes that cannot be accounted for by current theory. Science cannot say anything about that which it does not know. So denying the action of the supernatural only results in these scientists not wanting to know answers that they don't already know. We see it in the Bigfoot and UFO phenomena. Bigfoot just HAS to be an unknown primate in order to fit into what scientists think they know about evolution. UFOs just HAVE to be extraterrestrial

aliens in order to fit into Copernicanism (the idea that there is nothing special about the earth.)

The assumption that the supernatural (or God) does not act in the world results in the desired conclusion that only natural phenomena exist. Many, if not most, scientists appear to think that somehow if we allow ourselves to consider the possibility that God acts in the world, we will degenerate back into the dark ages as religion takes over science. Now this might be a legitimate fear, given the tendency of humans to go off into inadequate solutions. But how can they assure that acting on **their** fear by not wanting to know the answer to questions like evolution, Bigfoot, and UFOs (and who knows what else) is a better solution? It really sounds like superstition.

Theoretical science is not necessarily interested in truth, only in propounding a theory that works to explain the world according to known principles. Experimental science can provide support for theoretical science, in that observations, measurements, and testing can be done to attempt to disprove the theoretical solutions that are proposed.

If the theoretical construct cannot be refuted by observation, measurement, and experiment, then it can be used to explain the world until an explanation that explains unexplained data comes along. Data that conflict with the theory are set aside awaiting an explanation in accordance with the theory, or a better theory.

Now this brings us to the problem of evolutionary theory. The theory asserts that humans evolved from one-celled life by natural processes of chance and natural selection, and there is no natural alternative that can be proposed, at least at the

present state of human understanding.

So there is no better theory possible in theoretical science. This leads to an amazing quandary. No matter how much the data conflict with the theory, it can never be refuted in theoretical science. All data in conflict have to be set aside awaiting an explanation in accord with the theory.

This leads to the necessity to deny the data in order to preserve the theory. It is necessary to interpret all data by the assumption that the theory is true, so that evidence against it cannot exist.

This is the meaning of the assertion by the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) that "there is no evidence against evolution," and that "there is no serious questioning in science of whether evolution occurred, only how."

There is no questioning of evolution in theoretical science because it is not possible to question it, since questioning would give support to the idea of creation by God, and that would take the whole controversy out of the realm of science altogether. As the National Center for Science Education (NCSE) tells us, "the public questioning of evolution is fundamentally religious, not scientific, in nature."

Here science is being misused to give an answer to a question it cannot deal with. The subject of origins, by definition, like the subject of destiny, is outside of science and can only be answered by faith. Faith, in this case, is in an explanation of origins that is

suitable to human understanding and an exalted human self-concept.

Dictionary.com tells us the definition of "superstition:"

1. a belief or notion, not based on reason or knowledge, in or of the ominous significance of a particular thing, circumstance, occurrence, proceeding, or the like.

Now we could say that the belief in the ominous significance of evolution of humans from nonhumans is based on reason, in that the alternative is not scientific. But it is not rational to believe something is true just because all data concerning it is interpreted by the assumption that it is true. Evolution is also not based on knowledge; it is based on the assumption that the data collected is interpreted correctly, which it is not.

So evolution of humans from nonhuman ancestors fits the definition of a superstition, in that it cannot possibly be found to be false in theoretical science, and it does not rise to the level of an actual religion, defined as:

1. a set of beliefs concerning the cause, nature, and purpose of the universe, esp. when considered as the creation of a superhuman agency or agencies, usually involving devotional and ritual observances, and often containing a moral code governing the conduct of human affairs.

## Chapter Ten

### Why Evolution Is Not Science

*Why reject the possibility of UFOs, unless you have some preconceived notion that you are afraid to see threatened?*--Physicist Dr. John G. Hartnett

Evidence is interpreted data. There has to be a framework for understanding the data. The accepted framework is evolutionary theory, and all data about origins is interpreted by the assumption that humans really evolved from nonhuman ancestors.

Data, or "facts," are items like the in situ prints of a human-like foot in rock dated at 3.6 million years ago found at Laetoli. They are evidence when they are interpreted in such a way that they can be used to support a possible explanation, like the theory that humans evolved from nonhumans. They are interpreted in accordance with the framework, to show that the creatures that are accepted to have lived at that time walked upright and had a human-like foot. The plain interpretation of the prints is ignored, that the prints were made by modern humans. This is true for all data, it is interpreted in a way that allows the theory to be true. It is not possible for evidence against evolution to exist because all data is interpreted by the assumption that it actually happened.

Interpreting data by assuming the truth of evolution can be illustrated by the controversy over the Laetoli prints. There are a number of scientists who think that these cannot be the prints of *Australopithecus spp.* since the foot structure of the prints is wrong. A reconstruction of the foot has been done by scientists who have

studied the prints, and it is fully human. However, they are not recognized as human prints since they are in a layer dated at 3.6 million years, when humans are thought not to have existed according to evolutionary theory.

Any data that clearly contradicts the theory is set aside, because it cannot be examined, since to do so would not be science according to the worldview that science assumes that the supernatural does not act.

Another example of this is found in the instance of the well-known Glen Rose human prints in Cretaceous strata. The prints cannot exist given evolutionary theory, so they are interpreted as dinosaur prints from an unknown species, or filled-in dinosaur prints because of the discoloration around the prints. There is no way that they can be acknowledged to be human prints, since that would require that evolution would be false. No data can ever disprove evolution, since disproving evolution would disprove science itself for those who think that science must assume God does not act. If a theory cannot be disproved because the alternative is dismissed on the basis that scientists do not want to know if it is true, the theory is not science.

Evolution cannot be false, given the assumption. The stated position of the AAAS, as given by them on the Internet at this writing at the web address [http://www.aaas.org/news/press\\_room/evolution/qanda.shtml](http://www.aaas.org/news/press_room/evolution/qanda.shtml) is given here:

Q. Is there "evidence against" contemporary evolutionary theory?

A. No. There are still many puzzles in biology about the particular pathways of the evolutionary process and how

various species are related to one another. However, these puzzles neither invalidate nor challenge Darwin's basic theory of "descent with modification" nor the theory's present form that incorporates and is supported by the genetic sciences. Contemporary evolutionary theory provides the conceptual framework in which these puzzles can be addressed and points toward ways to solve them.

Now this means that, as is often stated, there is no controversy in what is called "science," or the "scientific worldview," over whether evolution occurred, only how. Obviously, there is controversy, but there is none in what is called "science." The reason for that is that "science" is defined as requiring the assumption that God does not act in the world, so what the AAAS says is technically true, but they do not admit how they are defining "science." They are effectively saying that science can rule out the supernatural out of reality.

Now it should be apparent that this is a misunderstanding. Science can only investigate reality, never dictate it. The assumptions that a scientist makes can only allow him to be objective or not, but can never dictate conditions to reality.

### Truth and Darwinism

Truth is irrelevant in Darwinism. As a matter of fact, searching for the truth about Darwinism is a positive hindrance to understanding how humans evolved from nonhuman ancestors.

In order to understand that, one has to accept the fact that Darwinism happened, and interpret all data that is found affecting human origins by the assumption that humans evolved from nonhuman ancestors. This is because Darwinism is what is called "science," and "science," of course, requires that only the material exists, and that there are no supernatural causes of any phenomena or events.

Intelligent Design is not science in the "scientific worldview," because it does not exclude the possibility of the action of the supernatural. It also allows the existence of truth, so it must be opposed by all faithful Darwinists.

This is illustrated by the dedicated Darwinists. They don't care what truth is. They don't even think about it enough to have their own definition of it. Some even insist that science does not attempt to find truth. Yet they want to give the impression to the public that humans really evolved from nonhuman ancestors, that is, that it is "true."

Daniel Dennett calls Darwinism a "universal acid" that destroys religion. Yes, Darwinism even destroys the concept of truth. The good news is that that means Darwinism cannot possibly be true.

In order to understand the modern world, it is necessary to understand that much of politics and what is called "science" depend on the destruction of the concept of objective truth. Certain people do not want to have to believe that human abilities and understanding are limited in any way, and they want to believe that humans can develop into God, just like in Mormonism.

Darwinism is a basic part of this strategy. It does away with the concept of truth, since we only have adaptations that give a selective advantage, and those that don't. So humans are only limited by old fashioned conservative ideas that certain things are true, and that they should not be done away with.

Truth is no longer a consideration concerning a proposition in Darwinism. The only question is, does it advance humanity toward the next level in evolution? But the Darwinist does not realize that he is still dependent on truth. Is it *true* that it advances humanity? More to the point, is it *true* that there is a next level? Or is it true that the only advancement that the abandonment of truth is going to give humanity is advancement toward destruction? The nonexistence of objective truth is only a trick played on humanity by smarter nonhuman forces.

Darwinists may say they have no problem believing in objective reality. The problem they have, however, is with objective truth. Humans do not perceive objective reality, they only perceive what their senses tell them, as interpreted by their brain. We only *assume* that our senses are telling us objective truth about reality. For actual objective truth, we have to rely on God having established the world in such a way that what we perceive actually reflects reality. Without a reliable, intelligent, omniscient God, there is no reason to believe our senses. Knowing reality becomes hopeless, like some materialists say, "we may be pawns in an alien video game." Darwinism leads to intellectual suicide.

Some Darwinists think that, since they believe that truthful statements can be made,

then truth can exist in Darwinism. Truthful statements are not the problem. *truth* is the problem. Darwinists have appropriated a concept that cannot exist in materialism. They assume that Darwinism is "true" based on the fact that people whose opinion they trust tell you it is. That is their definition of "true." Something is "true" in materialism if you *want* it to be, and is dependent on your choice of authority. There is simply no concept of "objective truth" possible in materialism. An omniscient Mind is required for objective truth to exist. This is why science could not have developed in materialism.

## Chapter 11

### Thinking In New Ways

*And he said unto me, Son of Man, stand upon thy feet, and I will speak unto thee.--*  
Ezekiel

We have seen that it is necessary to think in new ways to actually have a good grasp of the UFO phenomenon. We know that it is not necessary, or even helpful, to think of

gods, or angels, or demons producing the phenomenon. That was the old understanding, and those like Zecharia Sitchin ([www.sitchin.com](http://www.sitchin.com)) have jettisoned that in favor of understanding the Bible as a record of the interaction of space aliens with humanity.

We have seen that just because a theory is not supernatural, that does not make it necessarily true. The extraterrestrial explanation for UFOs just imposes a non-supernatural explanation on the unknown phenomenon, and ignores the conflict of the proposed explanation with the observations.

Science does not require a materialist explanation of phenomena. If one holds a particular worldview, one requires explanations in agreement with that worldview. Science is often confused with the worldview that can be described as "materialistic naturalism," or the dogma that states that the supernatural does not act in the world.

For the purpose of attempting better understanding, we have thrown out for a moment the idea of God, angels, demons, religion, church, Bigfoot, or space aliens. We investigate the subject, rather, using the concept of non-human life with equal or superior intelligence (NheOSi).

Now even atheists would not have any trouble accepting this concept, I would think. Many of them seem quite ready to acknowledge that civilizations more highly developed than human could exist, and most probably do.

The famous equation by Frank Drake goes something like this: There are so many stars

that, even if only one in a million has planets, there are still many stars with planets. Out of all these stars that have planets, even if one in a million is habitable by life, then there are still many that are habitable. Out of all those stars that are habitable, even if life only evolved on one in a million of them, there are still lots of planets where life evolved. Out of all those planets with life, even if only one in a million evolved intelligent life capable of technology, there must be lots of planets with advanced life. This is the basis of SETI, trying to find radio signals from those planets where there is life with technological capability. It has had absolutely no success in almost a quarter of a century of looking.

However, even atheists should be able to understand and accept the concept of the NHeOSi. So we all agree that the NHeOSi exist, we just disagree on what they are. Now if the NHeOSi actually have a superior understanding, like "highly evolved" aliens or God, there is every reason to expect that they know principles of the universe that operate differently from those we are familiar with. For instance, the Star Trek people knew about "warp drives" and "teleportation." Their everyday actions might seem to be "supernatural" to us. They might have some kind of brain-wave projection communication with their technology, or it might operate in other ways not even suspected by us, or they might even be beyond having to use technology. We just don't know, and cannot be expected to understand.

For this reason, science cannot assume that the supernatural does not act. That will just mean that those who make that assumption are unable to admit that there are unknown principles, and that will make them unable to find those principles.

Now, that assumption is made in the case of evolution of humans from nonhuman ancestors. It is assumed that human origins are understandable, and therefore humans must have developed from nonhuman life by known processes, like natural selection operating on chance mutations. It is true that science does assume that the universe is understandable, but that does not mean that everything is currently understood. There is no reason to expect that humans currently understand all of the principles of the universe. The evidence from life, with new discoveries being constantly made, is that there is much more to understand.

The materialistic naturalism philosophy makes no rational sense in other ways. If the material is all that exists, there is no justification for the existence of truth, love, freedom, or other nonmaterial concepts. All is simply the emanation of randomly arranged atoms, and everything is determined and unchangeable. Any philosophical justification is only determined by chance, and there is no reason for anything to exist, let alone intelligent life. Just the fact that such things do exist demonstrates that materialistic naturalism is wrong. Assuming materialistic naturalism is simply irrational, and depends on being able to turn off one's mind to the implications of reality.

However, there is no reason even in materialistic naturalism to assume that the NHeOSi do not exist, as we have seen. One's assumptions determine what identity the NHeOSi have, but it is clear they can exist even for the unthinking materialistic naturalist.

The person who has a UFO experience often has his life changed in some important way. This is quite true of an experience with any NHeOSi. People often have changes in their lives by contact, and the experience may not be positive. There is a Biblical statement

that no one can see God and live. Those who see UFOs and are abducted by UFOs have severe disruption to their lives, because they know what they saw and cannot explain it in satisfactory natural terms. Seeing any NHeOSi is an upsetting experience. Perhaps one might imagine what it would be like if real, physical, extraterrestrial beings made contact with some earth government. Not everyone would be happy, perhaps especially including other governments because they were not contacted. Science would have to be rewritten, and new concepts would have to be learned by those who thought they understood the world. Whole industries and academic disciplines would suddenly be irrelevant.

The reaction to UFO appearances is often awe and fear. This is interesting in light of the reaction of the Israelites. When confronted by the appearance of Yahweh on Sinai, they asked Moses to speak to them for Yahweh, not to bring them before Him because they were afraid of Him.

Communion is a traditional religious rite. But some materialistic naturalists believe that communion with alien, extraterrestrial beings is possible and desirable. They have their own proposed communion with the NHeOSi, not necessarily in a spiritual way, but in a naturalistic way.

Of course, they disregard and denigrate the experiences reported by some that UFO abductions are not positive experiences. The "aliens" often do not want to interact in a meaningful way, they only want to probe and cause discomfort to their abductees for purposes that they keep entirely to themselves.

Now of course abductions could be experiences that are imposed by our psychological makeup, but there is no way to establish that for certain, due to our lack of knowledge about the interactions of consciousness with matter, even in the brain itself. There is really no reason to assume such a thing, apart from the assumption that the supernatural does not act, or that there is no unknown principle acting.

