

**THE
FALL OF
FALSEHOODS**

BY
GEORGE P. STAVROPOULOS

ATHENS
2007

+ +

+

+ +

+

+ +

+

THE FALL FALSEHOODS

+ +

+

+ +

+

+ +

+

+ +

+

THE FALL OF FALSEHOODS

BY

GEORGE P. STAVROPOULOS

B. Sc., M. Sc., D.I.C., Ph. D.

ATHENS
2007

+ +

+

+ +

+

© 2006, 2007 by George P. Stavropoulos
ISBN: 978-960-85044-4-8

All rights reserved. No parts of this book may be copied or reproduced in any form by any means photographic, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, or recording, nor be translated in *any* other language, nor be set in any information storage and retrieval system, intending to obtain commercial gain for any third party without permission in writing from the Author.

Inquiries should be addressed to the Author at
45 Sporadon Street, Athens, 11361, Greece.

© 2009 by George P. Stavropoulos.
ISBN: 978-960-92751-4-9

The electronic resetting is intended for the exclusive publication in the Internet *solely for the free strictly personal information of its users*. Should the latter feel they owe something, let it be to their favorite *true* charity. Except for legitimate quotations for the purposes of analysis, criticism, research and the advancement of knowledge, the above restrictions apply.

Special Prepublication Edition.
Revised for the first Public Edition, 2006

Stavropoulos, George P., 1934—
THE FALL OF FALSEHOODS
Internally consistent in depth Analysis of the present accepted Foundations of the Religious-Scientific-Philosophical Conception and Theories and their Effect on Our present Behavior.
Includes Index.
1. Logic. 2. Philosophy. 3. Reality. 4 Religion. 5. Science.
6. Effect on Behavior.
I. Title.

Text set principally in Palatino Size 10.

Printed in Greece.

+ +

+

+ +

+

To all those having the Courage
to face the Whole,
in order that through It they get to the Meaning.

+ +

+

+ +

+

+ +

+

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	9
	Current Theology and Philosophy	
2.	The Culprits For the Passage to Present Beliefs	15
3.	The Common Source and Mold of all Falsehoods	26
4.	The Falsehoods believed about the Scriptures	32
5.	The Setting we need to face the Atheistic Dogma	35
6.	The Suspicious Origin, Ground and Purpose of our Present Beliefs	47
7.	The Bone of Contention between Religion and Science	59
8.	How (thinking of) the Personal God simplifies Things	63
9.	Binding Consequences of Disciplined Reasoning	69
10.	Reason contra Biblical Cosmogony Science	72
11.	The Origins of the Notion of Unfalsifiability and the Method of Falsification of Atheism	82
12.	Where the Difference lies between Man-made and Natural Law	92
	Current Science	
13.	The Problems of Light and Energy	