Many people think that they are doing science when they use expensive equipment to gather data, and use that data to support a theory. Look at the Bigfoot phenomenon. There is a theory that Bigfoot is an actual unknown animal, a byproduct of human evolution, an ape that walks upright. The "science" that supports that view is limited to the evidence of footprints, at least some of which seem to show that Bigfoot does not have an arched foot, shown by the way the prints sometimes display a pressure ridge in front of the heel. The only other evidence is sighting reports. The proponents of that theory seek to prove it. Now that is understandable, but it is not science, it is only half of science. In order to do science, you have to propose a theory, and then see if there is any way for it to be refuted, as extensively as possible. A way it could be stated to be scientific would be to propose "there is no nonhuman primate native to North America" and attempt to refute the proposal. Some Bigfoot hunters think that proposal *has* been refuted by the footprints and sightings.

The number of sightings of Bigfoot that have been reported are in the multiples of thousands, in different parts of the U. S, and even over the world. In Australia it is called a Yowie, for instance ([www.yowiehunters.com](http://www.yowiehunters.com)). It is beyond belief that a real animal can have not left some physical evidence, and for this reason it is quite understandably not accepted by the scientific establishment as an existing animal. So it

is obvious that something else is most likely going on. Now, of course, in materialistic naturalism, there is a more obvious answer. All of these sightings are dismissed as just misidentifications or hallucinations. But this is not the only possible answer.

It may be that Bigfoot is an actual NHeOSi, which we have shown have a likely existence, and the creatures are playing games with humanity for their own purposes, like the possible NHeOSi that seem to be creating the phenomenon known as UFO abductions ([www.ufoabduction.com](http://www.ufoabduction.com)). Fairly often the phenomenon manifests itself in very different ways, and presents itself as other kinds of bizarre manlike and non-manlike creatures, as if Bigfoot were not bizarre enough. (<http://members.tripod.com/~ufoisrael> and [www.huntfortheskinwalker.com](http://www.huntfortheskinwalker.com)).

Now I am not proposing the NHeOSi as a scientific theory. I don't know how it could be stated in a scientific manner, that is, in a way that could be verified by observation and experiment. The NHeOSi do not necessarily operate in a way that humans can understand, and are not subject to human investigation and control. As UFO abductions show, they are the masters and are in control of at least some humans. Bigfoot also demonstrates the fact, as he appears at a time and place of his own choosing and never allows humans to control him in any way.

Science can only give us information about matters that are subject to observation and experiment. Simply because a phenomenon is not subject to observation and experiment does not mean that it is not real. It only means that it will remain unknown to science. The effects of the phenomenon, however, may appear in the material world and be subject to investigation. Due to the limits of human understanding, it may be impossible

to give a satisfactory explanation of the phenomenon, but if it is found to be predictable in some way, its effects may be subjected to scientific experiment.

One has only to think of gravity. Gravity has very predictable effects. If you drop something it falls down. We know that bodies attract one another according to their mass. But we have no satisfactory theory of HOW gravity operates. For instance, what is the speed of gravity? How do you produce it in the laboratory?

Now you might consider the force behind the proposed evolution of humans from one-celled life as the production of NHeOSi. It undoubtedly has intelligence at least equal to that of humans, and even superior intelligence, as it produced the intelligence of humanity, which has the ability to contemplate its origins. I think we can probably agree that this intelligence was non-human. The idea that chance mutations operated on by natural selection could account for the rise of humanity from inorganic chemicals is widely regarded in science as finally refuted. The theory of evolution no longer is even thought to apply until DNA had been created.

Even so, intelligence was required for the continued evolution of DNA life into man. Even if one assumes that intelligence had already been encoded in the DNA, and that guided the development of life, you have evidence of intelligent input. There is no reason to assume that that input did not continue, except the desire to have at least a partially naturalistic explanation for human life that is somewhat acceptable to human understanding.

So even in the evolutionary worldview, you have the necessity of NHeOSi acting to

produce humanity. The phenomenon of the observed existence of humanity does not correlate with the philosophy of materialistic naturalism.

It is not science to assume that origins were naturalistic, and then accumulate data that is interpreted by that assumption. As we have shown, there is the evidence of the vast amount of information encoded in DNA that shows that intelligence was involved in the creation of life. Such encoded evidence found by SETI would be considered to be incontrovertible evidence of intelligence elsewhere in the universe, and it should be considered as such in this instance.

## Chapter 12

### Darwinism and Human Freedom

*Darwinian biology sustains conservative social thought by showing how the human capacity for spontaneous order arises from social instincts and a moral sense shaped by natural selection in human evolutionary history.* --Political science professor Larry Arnhart

Dr. Arnhart, in his book *Darwinian Conservatism*, realizes the need to have a justification for morality and social order in a world in which Darwinism is accepted as fact. This, of course, is a commendable action, and is a real attempt to fight the breakdown of society that results from reaching the conclusion that morality is relative. But it depends on acceptance of the nonexistence of objective truth. It depends on convincing people that a particular way of looking at the world, or worldview, should be accepted as *meaningful* to them because it works pragmatically, not that it is objectively true.

Now, of course, the socialist, or social progressive, could assert the opposite. He could say that Darwinism shows how the potential for human progress is unlimited, and conservatism is a limitation of human progress. If we can evolve by natural, unguided means from one-celled life to the level of being able to control our environment by technology, there must be no limits to how far we can develop if we cast off our inhibitions, and use our intelligence to experiment with stem cells and human cloning, and

even extensive modification of the human body. So Darwinism can also justify revolution in order to get rid of the hindrances to society by social conservatism. Hitler used Darwinism as a justification for attempting to create a super race, by selectively breeding humans and getting rid of those whom he deemed unfit. Darwinism removed the inhibitions on treating animals like humans, since they *were* animals. German rationalism had prepared the way for him, by assuming that materialism was self-evident, and that the old assumptions about God were not necessary. (Humans, by the way, are now taxonomically classified in zoology as being among the "great apes.")

The issue here is not that Darwinism can or cannot justify conservatism; of course it can. Darwinism can justify anything, because nothing can be true if you consider Darwinism self-evident. It is just a matter of whether you can get people to accept a view of the world that allows them to function, and I commend Dr. Arnhart for trying to make the best of a bad situation by trying to justify conservatism in a world where people think Darwinism accounts for their origin.

Without a concept of truth, then all Dr. Arnhart can do is state his preference for conservatism, as he does here. He has removed the basis for an objective authority, and therefore the only basis for an authority that can be accepted by everyone can be *force*, if people cannot be persuaded to do what one thinks to be in their best interest, or in the best interest of that one. That is how Darwinism destroys human freedom.

Darwinists may deny that they consider evolution self-evident. Yet they never interpret any data by the assumption that naturalistic common descent could be false. They feel no need to justify this contradiction, because they do not understand what it means to

claim that something actually happened in reality. If something is claimed to have actually happened in reality, that means it is "true." If it is "true," Darwinism is a proposition that agrees with reality.

But here is the conundrum: If Darwinism is "true," it has authority. But it can have no authority, since there is no way of *knowing* that it is false, if all data is interpreted as if it were true. Further, even if Darwinism is "true," there is no such concept as objective truth and objective authority, there is only human opinion which can only be imposed by force of arms. Truth and authority, and all ideas, including Darwinism itself, are nothing but evolutionary adaptations that gave some selective advantage in the past. The concept of truth itself does not exist, the world is irrational, and totalitarianism is the only logical form of government.

Those who want us to have evolved want to deny the existence of any authority above man, and truth is above man. One has to believe truth in order to not be ignorant. If it is true that two and two make four; you can't logically believe three plus five make four. It limits you. Truth is actually an attribute of God, or Ultimate Reality, and if you deny God you deny truth. People who promote evolution want to deny the authority of God, but keep the authority of truth. This is irrational. Darwinism depends on keeping its adherents from thinking for themselves.

Hitler's propaganda minister, Goebbels, said that *truth is the greatest enemy of the state*. This is because people should not be free to think for themselves, otherwise they will come to conclusions that may not be in the best interest of the state, and will be harder to control. That is the case in public education, and it is why the education

establishment does not like creationism. It is a threat to control of the population.

I can understand the fear of introducing opinions other than the doctrine that humans evolved from nonhuman ancestors into science classes; in such a case the students may realize that evolution may not be true, and that naturalism may not account for all phenomena. This fear, however, is just the result of a totalitarian desire on the part of those who control education to dominate the students and deny them the ability to think for themselves.

People seem to no longer claim that evolution of humans from nonhumans is "true." They only claim that it is a useful understanding of reality. It "works" for them, and of course it "works" as long as they don't question it, and interpret all data by the assumption that evolution really happened. Many of us who still believe in truth and science are coming to realize that evolution has no authority in science because of the metaphysical assumptions upon which it is based. Science requires that propositions be actually "true" in objective reality. Postmodernism destroys science and the very concept of truth itself, and allows whoever has the most power to control others to take statist power over them, since truth is no longer meaningful to them.

Some Darwinists seem to claim that what a Darwinist defines as "science" does not claim that evolution of humans from nonhuman ancestors is "true," but that it is only provisionally accepted. Now I could agree with this as far as true science goes.

But with evolution, we are not dealing with true science. We are dealing with a claim that "there is no evidence against evolution." This makes it into a metaphysical claim to

certainty, which science cannot make.

But there is another level to this problem. The postmodern view of reality, exemplified by Dr. Arnhart, requires that there can really be no such thing as objective truth. So science does not seek to find what is true, it simply seeks to find information humans can use.

Some people, like myself, used to provisionally believe evolution was true, but now believe that it is objectively false. The real problem is that lots of people no longer believe in the existence of truth itself because of exposure to Darwinism.

The Internet is useful. It is dangerous, but it is also a good place for freedom, and freedom is dangerous. The anonymity makes people feel free to spill out all the evil that is in their hearts, but it also allows that evil to be dealt with so that it will not be manifested in a way that will destroy others.

Dedicated materialists use the internet to promote the idea of reducing reality to that which can be verified by evidence approved of by materialistic philosophy, and denying the reality of concepts like truth, morality, and goodness, which are not dependent on evidence. Those dedicated materialists may not be so obvious in person.

Logic is not the sum total of human experience, especially as they define it, completely subject to the material. Materialism is a denial of logic, and materialistic evolution is simply an assertion out of the infinity of human ignorance.

Darwinists do not want creationists or IDers to be able to advocate their position in public. The NCSE even recommends that creationists not be debated because they so often win. They want to use the courts, where they can control the outcome more effectively. Denial of advocacy of a position is denial of human freedom. Evolutionism depends on totalitarian control of human expression for its continued existence, because it cannot stand up in the marketplace of ideas on its own merits.

Advocacy of an unpopular position like creationism should not be a problem, if there is such a thing as academic freedom. Science depends on the freedom to investigate a question. When it is decided that one position is the only one acceptable, science is being squelched, not protected. What is being protected is *materialism*, not science. Evolution depends on mistaking materialism for science. The "educational institution" has become totalitarian if it denies freedom of inquiry. Of course they think that totalitarianism in the service of materialism is justified. All totalitarians think that repressions of freedom of which they approve are justified.

If Darwinian evolution actually happened in the way proposed by people such as Richard Dawkins, then many concepts we take for granted are only evolutionary adaptations, and have no actual objective meaning. Daniel Dennett likes to propose that religion, for example, is an evolutionary adaptation which gave a selective advantage to those who were religious. Therefore, religions have no objective meaning, and they are only a matter of preference and one can take or leave them. The solace and other positive features they provide can be attained in other, more rational ways.

However, one does not have to go very far with this concept until he comes upon a

disturbing quandary. The concept of truth is also an evolutionary adaptation. The idea that some proposition can be found to agree with objective reality no longer makes sense. Humans cannot perceive objective reality directly; they are dependent on the interpretation of the perceptions of their senses as interpreted by the brain, and those perceptions vary based on the previous experiences and mental state of the observer, as well as the acuity of their senses. So humans cannot know that something is objectively true. But, further, if no mind exists that can know reality fully, then there is no objective truth to find.

This results in the breakdown of the ability to exist of all kinds of things that we take for granted, such as science, morality, law, justice, and honesty. They are all evolutionary adaptations, and there is nothing objective or true. Darwinism, even, is only an evolutionary adaptation with no real meaning.

### Political Implications

Now this is essentially the postmodern position, and the position of leftist politics in the modern world. Truth no longer matters concerning a position, and the only thing that matters is what people can be made to accept. Without the concept of truth, there is no hindrance to change in the direction of whatever is popular at the moment. Science is abandoned for totalitarian power, because there is no longer any such thing as science without truth for science to find. Darwinism is certainly a "universal acid," as Dennett has said. It even dissolves itself.

It is often said that science does not conflict with religion. This is true, but Darwinism

is not science. It fulfills a religious need for many people, in that it is based on assuming that the material is the explanation for all phenomena.

It has been said that Christianity is the objective method provided by God to deal with human guilt before God's infinitely holy demand for perfect justice. Darwinism also deals with guilt in a very different way. It simply treats it as a nonexistent entity that is a result of an evolutionary adaptation that gave some selective advantage in the past, but now that humanity is "mature" it serves no useful purpose. Therefore it can be dispensed with.

Not all people are bothered by guilt. Once you have such a justification as this one provided by Darwinism, there is no reason to believe that there is any objective morality to which you have to answer. Morality becomes relative, not objective, and dependent on the belief of the person, or at best on the society in which one lives. So one can destroy those who disagree with him with impunity, as Stalin did, if he has the power, and have no guilt whatever.

In the lives of ordinary people without the power of Stalin, this morality also works itself out. They are not bothered by violations of the Ten Commandments, and after violating them often enough, they no longer have any meaning. The Commandments are only the result of the imaginings of a bronze age society, after all, and are just the result of the evolutionary adaptations of the ancient Hebrews. If one ignores the promptings of conscience saying that one is doing something wrong, one comes eventually to the point of never being bothered by conscience any more because it cannot be heard. It has been silenced because one is no longer sensitive to it.

If theistic evolution is "true," then why are those believers in God who support evolution fighting creationists instead of fighting this denial of Christianity? Quite simply, their preferred religion is materialism, not Christianity. They accept the mistaking of materialism for science, and think they are defending science.

### Hindering Science

This assumption that science requires that the supernatural does not act results in the impossibility of solving the creation-evolution question. This is a political ploy by supporters to make sure that evolution has to be promoted as true to the general public, and has been very successful up to this point. However, it is at a high cost to science.

It results, in practice, with the supernatural being confused with the unknown. New principles of the universe cannot be found if it is assumed that there are no unknown principles. Anyone trying to find new understandings of the universe can count on ridicule from those who think that science must exclude the supernatural, because they make the mistake of thinking that what is unknown must be supernatural. Therefore, what is unknown cannot exist in that worldview, since they think that science must assume that the supernatural cannot act in the world, and the unknown is supernatural.

The evolutionary collapse is going to be bigger than the Copernican revolution for its meaning for science and the scientific community. They have put all of their eggs in the materialistic evolutionary basket and this is going to be an unmitigated disaster for them and even for us, I think, because the collapse of evolution will affect so much of society. But truth is always uncomfortable for deniers of truth ("I am..the truth"--

Jesus), and there is always a Judgment Day. Evolution is about to face its Judgment Day.

## Chapter Thirteen

### Running from the Battle

*On the battlefield of ideas, winning requires moving toward the sound of the guns.--*  
Newt Gingrich

Creationism is an interesting phenomenon. Those who try to promote the idea that there is evidence for creation continue to provide evidence that they claim supports it, and those who consider materialism to be science—including the AAAS, the NCSE, the scientific community--deny that it is evidence. The stated position of the AAAS is that there is no evidence against evolution, in spite of all the content of the creationist scientific publications, however careful or well-reasoned. They are simply asserted to be irrelevant to science.

Yet the creationists, often PhD scientists, continue to present what they consider to be evidence against evolution. In all of this, they never question the basic assumption of the materialists; namely, that the action, and even the existence, of God must be proved by evidence.

The statement "there is no evidence against evolution" is a basic statement of the assumption that evolution, as a materialist-based origin of life and humanity, must be considered self-evident.

Now, as Alvin Plantinga tells us, evidence is not the only way of determining truth. There may be other valid ways of doing so. One of these ways is noting that the existence of objectively valid evidence itself requires a prior assumption, namely, that objective truth about a proposition exists.

This is why Intelligent Design is so threatening to those who support evolution. It is considered an opening wedge to creationism, and of course it is. If there is any kind of intelligent designer, then Darwinism is nonsense, and there is no materialist-based origin of life, and materialism cannot be considered self-evident. Then the whole Darwinist house of cards comes tumbling down.

Yet, at the same time, many in the ID community do not realize what is happening much better than the members of the young-earth creationist community. They think that common descent is still valid, even though they realize that materialism is not self-evident. The issue is that the evidence for evolutionary origin of life is based on the denial of the existence of objective truth. We all have to so great an extent absorbed the idea that it is possible for God not to exist, that we have become unable to see that the existence of objective truth itself requires God.

Now, what I mean by this is that truth is best defined as "the agreement of a proposition with objective reality." One could say that "the sky is blue," and according to human perception that is a true statement. But to one who knows reality fully, that may not be the full explanation of an objective reality. An omniscient mind is required that knows reality fully in order to have the concept of objective truth.

Science attempts to find objective truth as nearly as possible. Quite simply, without the concept of *God* science makes no sense. Without *God*, there is no truth to find. There is only human perception, which is dependent on several factors which reduce it to subjectivity. Science is dependent on human perception to attempt to find that objective truth, and the fact that it *does* find useful information about reality verifies the existence of that which is at the basis of the concept of *God*. If science could not find any useful information about reality, it would verify the concept of materialism, or that there is no actual existence of what is called "God." But then everything would be meaningless, and would degenerate into chaos.

This is the real error at the basis of Darwinism. No one is addressing it, and they are preferring to charge windmills instead of confronting the real issue. This is because the history of modern thought took the wrong turn, and it was assumed that the human mind was capable of rising above its subjectivity, and making an informed decision about whether or not to believe in *God*.

However, such an informed decision is not possible. This is due to the fact that there has to be a starting point for reasoning, and if the starting point is the assumption that the mind is fully capable of finding truth without reference to *God*, then it is being assumed that materialism is self-evident. Then, on this basis, evidence of *God* is required in order to prove that *God* exists. But once you require evidence to prove *God*, you have abandoned the concept of *God*. You are attempting to prove a contingent being, which may be powerful, and far above humans, but it is not *God*. It could be Superman, or Zeus, or even Krishna or Brahma. But it is not the *God* of Christianity.

## Chapter Fourteen

### Darwinism and the Founding Fathers

*Direct my thoughts, words and work. Wash away my sins in the immaculate blood of the lamb, and purge my heart by thy Holy Spirit, from the dross of my natural corruption, that I may with more freedom of mind and liberty of will serve thee, the ever lasting God, in righteousness and holiness this day, and all the days of my life. --George Washington*

*"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed..."*

The Founding Fathers understood that evolution out of inorganic matter could not endow anyone with rights. Freedom grows out of the fact that man is created in the image of God, and that there is a Final Judgment, and a Judge who is infinitely just, and Who is the meaning and purpose of life. They had a deep understanding of liberty and its roots in the will of the Creator, not, like the French Revolution, in throwing off all restraint. Darwinism leads to totalitarianism, since the only rational justification for obedience to law is the threat of violence. The strongest imposes his rule, and the weaker obey or die.

The whole of materialism, liberal theology, and "leftism" in general is based on the misunderstanding that something can be true without the Christian concept of God. It assumes that "truth" is relative, and there is no objective truth. Humans are the only

mind in existence, and they establish what is true by verifying it by whatever means they agree upon. This means that there is actually no such thing as truth; it becomes only what humans agree upon, and that agreement may not be based on rationality. Once the moorings of wisdom and truth are cast off, the ship is free to crash on the breakers of the rocky coast of reality.

God is not subject to proof. He has to be considered self-evident. Failure to understand this is failure to understand the concept of God. Of course, the ability to make truthful statements about reality does not affect reality at all. It is human knowledge that is affected by the ability to make truthful statements about reality. Denying God is denying knowledge and science, since He alone can define truth because only He can know reality fully.

Patrick Henry "smelled a rat" in Philadelphia, since the Founders did not explicitly mention Christ or Christianity; they only used the word "God" or "Divine Providence." He was worried that they were really setting up a secular government. Many who want to see a secular government point to the fact that they specifically avoided mentioning Christ.

But the Founders, I think, had a better understanding of Christianity than many Christians, and set up the government on the *principles* of Christianity without specifically mentioning Christ. They understood, or at least *used*, those principles to form the government. They understood that there must be no compulsion used to enforce religion. In this sense, they promoted a government that was based on the ability of the individual to choose his religion freely, instead of insisting on enforcing

the correct religion based on what they liked. In this sense, they were true to the Christian principles of the Sermon on the Mount. They avoided mentioning Christ not just to get along with those who did not like Christianity, but because they had faith that if they allowed freedom to choose one's religion, Christianity would win in the long run. Even those who now try to exclude Christianity from the public square do so because they know it is winning, and sense that it will ultimately triumph as the only religious viewpoint that *can* be objectively accurate. They are trying to forestall that final triumph as long as possible. But just as Christianity sets up a base for human freedom to be expressed, also freedom allows Christianity to be expressed more fully. The only alternative to Christianity is suppression of human freedom, and as long as human minds are free, then the fact of the objective solution of Christianity to the problem of infinite human guilt will be embraced. It will be seen that the Triune God Himself has provided the only possible solution to human guilt before His own demand for perfect justice and righteousness from humans. The name of Jesus, or Christianity, does not even need to be mentioned. The principles behind Christianity have power to set men free.

Secularism developed out of the ideas of freedom when humanity was released from authoritarianism under the Divine Right of Kings, and Papal Infallibility. We do not really have a democracy; we have a Democratic Republic. There are powerful forces that are trying to destroy humanity, and it is difficult to keep them in balance. It is hard to balance human authoritarianism and human freedom; that is why the development took so long. America is the best balance of them, in my opinion, so far. Not that it could not be better. Many people want to go one way or the other, and it is a constant struggle.

Now a further word: I did not say it is rooted in Christian beliefs. I said it was rooted in Christian *principles*. The Christian influence is so subtle that it is hidden to those who do not want to see it, like atheists. Even Patrick Henry did not see it. Remember, he was not one of the Founders, and did not participate in signing the Constitution. This is the genius of the Founders. Henry wanted a more overt statement of Christianity, but the Founders avoided it.

They wanted freedom of thought to allow people to be able to reject Christianity, because they knew this was the only way that it could capture the hearts of the people. They did not want to inject overt Christianity into the founding documents, since they knew it would be used to form another authoritarian system. They had a belief in *TRUTH*, that is, a statement that agrees with objective reality, and is the same for all people regardless of their belief. They knew that freedom of thought was the only way that people could find truth (Jesus), rather than having Him imposed on them by government. They knew from bitter experience that people would resist whatever was imposed on them by force, whether it was true or not. This was essentially basing government on the golden rule, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

At the same time, they set up religious freedom, and prohibited the federal government from interfering in religion. They allowed the states to establish churches, knowing that at least people could move to the state that agreed with their faith. But now, the federal government is *prohibiting* religion, since they have discovered a hole in the protection that the Founders instituted. All that is needed is to appoint judges to the federal bench that do not believe in truth, and they can make rulings that prohibit religious expression. But there are constitutional remedies which can be applied,

fortunately.

Darwinism tips the scales. It provides NO balance to human authoritarianism and human freedom, because there is no truth to find. One can go all the way to total authority or total anarchy, and justify it with Darwinism.

## Chapter Fifteen

### Secular and Religious Evolution

*Ridicule is the only weapon which can be used against unintelligible propositions. Ideas must be distinct before reason can act upon them; and no man ever had a distinct idea of the Trinity. It is the mere Abracadabra of the mountebanks calling themselves the priests of Jesus.--Thomas Jefferson*

Jefferson here observes that the Trinity is not a logical proposition, and the mind of man cannot grasp it easily. But one might think that often the reason that an idea is unintelligible to a person may lie in that person, not in the idea. The person might need to learn to think in new ways.

After discussing the subject of evolution for the last two years or more, I discover that there are two basic kinds of evolutionary philosophies. One is the secular philosophy based on assuming that God cannot be self-evident, or if you prefer, on assuming that only the material is self-evident.

The other philosophy is religious, and is based on a spiritual belief in upward development of the species toward higher intelligence and greater control over the material world.

The peculiar part is that these two philosophies are interdependent and may even coexist in the same person, what S. J. Gould has called "non-overlapping magisteria." Yet they do not recognize the conflict.

Secularism is becoming popular in the general public at this time, and many people are abandoning faith in God with certainty. Much is heard about the post-Christian era, and the final victory of secularism over belief in God, as with the books by Dawkins, Dennett, Harris, and Hitchens, and the novels by Dan Brown that give Christianity a different meaning.

In actuality, however, secularism is long dead. Seeing all of this happening is like seeing a corpse stand up and walk around. It is kind of interesting in a forensic sense, if you realize what is going on. In the largest creation-evolution group on Yahoo, ([groups.yahoo.com/group/creation\\_evolution\\_debate](http://groups.yahoo.com/group/creation_evolution_debate)) , it is evident. No one can defend evolution in a rational manner; they all have to use irrational methods of insults, changing the subject, and stating their opinion as final to defend it. They think they are using evidence to support evolution, yet do not realize that that evidence is not scientific, since they are trying to prove evolution to unbelievers by interpreting all data in the field of origins by the assumption that evolution is true. They are interpreting the data based on assuming that materialism is self-evident.

All spiritually sensitive observers sense this, although they may not be fully conscious of it. But almost all of the educated do not oppose it because the people who defend evolution are good at irrational defense of evolution. The sensitive simply bypass the argument. Yet quite often they accept the religious philosophy of evolution without question. It has become part of the accepted wisdom.

Materialists are just not aware of the conflicts, and for that reason think they are

winning. But the real debate has passed far beyond them. They are like the imaginary cavemen still existing in a technological society. They just refuse to engage, and they live in an imaginary world that does not exist, pretending that they can interpret evidence according to their own prejudices and still somehow have it have meaning in science. They have made secularism into a belief system, or a religion without any grounding in ultimate reality, or any perceived need for any basis in truth.

## Chapter 16

### Why America is a Theocracy

*Blest with victory and peace, may the heav'n rescued land  
Praise the Power that hath made and preserved us a nation.  
Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just,  
And this be our motto: 'In God is our trust.'  
And the star-spangled banner in triumph shall wave  
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave!*  
--Francis Scott Key

"What a foolish idea," one might say. Of course America is not a theocracy. A theocracy is defined as "a government subject to or ruled by religious authority," in the American Heritage Dictionary. We have a separation of church and state in the United States Constitution.

This is true. But there is something MUCH deeper going on here. To begin to illustrate it in an understandable way, it might be helpful to quote the definition from dictionary.com: "a form of government in which God or a deity is recognized as the supreme civil ruler, the God's or deity's laws being interpreted by the ecclesiastical authorities." Now let us separate out the last phrase, and say "a form of government in which God or a deity is recognized as the supreme civil ruler," and forget about who interprets the laws for a moment. Depending on the ecclesiastical authorities to interpret the laws is a particular TYPE of theocracy; that is, an ecclesiocracy.

The United States is set up as a democratic theocracy, not an ecclesiastical one. Each person hears from God, and uses that knowledge to make law or to operate government. Or at least, that is how the government is set up to operate.

The danger, as with any government, is that people will operate according to their own desires, or their own deficient idea of what is right and wrong. This is where God comes in. Now we might think that God is something like Zeus, and is subject to human foibles of jealousy, lust and petulance like that Greek God was. So we would need a priesthood to tell us what he wanted us to do in government. Nobody has a personal relationship with Zeus. This would wind up simply being a totalitarian oligarchy, or rule by a small group.

The Triune God, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in the Bible, claims to be the ultimate Creator of the universe, and the only God. Yet he claims to reveal Himself to each person without favoring the rich over the poor, or the powerful over the weak. He also claims to be Truth. This is an important insight. The existence of an absolute Truth means that the citizens of a nation can all look to that Truth to rule them in their daily affairs, and to form a basis for their participation in government. Recognizing truth as ultimate in the operation of government is actually recognizing the Biblical, Triune God as ultimate.

This is the basis of our current cultural conflict. It is really not a matter of people of religious faith trying to impose their belief on people who are wanting to remain free in their secular viewpoint. It is, rather, a struggle between people who believe in the relevance of truth and those who do not.

The struggle against God is not a struggle simply against religion; it is a struggle against truth itself. America was set up so that one particular religious group could not suppress all others; but on the other hand, it *was* set up so that *truth* could suppress error.

Many of us have come out of the movement called "Christian Reconstruction," or "Theonomy." The thing that bothered me about the movement was that so many were so arrogant in their beliefs, feeling that God and the Bible were behind them, so they could walk over others, and institute their own ideas of how the Bible should be applied to society. This engendered a great deal of deserved opposition. This is all unnecessary. There is plenty of opposition to the idea of operating government according to truth. We don't have to generate more opposition by our own arrogant stupidity. As people come to realize that the government must be operated according to truth, they will necessarily institute Biblical principles in the process.

In the postmodern world, truth is no longer even a consideration for many. They simply vote, or serve in government, according to what they think will profit them personally, or according to some other value than truth. They use the concept of truth as a method of deception, often even deceiving themselves in the process. When such a person is caught in an obvious lie, or intentional misrepresentation, they claim that other considerations are more important, such as their experience, or their devotion to America, and treat the dishonesty as of no consequence. Yet, at the same time, they accuse their opposition of dishonesty. They use truth as a weapon, although they never define what they mean by "truth." This is an effective strategy because so many people think Einstein proved that truth is relative, and has no objective meaning. Einstein's

theory, however, demonstrated that the laws of physics could be seen as *absolute*, while time and space were relative. This had no application whatever to relativizing morality, except in the sense of being used as a deception.

So the culture war will be won or lost on the basis of truth, not on the basis of religion. If other considerations become more important to the voters than truth, then America will degenerate into just another totalitarian state.

I observe that, in the War of 1812, the British troops were in the process of burning Washington, DC, when they were suddenly subjected to a violent hurricane and even a tornado, and left the city bewildered by being opposed by the weather in such a strange manner. To me, this indicates again that God Himself is actually protecting the nation which has the government that He has set up to honor Him.

America really is a theocracy, because it allows people to participate in government based on what is ultimately important to them. This is actually their God. If a voter thinks government should be operated according to making him comfortable, then he is acting according to his God. On the other hand, if another votes according to what is true and righteous in his viewpoint, that voter is also acting according to his God.

## Chapter 17

### Understanding the Human Love of Tyranny

#### *Am I my brother's keeper?--Cain*

It is a constant struggle to avoid tyrannizing others, if you get power over them. This is exemplified by George Washington, who understood that he could not be made king if the Republic was to survive. The less wise elements of the citizenry wanted to make him king, but he would not accept. No doubt it was a temptation for him, but he did not yield to it. He wanted to set up a democratic theocracy, where *each citizen* interpreted the laws of God and put them into practice.

An ecclesiastical theocracy, or ecclesiocracy, is a form of government in which a priesthood interprets the laws of God, and is the usual kind of government we think of when we think of a theocracy. A democratic theocracy is what we have in the United States, where each person interprets the laws according to his God, which is that which is ultimately significant to him. It is actually a theocratic republic operated democratically, in technical terms, since there are established laws, which are formed by representatives elected by and responsible to the people.

We each have this struggle against the desire to have totalitarian rule over others. It is part of the human condition. Some of us are aware of the problem, like George

Washington, and are able to struggle against it with some success. However, in Darwinism, this tendency is naturally a part of humans, and not the result of the Fall. So resisting it really makes no sense whatever. Some are just naturally more competent; the weak must be subject to the strong as in nature. There is no concept of rights just because you are human. This Darwinist understanding is the basis of the animal rights movement, and charging humans with felonies just because the people demanding tyrannical power interpret what they do as animal cruelty, according to their own desire for totalitarian control.

We see this in the creation-evolution debate. People just want to impose their view on others, regardless of the truth of the viewpoint. No doubt, if these people had power to do so, they would suppress the other side. The scientific community has the power, because the courts are on their side. So they frame the debate in a way that the basic assumption that "humans evolved from nonhuman ancestors" is not allowed to be formally questioned.

Washington told us that our Republic was created to be operated by people who believed in God, and that when people cease to believe, then the Republic would decline. He said, in his farewell address as president,

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, Religion and morality are indispensable supports.

And again,

In vain would that man claim the tribute of Patriotism, who should labour to subvert these great Pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of Men & citizens.

Further,

Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure--reason & experience both forbid us to expect that National morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

Our modern understanding just dismisses this as political posturing. But Washington believed in truth, not political posturing. Remember, this was his *farewell* address, and he had no need to posture.

The love of tyranny is quite fully accounted for as the result of the Fall of Man, in the Bible. It is exemplified in the example of Cain killing Abel. If someone offends you, kill them. If you can't kill them, silence them by any means possible. The only being for which tyranny is appropriate is the Almighty God. He alone has the character and nature to be a tyrant. Attempting to have tyrannical rule over others is attempting to put oneself in the place of God, as Satan told Eve. "You shall be as gods, knowing (determining for yourselves what constitutes) good and evil."

Denying the Fall removes the understanding that there is anything wrong with tyranny. It is OK, Darwinists think, as long as no one is hurt, using their own definition of "hurt." They do not have the concept of freedom in their worldview, so no one can be "hurt" by having someone else's concept of reality imposed on them if the Darwinists approve of the one imposing the concept, and the concept imposed.

This kind of thing was anathema to Washington. He was even kind to the enemy troops, when they fell into his hand. He wanted the citizenry to be free to believe what they

wanted, although he wanted them to believe in God. He would not impose that belief on them against their will.

Now it may be true that Washington was not terribly "religious." But remember, God is not religion. One can be quite Godly without making it apparent to the casual observer, who has false preconceptions about what makes one Godly.

## Chapter 18

### Channeling God

And when they bring you unto the synagogues, and unto magistrates, and powers, take ye no thought how or what thing ye shall answer, or what ye shall say: : For the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say.--Jesus

"Channeling" is a concept we find in the New Age movement, where some spiritual being is assumed to be speaking through a sensitive person who is in contact with that being in the spiritual realm. An example is Hatonn, the supposed Commander of the Galactic Federation, who is channeled by some lady who published his sayings in a periodical called the "Phoenix Letter," I think it was. Also, the movie "Out on a Limb" with Shirley MacLane had some examples of the way channeling is done.

Now I am not saying that an actual spiritual being is speaking through these people, or even that it is not. I would say that there is every opportunity for deceit of the gullible here, however. Even assuming that there is a spiritual being speaking, there is really no reason to have any assurance that it is identifying itself properly.

On the contrary, there is every reason to think that it is NOT revealing its real identity. (We are assuming for the moment that a real, separate entity is speaking through the medium. It is always possible that the medium is deceitful, or is mistaking his own delusions for reality.)

First we have to go over the nature of God. God is not religion, and really has nothing to do with it, except being the object of it. He is not an actor in it, except in the sense that he acts in all things. Religion is a human response to the concept of God. God is actually ultimate reality, and religion is the human response to ultimate reality, which humans do not perceive directly. Therefore, of course, they get their response wrong to some greater or less degree all of the time.

These channeled beings do not claim to be God, and even claim NOT to be God. Since God is necessarily ultimate reality, it is impossible for Him to misrepresent Himself, so He cannot be speaking here. It is possible for the medium to have so much of his own personality and his own desires in what he speaks that all meaning from God is lost, but then he is not in touch with God at all. It is more likely, however, that he is in touch with something—even perhaps his own spirit(or perhaps not)—that wants to deceive. This is shown by the nutty nature of most of these messages, that include whatever nutty idea is prevalent at the time, like saving the earth from alien attack or preventing global warming, and always assuming evolution. The ideas are always man-centered.

Channeling God is a concept expressed in the book of Matthew, where Jesus tells his disciples not to prepare a defense, but trust the Holy Spirit to speak for them when they are brought before judges and accused of crimes. That is what we Christians are charged to do. It is a more powerful concept than you would first think, since what we are actually channeling is *Ultimate Reality*.

## Chapter 19

### Science and Creed

*The basic presumption of all natural science is that there are no supernatural beings or forces acting in the natural world.--Anthropology Professor*

Most scientists mistake science for a kind of creed which asserts that all phenomena have natural causes, and they propagate that error in their students, assuring that it will continue unchallenged. For this reason, there is much confusion about the nature of science in the modern world. Many religious people have accepted this view of science, since it is taught in the public schools. They conclude that religion and science are in conflict. This is perfectly logical, because if science is a creed, then religion and science **are** in conflict. This is why many atheists, like Richard Dawkins and Daniel Dennett, claim that science supports atheism. However, this is simply an illusion created for purposes that have nothing whatever to do with science.

Interestingly, some who do NOT make this error still do not realize the depth of the problem that it creates. Also, many scientists who are Christians say that religion and science are not in conflict, but mistakenly think that this is because there are two spheres of reality: The religious and the scientific. God, they think, deals with ethics and salvation, while science deals with the material world. The two spheres do not overlap, so there is no conflict.

One often hears this argument by proponents of "theistic evolution," who fully accept the naturalistic basis for science, and yet assert that God was somehow involved in the process in some undetectable way. This makes God totally irrelevant in the material world, and abandons it to atheism.

This is a basic mistake in understanding reality. Such people do not fully grasp the concept of "God," and are denying God in contradiction of their attempt to affirm Him. God is not actually God if he is not in control of all reality, not just religion.

We often hear it said that God could have *used* evolution to create life on earth, and that science tells us that that is actually the method He used. Of course, the creed that all phenomena have natural causes *must* tell us that, since to tell us that God used any other method would deny the creed. However, the creed is not science; it is simply a naturalistic creed.

Now it is claimed that the naturalistic creed is necessary; otherwise, if it is believed that unknown forces which could be supernatural can act in the world, then society will degenerate into seeing demons and angels, and abandon scientific skepticism, and lose confidence in rational solutions to phenomena. Science, they think, would no longer be trusted to create technological solutions to problems.

However, there really is no difference between phenomena being attributed to demons or angels, and having them attributed to aliens. The problem is that the phenomena really happen, no matter to what they are attributed. It is currently the acceptable mythology to attribute UFOs to extraterrestrial aliens, but this is simply science fiction

mythology which is accepted without question regardless of absolutely no evidence of even rudimentary life beyond earth.

The naturalistic myth is really a hindrance to scientific understanding, not a help. Answers are not wanted if they are not naturalistic, so what is called "science" does not look for them, and ridicules those who do.

When evolutionists see where their position leads, they don't want to talk about it any more. *Of course* science is not a creed. Science is a *method* used to find information about the universe, and to the degree that it becomes a creed, it ceases to be useful for that purpose, and hardens into dogma. It becomes nothing other than arrogant stupidity. That is what we see in the case of evolution.

Materialists seem to be asserting that Christianity is science, since it can be refuted by finding the body of Jesus. They are also equivocating on the definition of "evolution," using "development of modern life from one-celled life by natural means over hundreds of millions of years" at one time, and "change" at another. The interesting part is where they think that a theory in science can be both creed and theory. This is where we really need to do our work.

Now it is true that someone has to believe in a theory in order to defend it, but they are confusing individual scientists with "science." "Science" is the broader concept which includes those who are trying to refute it, not just those who "believe." If no one is trying to refute it, it stands by default. That is not the case with evolution. The AAAS asserts that "there is no serious scientific controversy about whether evolution

happened, only how." This is an intentional misrepresentation based on the AAAS not recognizing any scientists who reject evolution, and want to refute it. There may be no controversy within the AAAS, which claims to speak for science. But the AAAS does NOT speak for science. Its claim to authority is illegitimate. It speaks for the creed of evolution. The AAAS simply ignores any evidence against evolution, and interprets all data by its creed that "evolution is a fact." They attempt to fool people by equivocating on the definition as above.

Someone has to believe in the theory in order to defend it. But a theory in science is only accepted if everyone (not just those accepted by some authoritarian group) stops trying to refute it. This is not the same thing as imposing it as a way of interpreting all data *before* people stop trying to refute it. That is what is being done in the case of evolution. The scientific community says that "people just should stop trying to refute evolution, because *we* have decided it is true." The idea that "the earth is not flat" is the apt comparison. No one anywhere is trying to refute the idea that the earth is not flat. That is how a theory becomes accepted, not by pronouncements from the accepted scientific community who mistake themselves for a scientific priesthood able to impose their understanding of reality on everyone else. Evolution is really only a minority opinion. I understand the difficulty of grasping this. It took me over fifty years, and I was *trying*. The evolutionists are not even trying.

This is amazingly hard to understand. We have been taught to accept the idea that science is a creedal statement of materialism, and it is very difficult to unlearn and find the truth. One can put the burden of proof on whomever one wants, but it is really on each individual. You are responsible for your own beliefs, and they will lead you to

success or destruction. You can believe that you can drive drunk the wrong way on the interstate without consequences and act according to that belief, or not. Reality (God) will correct you.

## Chapter 20

### The Authority Structure of the Kingdom of God

*Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.--Jesus*

This is something that I think I have seen in the process of my discussions with atheists. It might be relevant to the topic of discipleship. Authority in the Kingdom of God does not work in the same way as that with which we are familiar. The Holy Spirit is the commander, and we are doing the work of the Kingdom if we obey Him. If we do anything else, we are not supporting the Kingdom. Our orders come in the form of instruction from those above us in the church or any other hierarchy, and WE have to choose whether they are actually from the Kingdom of God or not. There may be ecclesiastical laws or civil or criminal laws that propose punishments if we do not obey, but that is irrelevant to the Kingdom of God. We are each responsible for being in touch with the Holy Spirit and doing according to His will. The punishments are from the Father if we do not, and they are in the nature of our continued irrelevance to reality, not banishment from the Kingdom. Our guilt has been removed by the sacrifice of Jesus, if we trust in His righteousness and not our own to make us acceptable to God. However, if we do not act according to the prompting of the Holy Spirit, we are no

longer in touch with reality, and are trying to live in a world that does not exist. This has disastrous consequences.

Those above us, like teachers, pastors, and presidents, cannot order us to do something in the Kingdom of God. They do not have that kind of authority in it. They may have some kind of church authority, or they may be able to put us in jail if we disobey them, but that is not the Kingdom of God. Just because a person is a teacher, or other authority, recognized by some church organization, that does not make him above us in God's hierarchy. God only recognizes the authority of truth; that is, Himself.

The Kingdom of God is subtle, not overt. That is why the "Discipleship" movement of Charles Simpson and Ern Baxter, of which I was once a member, failed. That is why all of these messianic movements fail, and some spectacularly, like the Branch Davidians at Waco. I am writing this just before April 19, the anniversary of them being burned to death, and the Oklahoma City bombing on the same date by other people wanting to bring in the Kingdom of God by killing the enemy. It backfired spectacularly, so that theocracy became a pejorative.

People misunderstand the concept of theocracy, which is, literally, "god-rule." They confuse it with an "ecclesiocracy," or a form of government in which a church hierarchy interprets the desires of God, and imposes their concept on the masses. A theocracy is actually a form of government in which God rules, not a hierarchy of men. The United States is a theocracy, because each person participates in government according to what is ultimately important to him; that is, according to what he interprets as his God. That, of course, does not mean that he is acting according to ultimate reality; his

perception of God may simply not be accurate.

All that is required for the United States to become the Kingdom of God is for its citizens to act according to the prompting of the Holy Spirit, which is not something "religious," ethereal, and undefined. Everyone can do it. All they have to know is that they must act according to objective truth. Objective truth is actually God. Of course, there is infinitely more to Him than that, but that is the absolutely necessary basic understanding. Our mission is to get them to understand that. That is how we participate in bringing in the Kingdom. This does not necessarily correspond to the goals of any church organization; as a matter of fact, the organization may make it impossible to achieve in the short run.

In this, we can participate with any other religious persons, even Mormons, Catholics, or Hindus, or even atheists, who actually believe in acting according to truth, and must oppose many people who claim to be Christian but do not believe in acting according to truth.

One HAS to act according to the concept of individual freedom for others, and individual responsibility, to make theocracy work. That is the genius of the Founding Fathers. Actually, I think they just reacted against the disastrous forms of government they had observed in Europe, and just naturally came up with a theocracy as the only logical form of government in spite of themselves, not intentionally. One absolutely has to respect the freedom of others to obey or disobey the Holy Spirit. The participation of others is really irrelevant; the individual still has to obey the Holy Spirit. He cannot impose his wishes on the others in any way. Again, this is totally separate from any

church or civil hierarchy, which DOES have temporal authority.

As this concept influences the laws of the society, then it actually becomes the Kingdom of God, as people turn over their will to that of God (objective reality). Not that it will ever be PERFECTLY the kingdom of God as long as the curse of the Fall is still with us. But we have the promise in Revelation that there will someday be no more curse. This whole idea of the New Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven may be more literal than we think, and we may live to see it.

I have always made fun of the idea of the "rapture of the church," but now I am not so sure. SOMETHING is about to happen. A vast wave is about to break over the modern world, and it will be bigger than the Copernican revolution. It may even be infinitely bigger. Individuals will ride the wave, or will be overwhelmed and will not even know what happened.

This may seem like the raving of a madman. Maybe it is. Maybe I have lost my mind talking to these atheists. But I don't think I am alone in sensing this.

The Mayan calendar ends in 2012. The I Ching seems to indicate that the world will end soon. The web bots, which were created to predict the movements of the stock market, indicate that things will come to an unexpected end in a few years. The Sybilline prophecies also seem to indicate it, and the prophecies of Nostradamus. We also have the prophecies of Edgar Cayce (the resurfacing of Atlantis, even though he placed it in 1968), and the reported vision of George Washington, in which he predicted a final war on the American continent, that would end with divine intervention. The Large Hadron

Collider, a device used to investigate theoretical particle physics, is expected to fundamentally change our understanding of the nature of the universe. Darwinism, the basic underpinning of modernist and postmodernist thought, is about to collapse and leave the scientific community, and much of society, in anarchy. Most of the scientific community does not even know what science is, and does not know that they do not know, and are teaching their ignorance to the public. They are about to find out that they do not know, with the collapse of Darwinism. Many people are looking for the coming of something that they think are "wise and benevolent extraterrestrial aliens" to help us solve our problems. The primary political candidates for President of the United States are apparently not even attempting to act according to truth, but are pretending that truth can be ignored in favor of some other imagined value.

Whether this all might end in the Biblical Second Coming, the hypothetical Rapture, the Resurrection of the Dead and Final Judgment, the Final Rebellion Against God, or something entirely different, is not at all clear to me. I think that those to whom it IS clear are not being objective. But it IS clear to me that the world, God, reality, and the future, are not like most people think they are. There are lots of surprises in store, and they will not be long in coming.

I would like to find a nice sunny spot on the grass next to the creek, and just lie there and forget about all of this. But it keeps coming back, and it won't go away. It is our time now, and we will meet the challenge or not. If we don't, someone else will, but no telling how long it will be if we somehow manage to lose America to the forces of darkness.

## Chapter 21

### The Coming of the Son of Man

*For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. For wheresoever the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together. Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.-- Jesus*

*I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed. I Daniel was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body, and the visions of my head troubled me. I came near unto one of them that stood by, and asked him the truth of all this. So he told me, and made me know the interpretation of the things. These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth. But the saints of the most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever.--Daniel*

Something like a mile-high tsunami is about to strike the modern world, I would think. Everything looks so peaceful and green out on the golf course; the sun is shining, the birds are singing, and the grass is growing. People are going about their business of daily life, just like the Bible says that they never knew what was coming until the Flood came and took them all away. It is easy just to look the other way and pretend everything is

all right. But this is not the case.

We might overhear this conversation in some quarters: America is the basic problem for us to continue to deceive those who we want to continue snoozing so we can destroy them. It still has too much of that pesky thing called human freedom, and uses it to believe in that awful God. This just has to stop.

So we just have to get rid of freedom. We can do this by convincing people that their self-interest is what is important, and truth really doesn't matter as long as they get what they want. So we convince them that people who insist on truth will deprive them of what they want, as for instance others will starve their children by insisting on stopping the growth in federal spending. Once the debate is framed properly, solutions can be proposed that don't work, like spending more money on education rather than solving the real problems with education, whatever they might be. When education continues to decline, then we can claim it is because not enough money is being spent on education, and say that those who try to solve the problem in other ways that don't require vast amounts of more money are trying to keep our children ignorant. This principle can be used in many ways, to get any agenda promoted that we want, as long as people let us frame the debate. We can do this by playing on people's fear and greed, or perhaps other vices. Truth is our enemy; fear and greed are our friends.

We can propose solutions that will not solve the problem, but which will depend on more regulation of human freedom. Gun control is always useful in this area. We can frame the debate as a public safety issue, and use the public shootings that continue to occur as society breaks down to advocate more control of guns so that the public cannot defend itself from criminals. Then when more public shootings result, we can blame the

fact that there are still too many guns, and finally manage to take away all guns. It is important never to present the presence of guns in a positive light. Again, truth is our enemy, and we don't want to acknowledge it, and ridicule it at any opportunity. Just the violence of our rhetoric will go a long way toward discouraging our enemies who might try to use reasonable dialog against us.

Animal rights are quite useful in this area. This subject is just a wealth of source of limitation of human rights, since animal rights must be taken away from human rights. Felony animal cruelty laws are our friends, since almost everyone loves animals and does not want them to be abused. This allows us to progressively take away human rights in a way that humans will approve of, and will not realize what is happening until we accuse *them* of felony animal cruelty for something they did not imagine would be considered animal cruelty, like failing to neuter a pet, which we will get passed into law by this method. Then the accusation, once having been made, can be made to stick by focusing on the terrible act of cruelty to animals instead of the actual nature of the abuse.

Climate change is another treasure trove for this method, as is all of the rights of the environment. Again, the right of the environment to be left in a state of nature is taken away from human rights. We can frame the debate as if anyone who opposes us is for dirty water or for destroying humanity by failure to control human-caused global warming. The truth as to whether there is actually global warming is actually our enemy, and we must make it irrelevant because of the need to make new laws to address the seriousness of the problem. So we get to act to take away human freedom by new laws that limit the ability of industry to provide transportation, food and shelter. And then we say that these laws are not working, and we need stricter ones. If we create enough fear, and are strong enough in our advocacy, people will give in for the sake of peace

even though our position is irrational.--End of overheard conversation.

This is not the wave that is about to overwhelm us. The wave is ultimate reality, which will sweep away all such nonsense and those who accept it. Some of us are riding the wave, and are astounded to see that no one is paying any attention except for the few of us. We are fighting with our own abject terror resulting from seeing what is happening, and trying to maintain our balance on the point of the infinite power of the wave.

Human stupidity is infinite. The reason for that is that we are not in touch with ultimate reality because of the guilt of our desire for our own will rather than that of ultimate reality. That guilt has been removed by reality itself for those who will trust in that reality rather than stupidly insisting on their own way. That is the real meaning of Christianity.

The coming of the Son of Man is what is going to result when human society is finally, irrevocably faced with the fact that there is no hope for humanity in any sense—psychologically, spiritually, emotionally, or physically--outside of the provision that Jesus has made for them.

## Chapter 22

### Exploring Unknown Territory

*Who would Fardles beare  
To grunt and sweat under a weary life,  
But that the dread of something after death,  
The undiscovered Countrey, from whose Borne  
No Traveller returnes, Puzels the will,  
And makes u rather beare those illes we haue,  
Then flye to others that we know not of.--Hamlet*

It is always dangerous to explore unknown territory for the first time, and that is what creationists like myself are doing. We are attempting to find ways of overcoming the spiritual forces behind evolutionism, and we are going deeper into this demonic territory than anyone has gone before. We all may have different methods of dealing with the forces, and some of our methods may seem less effective than others. The supporters of evolutionism will not admit that ANY of our methods have any effectiveness, but that does really not mean anything to us. All that is meaningful is the observation that we are creating opposition. If we were actually not being effective, the evolutionists would be able to ignore us because our methods would not bother them. They would simply be able to explain where we were wrong on a rational basis, and dismiss us by reference to that argument. On the other hand, I continue to explain in detail where *they* are wrong in response to their non-referenced assertions that they have refuted me.

There is a reason that the Flat Earth Theory has no supporters. No one will defend the idea that "the earth is flat" because we can see quite easily that it is not. The supporters of evolution want "life was created" to have the same status; but that is not the case since many people see that creationism is philosophically acceptable. The supporters of evolution are simply philosophical nonparticipants; that is, they do not consider the necessity to provide philosophical justification for their beliefs. They depend on the concept that any argument that they do not accept must be invalid. It does not matter in the least to them why they do not accept it.

Many have been around a long time, and continue in the battle. They have their own methods, and I do not criticize them, since they are helpful. I am sorry that I cannot understand what some creationists are doing, but I don't know much. I also appreciate the others that show up from time to time. I *do* criticize those who compromise with the evolutionists, like the pseudocreationists who try to find common ground with them, and the theistic evolutionists. We do have common ground, but it is in our lack of understanding of reality. The evolutionists just deny that they have a lack of understanding, and consequently they cannot be corrected. Evolution *has* to be the explanation of life on earth, and that is all there is to it for them.

They do not realize that they are in the grip of powerful spiritual forces that are remaining hidden to them. They think they are just being rational, and are comfortable in their understandings, and do not want to become uncomfortable by questioning them. Some are far down the path of being controlled by these forces, and cannot be reached by their own consciences, which almost never bother them.

We can see this demonstrated by the fact that some evolutionists have no trouble whatever ignoring their consciences. This shows that they are completely under the control of their masters, and their personality has been completely subjected to the forces. They can ignore the prompting of their conscience that they are being unfair. The others are being schooled by the forces in being able to ignore conscience, but they are still bothered a little. They cannot deal with the issue properly, however, and think that I should just shut up and stop bothering them. They are to the point in instruction from the forces to where they cannot even recognize that the bothering comes from their own consciences.

This is all very interesting forensically, and I am glad to be able to point it out for your edification. Evolutionism in general depends on the action of these forces enslaving humanity, with the willing cooperation of humans. This is a trap, however, and the time will come when the forces will spring the trap. I am giving you all the chance to escape. It requires leaving your comfortable stupidity, and I have seen little evidence that anyone is willing to do that.

## Chapter 23

### Why We Should Love and Enjoy Atheists

*The God of the Old Testament is arguably the most unpleasant character in all fiction.--*  
Richard Dawkins

Evolutionary biologist Richard Dawkins' book *The God Delusion* provides possibly the most logical reason anyone has ever provided to accept the existence of God. Dawkins is possibly the most personable, intelligent and logical atheist in the world today. This alone is his undoing. If he were less logical, he would be a better defender of atheism. He is also quite dedicated, but it seems he does not exactly know what it is to which he is dedicated.

The flyleaf of the book tells us that Dawkins is Professor of the Public Understanding

of Science at Oxford University. In light of the subject of this book, which has to do with the public understanding of science, Dawkins' views certainly should be considered.

Dawkins' book makes some slight attempt to address the problem of the nonexistence of ultimate reality, but it is not even clear that he is aware what he is doing. He argues that we may be the result of the creation activity of extraterrestrial aliens, but that those aliens were the result of the action of other aliens, and so on back into the infinite past. That means that there is no ultimate reality; there is only infinite regression, and no final authority for anything. However, he never develops this thought, and just goes off on endless tirades about his opinion of the nonexistence of something called "God," which he never seems to actually define. It seems to be the same as "religion" in his *Weltanschauung*, and is represented by the ecclesiastical authorities in the Christian religion. It is not at all clear that what Dawkins calls "God" *does* have any actual existence, since it does not seem that he knows what he means by the term.

It should not be surprising that Dawkins tells us that most distinguished scientists are atheists. For the last 150 years or so since Darwin, materialism has been confused with science, and religious believers have been ridiculed in scientific circles. This is only evidence of the religious prejudices of the scientific community, not evidence of the existence of ultimate reality being a delusion.

Dawkins tries to confuse himself with a statement of the different deities that have been worshiped in human history, and the difficulty of choosing which one might be the right one. Here, as elsewhere, Dawkins shows that he has no concept of God. That which is God is simply that which is ultimate reality. It is not a matter of choosing the right God, is just

a matter of acting according to the authority of ultimate reality.

The God of the Bible does not claim to be one of many Gods among which you can choose; He claims to be the only ultimate reality and the final authority. He claims to be truth, and if you act according to truth you are acting as God requires.

Dawkins makes the mistake of thinking the visible ecclesiastical structure is the real representative of God. This is a common mistake, and many even in the structure make this mistake, so he can be pardoned for this. I deal with this at length in a later chapter.

Dawkins confuses supernaturalism with God. He says he is attacking anything and everything supernatural. Now, as we have seen in previous chapters, "supernatural" is not a meaningful term. Cellular blackberry headsets might be considered supernatural to people who lived when Darwin wrote. So Dawkins again does not define his terms and confuses himself. The supernatural is simply that which we do not now understand. So Dawkins is really saying that anything he doesn't know about doesn't exist.

He brings up the quote from John Adams, "how has it happened that millions of fables, tales, legends, have been blended with both Jewish and Christian revelation that have made them the most bloody religion that ever existed." Perhaps Adams did not know about Islam. However, to ask the question is to answer it; fables have been blended with revelation because of the evil nature of man, who wants religion to serve him, not God. Dawkins cannot see the answer because he does not want to understand the evil nature of man apart from God.

He quotes Nehru, who he claims as an atheist, in the same vein, "the spectacle of what is called religion, or at any rate organized religion...I have frequently condemned.." because he thinks it supports his position. As we have seen and will see, organized religion can be best understood as the Whore mentioned in the book of Revelation. It is unfaithful to God. He is making a valid point, but does not understand that religion really is only an imperfect human response to God, and really has nothing to do with God. Atheism is also an imperfect response to God.

Dawkins goes off on an extended tirade on the probability of God. This is very entertaining. He deals with the arguments for God by Aquinas, and dismisses them. Surprise, surprise. But Aquinas himself made a basic mistake, which Dawkins does not point out. God, if He is actually God (ultimate reality), is not subject to proof. Ultimate reality is that which defines all else. It has to be considered self-evident, and used as the basis for reasoning. It is a fallacy to try to prove or disprove ultimate reality from some supposed higher point. So Dawkins' arguments about probability are meaningless.

Dawkins asserts that scientists are more qualified than theologians to answer deep cosmological questions. He goes on to assert that his opinion on morality should be accepted because God is improbable. He brings up Gould's idea of non-overlapping magisteria (NOMA) and ridicules it. That is, science is about *how*, religion is about *why*. Now Gould's idea is nonsensical, I agree, but not for the reasons Dawkins asserts. Gould really doesn't understand his own position. Gould is saying that ultimate reality does not influence science. Dawkins rightly understands that this is not correct, and that we are in a war for or against human rejection or acceptance of response to God. He just fails to understand that he is necessarily denying reality.

Another entertaining fact is that Dawkins is an honest evolutionist. He understands that the National Center for Science Education (NCSE) are not such, and calls them the "Neville Chamberlain school of evolutionists." Their goal, he says, is to mobilize "sensible" religious opinion of church people who regard creationism as an embarrassment to their faith. They try to sell NOMA—the idea that science is non-threatening, because it is disconnected from the claims of religion. It is true, of course, that most people who accept evolution are Christians or other believers in God. Dawkins wants to convince those religious believers that evolution, and science, requires that there is no God. He does not approve of the NCSE tactic of trying to put believers to sleep and sneak in atheism, calling it "science," convincing the young people of it, and allowing it to become the dominant view in the society before they realize what is happening. The NOMA view is helpful in this, since it confines religion to a private matter that does not matter in public, and allows atheism to dominate public affairs. Dawkins blows their cover.

Dawkins says that believing is not something one can decide to do as an act of will. This is true, but one can decide by an act of will to make the assumption that God must be considered self-evident. This is actually necessary in order to have the concept of truth. There has to be an ultimate reality behind all things in order for anything to actually be true, so the assumption of God makes sense. After a while, one will come to see how this makes so much more sense than starting from the assumption that there is no ultimate reality, and that we can just believe whatever we want.

Another interesting section is his assertion that belief in Darwin is a consciousness-raiser. Here Dawkins takes the idea of the necessity of assuming that something is self-evident, and applies it to Darwinism instead of God. He thinks that because Darwinism

makes sense to him, it must be true; so he can use it to interpret reality and ignore any evidence that indicates that it is false. This is the common viewpoint of the scientific community, and prevents any scrutiny of whether evolution actually happened. As the AAAS says, "there is no serious scientific controversy about *whether* evolution happened, only *how*," as we have seen previously.

Dawkins says that the choices for how we evolved are not chance or design, but natural selection or design. He asserts that the appearance of design is produced by natural selection acting on biological systems. But he conveniently overlooks the fact that chance mutations have to produce the raw material for natural selection to work on. The choices really are chance or design. He never deals with how chance mutations could produce new, more complicated structures for natural selection to select.

He appeals to the power of accumulation of small changes to "climb mount improbable," and ignores that small improbabilities also accumulate to make large ones. This is really not a solution. You have to get up the mountain, whether you do it all at once or a step at a time. There is still no energy source for the climb, just as rocks do not roll uphill a little at a time, or all at once either.

Dawkins performs "thought experiments," in which he imagines small changes accumulating. But thought experiments are not experimental science, especially when they are performed in contradiction to observations, as this one is.

He tells us that it cannot be demonstrated that any complex organ exists which cannot have been formed by successive slight modifications. Many have been proposed, but none have stood up to analysis, he says. What he means is that none have stood up to

faith in Darwinism. No evidence against a proposition considered self-evident can be found by those who consider it self-evident.

He brings up the case of magicians who can perform a trick, and he cannot see how it works. He knows it is a trick, and he does not think it is supernatural, even though he does not understand how it is performed. He does not realize that just because he has an explanation of origins in Darwinism, that does not mean it is valid, just as one might come up with a wrong explanation of the magic trick.

He says that ID is a "lazy default," but so is evolution. Whatever you consider self-evident is a default. We might call our ignorance "ID" or "God", but why is it better to call our ignorance "evolution?"

Dawkins makes the mistake of thinking that truth can exist without ultimate reality. He understands that scientists search for answers to defend against disease. But he does not realize that answers require the existence of an ultimate reality, which is the God he denies.

Dawkins makes the claim that the 19<sup>th</sup> century was the last time an educated person could believe in miracles like the virgin birth. He crows that he has disproved God by saying that God is the "Ultimate 747" who is so improbable that he could not exist. But probability does not even enter the question, because something has to be self-evident, and materialism requires that truth does not exist. Truth is the agreement of a statement with reality, and it requires a mind that knows reality fully to know that a statement agrees with it.

He sees religion as obedience to an authority, no matter how irrational the order to obey may be. He does not see that the denial of authority means that truth itself no longer exists. He just substitutes imperfect human authority for that of ultimate reality, and does not see that such a substitution necessarily denies human freedom, since there is nothing outside of man that can serve as an objective point of reference that people can agree upon. All that is left is human imposition of the will of the most ruthless upon others.

Dawkins is surprised by all of the hatred that atheism brings out of religious people. I have a hard time understanding why he is surprised. He is denying that reality has any meaning, and that people's lives are necessarily without objective meaning. He is further asserting that he is better equipped to tell them the meaning of morality, and good and evil. Now maybe Christian people should be more charitable, I agree, but he is dealing with ultimate issues and not everybody in church is fully, or even partially, free of the human tendency to violence.

He deals with the idea of having good without God. He argues that some people say they would do bad things in the absence of a belief in God, so they are immoral anyway, and the presence or absence of God makes no difference in their morality. Here Dawkins again confuses God with religion. If there is no absolute, final standard of morality from ultimate reality, then what constitutes the standard of morality? Again, he does not understand what he is saying. The existence of an objective standard of morality recognized by almost everyone points to the existence of that objective standard, which is established by God. Dawkins gets close to the truth here about the need for an objective standard, but gets distracted by an extended attempt to dismiss the Bible rather than addressing the issue he has raised.

He complains about those who blame the New Orleans hurricane on the judgment of God. Again, he shows that he does not understand the nature of God as ultimate reality. The hurricane itself may not have been moral judgment, but the destruction caused by the hurricane had a lot to do with physical judgment on the wisdom of building below sea level in an area subject to hurricanes, and on the wisdom of depending on government to provide for you instead of taking personal responsibility. In that sense it can be seen as the judgment of ultimate reality, just like what happens when you drive drunk the wrong way on a busy interstate.

In judging the Bible, Dawkins misses the point that God, not him, decides what is good. He is judging God by what he thinks is a higher standard, and making himself into a rival god. Now he should be free in America to do this, and even to try to convince others that it is a valid idea. But in order to do so, he has abandoned the basis for the existence of truth, so he has abandoned the concept of validity.

Dawkins prefers the modern prejudice over that of the past. He rightly observes that there is a shifting standard of what is morally acceptable. Hitler is abhorred, he says, even though he was mild by the standards of Genghis Kahn. But who accepted the standards of Kahn, even then? And why is abortion kinder than the ministrations of Kahn? Is it better because it is hidden in clinics where the abortionists can hide their love of crushing the skulls of babies of different races? Has Dawkins seen the reports of *current* third world government officials joyful over burning people alive in their churches? Dawkins is living in a world that exists only in his imagination.

Dawkins attempts to answer the charge that his belief in evolution is just another kind

of fundamentalism. He does this by telling the story of a colleague who learned that he was wrong about the existence of the Golgi apparatus in cells, and thanked the person who proved that he was wrong. In like manner, he says, he is open to evidence that would disprove evolution. He quotes the creationist student of S. J. Gould, Kurt Wise, as an example of the reverse, where Wise says that he will be a creationist because of the Bible. However, Dawkins is simply not aware of his prejudice. Belief in evolution is not just a belief in some apparatus in a cell, it is an essential part of an anti-truth worldview. It begins with the assumption that the material is all that can be assumed to exist, and all other ideas must be proved. It assumes that the material is self-evident, and therefore God cannot exist. There can be no ultimate reality, and no truth by which all things are judged, except the truth that the material is all that can be assumed. This is an irrational beginning point, and there is no wonder that it leads to irrational conclusions.

Dawkins hates fundamentalism, but, to his credit, he also hates moderate religion. He says that religious faith does not deserve respect just because it is religious. He denounces the idea that unquestioned faith is a virtue, yet does not question his faith in the principle that the material must account for all reality.

Dawkins doesn't like the idea of people having the presumption of thinking the faith of their birth is the one true faith. Now, of course, I think we Christians could agree with this. Faith needs to be examined to see if it meets the test of truth. But the idea of examining God to see if He exists is invalid. Once you begin to test God, you have abandoned the idea of truth itself, and you are adrift in a sea of meaninglessness.

Dawkins considers "Reconstructionists" or "Dominion Theology" to be the real

extremists in America since they advocate a Christian theocracy. That, of course, includes me. However, I might agree with him about many Reconstructionists. There is a tendency to some severe misunderstandings among Reconstructionists about what God really wants. I think that we *already* have a theocracy in America, we just need to take advantage of it. We have the freedom to interpret the laws based on what is important to us (our ultimate reality, or God) by our vote for our representatives, and our influence on them. We can even submit our own laws by initiative and referendum. The question is, will we go by the desires of the real God, or one of our own making?

What could be called Western science is really based on a falsehood, and Dawkins points it out for us. Aquinas thought that God could be proved by human reason, beginning from a point outside of God. Dawkins begins from that point outside of God, and comes to a conclusion that leads to the inevitable finding that objective morality, reality, truth and science itself do not exist. He, like the rest of the evolutionists living on the unacknowledged capital stored up by Christian thought, is destroying the world, and has no idea whatever what he is doing.

## Chapter 24

### The Identity of the Institutional Church

*The Christian Church is responsible for more mayhem in history than any other institution.* --Richard Dawkins

Religion deals with ultimate issues. Of course, if an issue does not matter to anyone, no one is going to get upset about it. One could also point out that Stalin and Mao were not members of the Christian Church, and they killed tens of millions. Dawkins would no doubt say that they only were able to kill so many because there are now more people on earth, and the Church would have killed more if they had been available when it had power. Dawkins simply explains away the murders of secularism as if they were

irrelevant.

Yet, at the same time, Dawkins has a valid point about the Church. Why is there so much murder, theft, and other kinds of injustice that can be directly attributed to the institutional church?

This reflects a common attitude in modern society. People reject Christianity because its participants seem to be so violent and unwilling to be like Jesus. The actions of Christians speak so loudly that no one can hear what they say, we are told.

We have the phenomenon of groups like the Aryan Nations who claim to be Christian, yet who have been implicated in crimes as a way of life. We have people who bomb abortion clinics because they believe God requires it. We have various Christian Reconstruction groups who want to overthrow the government and replace it with a government based on Biblical law.

And this is just the modern situation. We have ample examples of Christian groups in history killing one another, or killing the unconverted, or coercing conversions to one or the other. We have the Crusades, when large numbers of Christians fought and killed Muslims and even other Christians, and Jews. We have the historical prejudice against the Jews because they are said to be "Christ-killers."

Many people explain the phenomenon by asserting that these people simply are not true Christians. They claim the name, but do not really accept Christianity. I assert that this is a false argument. Many people think that Christianity is a system of rules that one must follow, and very few who call themselves Christians even attempt to follow their

own rules. Many therefore conclude that there is no need to try to follow those rules, and there is no reason to be a Christian. Those that claim the name of Christian are simply fooling themselves, and hoping for pie in the sky by and by. The realist, they assert, accepts that life here and now is all we have, unlike those dreamers.

Christianity is not a system of rules. It is a method of dealing with ultimate reality. Now it is true that many assert that ultimate reality does not exist, and there is no such thing as knowledge, or goodness, or truth. But there is no evidence for this assertion. We all see that there are actual realities, and that we can bump our heads on them. Denial of ultimate reality is not something that even Dawkins wants to assert, even though he toys with it. He does not realize what it means to assert that truth is relative, and depends on the observer. He wants reality, but at the same time wants to deny it if he doesn't like it.

Guilt is real, not imaginary. There is something built into humanity that tells us that others "should" not be killed even if we can do so without consequences, and it is not just our pragmatic need to have others around to help us. There is some authority that is over us. That authority is ultimate reality. We have historically called it "God." It defines our guilt.

Getting rid of our guilt for doing things of which ultimate reality does not approve requires denying ultimate reality. Those things should be quite apparent to everyone who understands reality, and do not require the statement of a "ten commandments." That is why codes of behavior developed in other areas than the desert of the Middle East. Yet the Israelites had the benefit of a personal Presence, and had a better understanding of the requirements of ultimate reality.

Yet, no one could keep the requirements to the extent required by the Perfect Righteousness. Their righteousness was not simply imperfect, it was less than nothing compared to the infinite demand of ultimate reality. This is because of the nature of infinity. Even millions of acts are the same as nothing compared to infinity. They all became guilty, and had to have their guilt removed by a method approved by ultimate reality. That method was looking forward to the sacrifice of ultimate reality on their behalf, to remove their infinite guilt. Only ultimate reality itself could provide a sacrifice acceptable to ultimate reality.

So, as you see, Christianity is simply a method provided by ultimate reality for removing infinite human guilt. It has nothing whatever to do with the worthiness of the object whose guilt is removed. Some atheists may be millions of times better at keeping moral rules than some Christians. But the atheists still have their infinite guilt, because they are trusting in their own righteousness rather than in that provided by ultimate reality. Viewed from infinity, there is no difference between the guilt of the righteous atheist (or the righteous Christian) and that of Hitler. Only the one who trusts in the method provided by ultimate reality has his guilt removed.

Of course, this means that some real stinkers can be Christians. But it also means that outsiders have no valid basis on which to decide who is a Christian. Even INSIDERS have no valid basis for such judgment. It is known only to God, who alone knows ultimate reality. No human knows who has been accepted by God, and who has been excluded.

This brings us to the real identity of the institutional church. There is no institution on earth that can claim the authority of God, unless it always acts according to ultimate

reality. I don't think there is any such institution. The institutional church is necessarily NOT the real church, because it always fall short of the demands of ultimate reality. Human obedience is always incomplete, just like human understanding of the infinity of reality is always necessarily incomplete.

That is why the church is responsible for so much evil. It is a human institution made in response to ultimate reality, and is subject to human vanity, jealousy, lust, and greed. It deals with issues that are important to people, and people are going to disagree about those issues because they react based on their vanity, jealousy, lust and greed rather than according to ultimate reality.

At the same time, we need to realize that our stupidity is infinite. We need the company of others who are struggling with their limited and sinful nature like ourselves if we are all held together by a belief in truth. But we have to all believe in truth, and that it is relevant and must be sought. This is not a characteristic of the institutional church. But there CAN be groups formed for which it IS a characteristic, and those groups DO exist in the form of churches.

## Chapter 25

### How to Believe in God

*Such secrets have been revealed to me that all I have written now appears of little value.*--last words of Thomas Aquinas

God is not subject to proof. He has to be considered self-evident. Failure to understand this is failure to understand the concept of God. An amazing number of people, even Christians, do not seem to grasp this simple concept. God, as Einstein understood, at the very least, was that which is ultimate reality. Einstein may not have understood that ultimate reality was personal, but he did at least realize that ultimate reality absolutely **MUST** exist in order to have the concept of knowledge. Many do not realize that. Most atheists do not have even the slightest idea what they are doing when they deny the existence of God. They have simply made it impossible for knowledge to exist.

Many agnostics say they would like to believe in God, or even that they once believed in God, but could no longer do so after they grew up and became exposed to new ideas. They abandoned their Biblical faith, and now are so skeptical that they cannot get it back even if they wanted to do so.

I am glad to point out to such people that there is a method for getting their faith back, or of establishing it if they never had it. If they are believers in evolution, all they have to do is apply the same method that they use for believing in evolution to God and the Bible.

There is also the advantage that the method can logically be applied to *God*, whereas the application of the method to evolution is irrational and unjustified. This is not immediately apparent, but I will attempt to explain in as much detail as possible.

Many people are looking for evidence to prove the existence of the supernatural, and *God*, and life after death, but cannot find any that they consider convincing. I would assert that this is not a defect of the evidence, but a failure of the philosophical ability of the seeker.

In order to have the concept that anything is true, we have to assume ultimate reality exists. Some assert that it does not, and we cannot be sure of anything. But the success of science itself to provide us so many useful items and procedures shows us that ultimate reality really does exist, because we can discover reality by assuming that reality has meaning, and acting on that belief.

## Chapter 26

### God as Oprah

*This book has the potential to do for our generation what John Bunyan's 'Pilgrim's Progress' did for his. It's that good!* --Eugene Peterson, Professor Emeritus of Spiritual Theology

A new fiction book has come out in contemporary Christian circles, which is billed as the *Pilgrim's Progress* for our generation. It is titled *The Shack* and it makes an attempt to grapple with many of the issues in theology, and present them in an understandable way.

It reminds me of an old joke that made the rounds in the sixties. It seems that some Southern Baptist ministers in an airplane chased down an angel, and asked him what God is like. He said, "she is black." Now that viewpoint has become so common that an author claims that it helps him present the idea of the Trinity in a way acceptable to the modern mind.

The book deals with deep issues, in that it deals with suffering and forgiveness toward those who have wronged us deeply. But its solutions are from Oprah, not from the Bible. It is not for nothing that he presents God the Father as a black woman, and also the Holy Spirit as a woman. We must forgive others who have wronged us, the Bible tells us. The hero struggles to forgive the man who has abducted, tortured, and killed his young daughter. Failure to forgive such people results in our own slavery to our bitterness.

The book has a theophany, as a judge who appears as a woman, again, arguing with the hero that God does not want any of her children to go to hell, no matter what they have done, so he shouldn't either. While this is no doubt true, we never actually get down to grappling with the issue of whether there is a hell, and what its meaning might be. She encourages him to judge the offender, and he finally has to admit that he would not want the offender to go to hell if he were in the place of God.

The book gets close to the real issue, but wimps out in Oprah-esque fashion rather than going on to the obvious conclusion. When we stand before God in the Judgment, we will be our own judge. God will explain the issue to us in excruciating detail, and we will agree that we do not deserve to be in the presence of God, and indeed that we do not *want* to be in the presence of God. We who have spent our lives effectively denying God will prefer hell because of the sheer terror of being in God's presence clothed only in our own righteousness, when we see Him as He is. God does not send anyone to hell; they choose it. Hell will be comforting compared to the terror one feels in the direct presence of God clothed in our unremitted guilt. Only those who trust in the sacrifice that God Himself, as the Son, made to provide a perfect righteousness for us will be able to stand before God.

God is not a comfortable old black woman, and it does not help understanding to picture Him as one. The author gets the concept right that God is not what we expect, but then he keeps coming back to the same limited metaphor. God is wholly other than what we expect, and is more of a terror than a comfort, especially to those who get too comfortable and familiar with Him. That is why He is not portrayed in the Bible as a woman, except in the most indirect manner.

What does this mean to us in the modern world? We now have come to expect women to rule over men, and to be the highest authority. We have women who are CEOs of companies, and will possibly have one as president. We have women who are bishops of the Episcopal Church, and women rule in other denominations. We have women in high positions over men in the military.

The issue is one of struggle for dominance. Men have always asserted their authority over women, and now the concept of their authority has been destroyed because they do not have any rational reason to assert that authority. Women have shown that they can be the equal of men in intelligence and ability, so it is irrational to suppress them just because they are women. Human freedom dictates that they *must* be allowed to do whatever men can do.

This is the natural result of the denial of the relevance of God as Ultimate Reality. The imposition of male oppression of women was the result of the Fall, and was an active evil. The male authority has now been rejected, because it only rested on force, not on rational authority. Now that that force has been shown to be invalid, women are released from the force that men imposed upon them.

Yet, this is only a temporary condition. Having rejected Biblical authority, most women see no need to be under the headship of men, just as most men do not see the need to be under the headship of God. Women's liberation can be a good thing, if it leads one to use her freedom wisely. Rejection of male headship is really a rejection of God by women, just as men have rejected God's headship. Neither sex has preeminence in being right. The problem is one of failing to acknowledge ultimate reality. Men are under God's

authority, and women in some sense are under the headship of men, as the Bible tells us. God named Adam, but Adam named Woman. This is a liberating thing for women, not a burden. Women need to be free to reject God's demands on their lives, just as men are free to reject God, in order to freely accept Him.

Pretending to be in charge in the place of God is not a wise use of freedom, either for men or women. God is the final authority, and His word must be considered self-evidently true. People must honestly seek what Ultimate Reality requires, or they are like the drunk who drives the wrong way on a busy interstate.

## Chapter 27

### Forgiving for Others

*But if any man hate his neighbour, and lie in wait for him, and rise up against him, and smite him mortally that he die, and fleeth into one of these cities: Then the elders of his city shall send and fetch him thence, and deliver him into the hand of the avenger of blood, that he may die. Thine eye shall not pity him, but thou shalt put away the guilt of innocent blood from Israel, that it may go well with thee.--Jesus*

It was recently reported in the news that the Khmer Rouge executioner Buch has become a Christian. He was responsible for the deaths of thousands in the killing fields of Cambodia. He appears to be sincerely repentant for his crimes, and has been trying with all his heart to make amends as he can.

Some have been arguing that, since this is the case, he should be forgiven and not subjected to the death penalty. On the face of it, this appears to be a reasonable idea. Since Christians are forgiven, they should not condemn anyone.

However, there are others who are not forgiving Buch, but want him to be executed for his crimes. This brings up an interesting conundrum. How can you forgive someone for others? Since some of his victims forgive him, does this mean that those who do not forgive him should have that solution forced on them? This is not a matter of simple forgiveness; it is a matter of human freedom.

Those who do not forgive him must be allowed not to forgive. They have the inherent human right to demand justice. The failure of the government to execute Buch is a denial of that justice; it is not Christian mercy.

The good that Buch is doing encourages those who support him to continue to try to save him, so he can continue to do good. Now, of course, if all of the relatives of his victims forgave him, they would have a case for denying his execution, since they would not be imposing injustice on anyone living. But his direct victims cannot speak, so even in this case, the forgiveness is imposed on others. The tender mercies of the wicked are cruel.

## Dealing with Guilt Inappropriately

*When they heard these things, they were cut to the heart, and they gnashed on him with their teeth. But he, being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up stedfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God, And said, Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God. Then they cried out with a loud voice, and stopped their ears, and ran upon him with one accord, And cast him out of the city, and stoned him: and the witnesses laid down their clothes at a young man's feet, whose name was Saul. And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. And he kneeled down, and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this, he fell asleep.--The Beloved Physician*

In the creation-evolution debate, as in other instances in the modern world like that of imposing forgiveness on others, we often see that guilt is dealt with in a manner that is not appropriate. This is because humans try to deal with guilt most often by denying that they have it. The burden of guilt is really too heavy to bear, and it must be displaced in some way for humans to retain any mental health at all.

We see this often in history, where when one was confronted with his guilt on an issue, he destroyed those who pointed out his guilt. The most blatant example might be Jesus Christ. He pointed out the guilt of the Pharisees, and rather than accepting their guilt and dealing with it in an appropriate manner, they had him crucified.

Various kings and emperors, as well as prominent churchmen, often did the same to those who pointed out their guilt in various manners. An exception was King David, who repented when the prophet Nathan confronted him with his sin in the matter of Uriah the Hittite.

The human tendency is to deny that one has guilt, and that involves removing the accuser if one has the power. The appropriate response is to accept the guilt, if it is valid, and ask God for forgiveness. This, of course, puts the atheist in an impossible position. If there is no identifiable party of whom to ask forgiveness, perhaps because the ruler has put someone to death, or if the identifiable party will not forgive, the guilt remains once accepted.

God has solved this problem for the one who trusts in Him. The guilt of human sins has been atoned for by God's infinite sacrifice of Himself for those sins. This atonement, however, only extends to those who will trust in that sacrifice rather than their own righteousness. One who insists on her own righteousness has no atonement for her sins, and bears her guilt before objective reality. She can therefore only deal with it by denial, and restricting the freedom of expression of others who might point out her guilt to her if she has power over them.

## Targeting the Distant Future

*And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away.--John*

Really, I don't expect much attention for what I am writing here. Even my own wife thinks the whole subject is boring. No one who is reviewing for me is reading my manuscript with rapt attention.

But this is not why I am writing. Christians in China and Laos and Saudi Arabia, and any of those who stand up for the principle of the existence of objective truth and the authority of that truth around the world, are being actively suppressed. Many humble people who understand what I am presenting here are being beaten, imprisoned in conditions of unspeakable filth, and killed. Why should I expect that the general public would eagerly embrace what I have to say, or even pay it any attention?

I don't expect it. I am just glad that we live in America, and that ideas, no matter how far out of the currently fashionable mainstream, are not exposed to suppression by

torture and murder. The relevance of truth is not in the mainstream, and really has never been in the history of the world.

But I have hopes that this will change, and my hopes are not simply vain wishes. They are found in the Biblical text, which tells us of a day when Christ will rule on earth, and that day will never end. I think we are seeing the first glimmers of the dawning of that day. Times are hard, and may become much harder.

But I am writing for the distant future, when scholars will look back at the writings of the current residents of the earth for information on how humans could have been caught up in so many things that were so obviously wrong. And it is then that my writings will be seen for what they are, and they will be understood and embraced.

There are so many things to understand, and I know that I am overlooking vast amounts of knowledge. But many think that they have the world nailed down, and do not realize how limited human knowledge actually is. The limitations are actually infinite. This is the key to understanding the human condition.

## Final Summary

There are certain points that need to be recapitulated from the text. Some people say you should tell people what you are going to say, then say it, and then tell them what you said. I hope this repetition is not too monotonous.

First, the nature of knowledge in Western society has taken a philosophically invalid turn hundreds of years ago, and has resulted in the crisis in which we now find ourselves. Aquinas and others have attempted to prove the existence of God by rational arguments and evidence. While this may seem to be a worthwhile endeavor, it results in destroying the concept of truth, because a point outside of ultimate reality is used as a reference point for judging that reality. Ultimate reality, God, has to be the reference point, and cannot be subject to proof without making knowledge irrational.

Science is found to have been captured by the idea that there is no evidence of God, so there is no God that is relevant to the world. God may have created, but His action cannot be detected and we have to consider it self-evident that our origin has taken place by evolutionary natural processes. This has taken us to the point that many believe that there is no objective authority that is relevant to all, which is the same as saying that there is no authority to truth, and pluralism is the only rational value.

The scientific method has been personified by society so that something called "science" is thought to exist which can give us a final answer to our origin; namely, that we came from less intelligent creatures by natural processes. This is equivalent to the ancient pagans carving a god out of a tree trunk and asking it to provide answers about their origin and destiny.

This concept of science is invalid because it leads to the peculiar idea that science MUST assume that evolution is the manner in which humans originated since it is the only way that can be understood to occur in a natural manner, and does not resort to supernaturalism. Consequently, no evidence against evolution can exist in this faulty view of science, since it would allow supernaturalism. All evidence against evolution, no matter how convincing, must be ignored. It should be plain that this is not science, it is a simple attempt to redefine reality so that humans can think they understand it. This means that evolution is not a valid concept in science. One cannot prove that humans evolved by interpreting all data as if humans evolved, and that is what is being done.

UFOs and Bigfoot are investigated, but nothing is ever found. People have sightings of objects and beings, but nothing is ever learned about their nature. The reason for this is that people are using the Western view of knowledge instead of the true view of knowledge based on assuming the self-evident nature of God.

Much is made of the statement that we do not live in a "demon-haunted world." All that can be said is that we DO live in a world that is haunted by unknown beings; we just call them Sasquatch or ET. Our view of reality is breaking down, and unless we reject our basic error of failing to base knowledge on ultimate reality others will take our place, like the Muslims who do not make the Western philosophical mistake.

But the Muslims are not our natural successors. They are only the natural successors of those who make the Western mistake. Christian theology does NOT make the Western mistake; it assumes God as self-evident, and allows us to escape the bondage to guilt by acceptance of God's sacrifice of Himself on behalf of us so that we can stand before

Him without judicial guilt if we trust in that sacrifice and not our own righteousness.

Humans become free of their judicial guilt before reality, and each individual is free to provide solutions to problems without the necessity to assuage guilt by inappropriate actions, like committing virtual suicide in what is likely to be a meaningless attempt to save the planet from human spoilage, or by turning our nation over to radical Islam and Sharia. Free humans no longer have to depend on submission to the dictates of a totalitarian state to free them from guilt. The Son has set us free.

Individuals are the ones to solve problems, not government. There is no material entity that can solve problems other than individuals in their manifestation of God Himself. God has chosen to rule through individuals, not through humans in the mass. This is because God is personal and deals with each of us on a personal level. One is given the solution to one problem that he is intimately associated with, and others are given the answers to other problems. I see the answer to the error that is being made by society in the narrow but far-reaching case of mistaking idolatry for science; others can see other solutions. We all must express the will of God in giving those solutions to humanity.

## Appendix 1

### Discussions

I have had various discussions with evolutionists over the last few years, and did not include them in the body of the text because they are often too upsetting to people. But they may be of interest to some, so I include certain selected conversations here, with the names changed. I assure you that these are real opinions, and show the thinking behind evolution and atheism. That is the advantage of the internet; one can find out what people really think without having to wade through decorum and civility.

MATERIALIST: Now Science cannot have omnipotent deities running amok throughout the method because an omnipotent deity acting upon the method would make it invalid, but Richard Lewontin said it better when he reviewed Sagan's "Demon Haunted World":-  
*To appeal to an omnipotent deity is to allow that at any moment the regularities of nature may be ruptured, that miracles may happen.*

UF0: Gosh, this is hilarious. Science is a method, not a superpowerful entity that can dictate conditions to omnipotent deities. People can use the method by ignoring the existence of omnipotent deities and assuming that they do not act, but that does not affect the omnipotent deities' action in any way, it just assures that the people will not be able to objectively

investigate.

MATERIALIST: Right there Lewinton explains why Science cannot address UFO's and Bigfoot as manifestations of an omnipotent deity as you would have us believe with your own assumption. Right there Lewotin explains why a method that has served humanity well for all these years cannot work if it is to be accepted that UFO's and Bigfoot are manifestations of an omnipotent deity.

UFO: Lewontin's statement is technically correct; you, and he, just misunderstand how. Objective natural science cannot say that God is responsible for a phenomenon because natural science does not deal with God. When you are using the method of natural science, you cannot invoke God. That in no way means that God cannot be producing phenomena. The method of natural science just does not deal with Him. It has to look the other way because it is incompetent. In the same way, it cannot come to the conclusion that He is not acting. That is where you and Lewontin make your mistake. You think that science can exclude God.

UFO: FX, it is easy to make disastrous mistakes here, and you are making them. It is quite easy to understand, because most scientists make the same mistakes, because they do not comprehend philosophy and consider it a waste of time.

FX: Fundie, Science is a method that applies general basic elements, and at least one of these elements would be invalid

if an omnipotent deity were involved. Can't figure it out yet?

UF0: No, FX, you are the one who can't figure it out. A method cannot exclude any solution and still be valid. Excluding a possible solution destroys objectivity. The problem is quite subtle. It could be stated this way: Science depends on a phenomenon operating according to fixed laws so that the phenomenon can be investigated by science. Now if a phenomenon does not operate according to fixed laws, like the UFO phenomenon, it cannot be investigated adequately by science. Science is simply incompetent in the area. The method does not work if the phenomenon is not predictable. God is not limited by fixed laws, and science cannot deal with Him. However, the universe generally does work according to fixed laws, and that is why science works in most situations. You are confusing the basic method with knowledge itself. Science, as knowledge, can deal with God. It is just the method of Baconian science that cannot deal with God.

FX: Yes, the method can operate quite well without the intervention of an omnipotent deity, but what would be invalid within the method if an omnipotent deity were assumed to be acting?

UF0: FX, natural science does not deal with God. It cannot assume He is acting or that He isn't. You are creating a problem that does not exist except in your own mind.

FX: You appear to be saying that Lewontin doesn't understand how to apply the method but it's simple really, and all he is doing is making sure that the method is applied correctly.

UF0: No, Lewontin is mistaking materialism for science. He is also confusing the method of science with knowledge itself, in order to pretend that God can be excluded from knowledge. God is excluded from the method, in a sense, in that He can be neither assumed or denied. It is materialism that denies God, not science.

FX: There is a reason why unexplained phenomena cannot be assumed to be the work of an omnipotent deity.

Do you know why?

UF0: Yes, for the same reason it cannot be assumed to NOT be the work of an omnipotent deity. Natural science does not make any assumptions whatever about God.

FX: Science does not exclude God, it just doesn't use God.

UF0: This is correct as far as it goes. You seem to almost understand, but not quite.

FX: If Science used God do you know what would be invalid when applying it?

UF0: "Science" has a double meaning, both as a method and a body of knowledge. The natural science method cannot use God as

an explanation of phenomena, since God is not "natural." Science, as knowledge, can include knowledge about God.

FX: Think about it Fundie, there is a very basic element within the method that needs to be achieved, and without it the whole process would fall apart.

God cannot be used in Science because God is ...

UF0: We are getting to your basic misunderstanding. You think the method called "science" would fall apart if God acts. You think you are defending science from ignorance. Actually, FX, you are using a misunderstanding of science to defend ignorance. You don't want to know that God acts, so you make materialist assumptions that God does not act. That is why you and the AAAS think there is no evidence against evolution. You don't want to know answers if they are not materialist.

FX: If you can finish that sentence correctly you will understand why the method that has served mankind so well would disintegrate, not because of the existence of God, but because of the assumption of God.

UF0: The scientific method makes no assumptions about God. You are mistaking materialism for science, since you think the scientific method assumes that God does not act. Assuming that God does not act is just as disastrous for science (knowledge) as assuming that He is acting to produce a phenomenon, and it cannot be investigated.

UFO: Human ignorance is infinite. No matter how much we learn, there will always be an infinite amount we do not know. This is true for the entire knowledge of the human race, and far more for any individual. The entire knowledge of the human race is not available to anyone, because one mind cannot hold it. Vast amounts of knowledge are being forgotten each day as people who know it forget it or die. No one misses it because it is thought to be "not important in the modern world."

UFO investigations operate on an assumption that science fiction interstellar travel can be possible. This is a myth with no scientific evidence to support it. Physics tells us that nothing can go faster than light, and the energy needed to reach 90% of the speed of light with a ship the size of the space shuttle requires all of the current power output of the United States sustained for 351 years, then that much energy AGAIN at the destination to slow down and stop. There would be no calling Starfleet Command on earth. The crew would be alone as no one had ever been alone, and completely on their own. These creatures are not from the stars. If they are, the method of science does not give us useful information about reality.

BB: ...What a sad, pathetic little man you are, Ed. Your wife must be so proud of you, and the way you serve your God. What a sterling example of the Christian ethic you display with your cavalier devotion to Truth."

UF0: Why, thanks for your comments, BB. You increase my credibility by showing how irrational your viewpoint is. You know that these posts reproduced earlier are verbatim reproductions, except for hiding the identity of my opponent. The problem is that there can be no truth in materialism, so you can accuse me of lying all you want, since all there can be in materialism is human opinion, because there is no God to establish truth. In your worldview, there is no truth, so there can be no lies. As Goebbels said, "truth is the greatest enemy of the state." The logical end of materialism is totalitarianism, since the only "truth" that can exist is that of the human with the most power and the most ruthlessness. You are demonstrating that by attempting to intimidate others into accepting your view of what is true.

BB: Truly amusing Ed, and pathetic. You have freely acknowledged that there is not, and cannot be, any objective evidence for the existence of God; you have also claimed that that same objectively unprovable, unknowable God is the source of Objective Truth; and now here you are claiming that only God can establish truth. You are making no sense, Ed. What you are saying is illogical and irrational. The Emperor is naked in the middle of the street, Ed.

UF0: Actually, BB, I have admitted there can be no evidence of God if you first assume materialism is true and interpret all data by that assumption. There can be no truth without God because the only thing that is left is human opinion enforced

by ruthlessness. The biggest gorilla in the jungle gets to establish his opinion as truth by killing his opponents. There is no right or wrong about any question that can be the same for everyone without God.

---

P1: Since there are many religions and they do not have the same concept of God I would say that is pretty objective. Why is your God better than other religion's God?

Creationist: Because God provides a foundation for objectivity. What grounds your belief in objectivity?

UF0: I would say that P1 does not accept the need for any opinion to be philosophically grounded in objectivity. He thinks that his opinion about God and evolution should be accepted by everyone, by force if necessary. So the only objective grounding for P1 is force of arms. That is how evolutionism depends on destroying human freedom, and resorting to the threat of force. That is why such people want to impose evolution and atheism by court decisions that have the force of the government and imprisonment behind them, not by democratic methods (as we have seen in the Dover decision on intelligent design not being allowed in public school). They know that they would lose in a democratic forum.

P1: I am asking the moderator to stop this sort of harassment.

I have never nor will I ever threaten anyone with any physical violence. Such claims from someone who can be shown to have threatened violence is libel and should not be permissible. I request an apology from Ed for these unfounded statements.

UF0: P1, you are resorting to an appeal to censorship in order to avoid facing the fact that you have no foundation for objectivity. You see, you are proving my point. You are depending on FORCE to enforce your viewpoint. This is the strategy of petty tyrants everywhere. You are just not aware of the problem. I am pointing it out to you, and your conscience bothers you because you know at a subconscious level that I am right. The solution is to CHANGE YOUR VIEWPOINT, not to silence me. You can silence me, but your problem continues.

---

UF0: So here GR refuses to discuss, and again resorts to calling me a tyrant, in spite of my request to put aside the name-calling and irrationality. GR, do you no longer say that people SHOULD accept evolution? What grounds that opinion in objectivity? Even if it is only advice, what grounds that advice in objectivity? See, there is nothing backing up that opinion except opinion. I am giving you an opportunity to explain yourself, and in the process, I am showing you that you have no authority to impose your opinion on others in any way.

MM: Who is imposing on who? Is science insisting on evolution being taught in the churches? No. Are creationists insisting on teaching religion in the science class room? Yes.

UF0: It is PEOPLE, not science, who are insisting that creationism should not be taught in science class, even though it is a vast controversy in the modern world that affects science. These people are simply denying others the right to speak, and students the right to learn.

MM: As usual, you accuse others of your own faults.

UF0: Creationists are insisting on teaching the controversy so students can be informed. They are not DENYING anyone the right to present evolution. Evolutionists are using the courts to deny free speech because it is not approved by them, in spite of what the majority wants.

---

UF0: You have no authority behind your opinion that can be meaningful to others. There has to be a shared authority that both parties recognize in order to have a democratic exchange of ideas.

MM: LOL And what is the shared authority that you offer? Your god? The bible?

UF0: Yes. God, as Ultimate Reality, and His word the Bible, is the shared authority that makes democracy possible, because all can look to Him for the foundation for morality and science. Without Him, truth does not exist, and humans can do whatever they can get away with. We have anarchy, followed by the imposition of the will of whoever gets the upper hand by force.

MM: Sorry ed, but by your wacky standards that ignore evidence

and facts (conveniently, since you have neither) you have no objective authority. I, and many others, do not recognize your god or your bible.

UF0: You can deny the existence of objective authority if you like, but you can therefore claim none. Your opinion becomes only as good as what you can enforce by overcoming others.

MM: You really need to think your arguments through before you go spouting off.

UF0: So what is this objective authority that requires creationists to accept evolution? You never asserted one.

---

UF0: Otherwise, one has to depend on force or deceit to impose his viewpoint.

MM: As you do.

UF0: No, I have an objective authority that applies to both of us. It is not removed just because you don't want to see it.

---

UF0: Creationists are trying to get you to see that there is a common authority, and it means that evolution is necessarily false.

MM: Likewise, science is trying to get you to see that there is a common authority called facts and evidence, and they show that your god and bible are necessarily false.

UF0: Facts and evidence have no authority. This is because data have to be interpreted by a mind, and that mind uses presuppositions to interpret those data to make facts and evidence. You are looking at the world through a presuppositional blindfold, and it is so much a part of you that you are not aware of it. It makes you unable to see evidence against evolution.

MM: See how that works ed? Your faulty logic proves nothing.

UF0: I agree that it proves nothing to one until one takes off his presuppositional blindfold.

---

UF0: Evolutionists have to resort to a nonexistent authority that only they recognize,

MM: You just described the authority you place in god and the bible. God is nonexistent and only creationists recognize the bible.

UF0: Yes, this is your presuppositional blindfold. God is simply the reality that is ultimate. If you say ultimate reality does not exist, then no one has any reason to pay any attention to anything else you say, because you are living in an imaginary world.

---

UF0: Where is your objective authority? Where is your "shared

authority that both parties recognize"? Facts and evidence are interpreted differently according to the presuppositions used.

MM: Really ed, you really need to think before you type.

UF0: You did not answer the question. What is the authority that logically requires that creationists must accept evolution?

---

UF0: Evolutionists are all asserting an authority that does not apply to everyone and are astounded when it is not accepted. They simply do not see the problem. I am doing my best to help you all accept reality, but I am not optimistic about it.

MM: LOL I would not be optimistic either if I was trying to force others to accept the authority of a nonexistent being.

UF0: I am simply trying to show you that facts and evidence have no authority, if they are not interpreted according to objective presuppositions. You are interpreting them according the abandoned positivist philosophy, that nothing is valid unless it can be verified empirically. This is obviously false, since that statement itself cannot be verified empirically. If you want to deny the existence of ultimate reality, you need to be free to do so. I just hope the crash is survivable for you.

Remember, the question is "what grounds opinion in objectivity?" On what basis are you saying that creationism

---

should not be taught in science class? You are not dealing with the issue. What gives that opinion authority? It is FORCE, imposing the idea on a MAJORITY who do not agree with it by using the power of government undemocratically in the courts to threaten imprisonment or fines. It is a denial of human freedom of thought and expression. There is no objective basis for the authority, only who gets the upper hand at the time.

---

UF0: Thanks for your comments. They help me show your errors again. See, you are attempting to impose your authority on my freedom of speech, by making the accusation that I am a fanatic who does not accept any authority. This is another accusation of me being a criminal, not unlike the others you have made. It is not true. I simply do not accept ILLEGITIMATE authority like what you are attempting to impose on creationists. Your asserted authority is a simple violation of the first amendment, which prohibits laws against people speaking freely. The Dover decision is such a legal limit on freedom of speech, and violates the Constitution. It is not seen as such because of the unending confusion raised by people like you. I am glad to have this opportunity to help dispel that confusion.

MM: I dont really care if you accept any authority. Thankfully we have laws in the US and Canada to protect me from fanatics like you.

UF0: The law works slowly, but it will self-correct. Your attempt to seize power over others in the Dover decision will ultimately fail due to the efforts of those who work for human

---

freedom.

MM: In fact, I am proud that I spent 6 years protecting my country from people who do not recognize any authority other than their own dogma.

UF0: Too bad you didn't learn how to protect the country from yourself.

MM: Oddly enough, I still find myself protecting the educational system from people who would force their beliefs on others.

UF0: You are protecting your viewpoint, not the educational system. You are intending to keep public school students ignorant of the creation-evolution controversy in order to protect your materialist worldview, which you incorrectly call "science."

MM: So ed, I have no doubt that you do not recognize any authority that does not support your our dogma. But democracy protects us from people like you.

UF0: You have not asserted any authority that I COULD recognize. You say that facts and evidence are your authority, but things like fossils do not have any authority. Authority must be capable of speaking in a way that humans can comprehend. Fossils do not have a voice; someone must speak for them. What objective grounding do you have to speak for them?

---

You have not given any.

You are not using democracy. You are asserting that you have authority, but it does not exist. What is the objective grounding of your authority? You have none except the force of court decisions like Dover, that impose solutions on people who do not want them.

MM: I also noticed that you failed to address any comments I made in the previous post.

UF0: Be patient. I will get around to them for you.

MM: What is your objective authority? What shared authority do you have?

UF0: Again, as I have said so many times, my authority is objective reality, which is actually God. If you do not recognize objective reality, you are simply trying to live in a world that does not exist.

MM: Have no fear, I really do not expect you to address any comments that show you are wrong.

UF0: Well, I really can't do so, because none of your comments show that I am wrong. To do that, you would have to have an objective grounding for your opinion, and you show that you do not.

---

Enough of this. You undoubtedly get the point. I am trying to overcome these people, not reason with them. We have no common ground for an agreement, since they base their worldview on rejection of ultimate reality, and assert human opinion as the final authority. No doubt this could be done better, and maybe the reader will see how to avoid the errors I am making without making new ones or returning to old ones, just as I have avoided some of the errors of those who came before me.

# Index

## Alphabetical Index

aliens.....	3, 5, 7, 16, 39, 45, 48, 52, 58, 89, 90, 91, 93, 129, 137, 145
American Association for the Advancement of Science.....	80
assuming the truth of evolution.....	83
Baconian science.....	72, 177
Bigfoot.....	2, 3, 44, 45, 52, 53, 89, 90, 94, 95, 175
Christianity.....	6, 13, 34, 37, 56, 63, 68, 70, 71, 74, 75, 76, 104, 105, 109, 111, 112, 113, 116, 130, 156, 157, 158
common descent.....	5, 60, 64, 76, 98, 108
contactee.....	23
dating rocks.....	69
Dawkins.....	32, 39, 65, 102, 116, 128, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157
democracy.....	9, 112, 185, 190
evidence for creation.....	11, 35, 107
evolution has no authority in science.....	100
evolutionist.....	9, 38, 58, 70, 72, 73, 130, 131, 142, 143, 148, 155, 174, 184, 186, 187
extraterrestrial.....	2, 3, 7, 8, 18, 21, 22, 49, 50, 51, 52, 61, 89, 92, 93, 129, 137, 145
Ezekiel.....	19, 20, 52, 89
Gould.....	12, 115, 148, 153
human freedom.....	12, 97, 98, 102, 112, 114, 139, 140, 151, 166, 182, 188, 189
idolatry.....	75
intelligent design.....	13, 32, 60, 62, 63, 64, 86, 108, 183
irrational.....	11, 25, 27, 38, 59, 62, 78, 92, 99, 116, 140, 151, 154, 161, 164, 181, 183
Israel.....	20, 22, 23, 52, 93, 95, 158
Laetoli prints.....	31, 35, 83
like a fussy baby.....	37
materialist mythology.....	7, 21, 22, 23
no evidence against evolution.....	80, 100, 107, 179
objective truth.....	5, 6, 12, 13, 14, 15, 26, 27, 32, 37, 46, 58, 63, 74, 86, 87, 88, 97, 99, 101, 103, 108, 109, 110, 135, 169, 181
paganism.....	71, 75
postmodern.....	5, 12, 13, 46, 61, 76, 100, 101, 103, 120, 136
prejudices.....	31, 40, 42, 74, 117, 146
relativity.....	6, 67, 68
religion.....	3, 6, 11, 13, 27, 40, 42, 52, 72, 74, 81, 86, 90, 102, 103, 105, 111, 112, 114, 117, 120, 121, 123, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 146, 147, 148, 149, 151, 152, 154, 156, 182, 184
science fiction.....	2, 7, 39, 57, 129, 180
self-evident.....	11, 13, 14, 31, 37, 76, 98, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 115, 116, 148, 149, 150, 151, 153, 160, 165
Sitchin.....	18, 19, 39, 89
spiritual.....	11, 13, 45, 70, 93, 115, 116, 126, 142, 143

supernatural.....7, 11, 12, 14, 21, 26, 30, 31, 43, 49, 53, 55, 56, 57, 61, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 78, 79, 84, 85, 86, 89, 90, 91, 93, 105, 128, 129, 147, 150, 161  
supernatural does not act.....7, 12, 43, 49, 53, 71, 72, 75, 78, 84, 90, 91, 93, 105  
technology.....18, 23, 55, 56, 87, 88, 90, 91, 97  
theistic evolution.....13, 105, 129  
theocracy.....75, 154  
UFO abduction.....2, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 44, 89, 93, 94, 95  
ultimate reality.2, 4, 5, 6, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 36, 39, 45, 99, 117, 127, 134, 141, 145, 146, 148, 149, 151, 152, 153, 154, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 164, 165, 185, 187, 188, 191  
worldview. .3, 12, 13, 14, 21, 30, 38, 42, 47, 66, 72, 84, 85, 86, 90, 96, 97, 105, 124, 129, 153, 190, 191  
Zeta Reticuli.....18, 38, 66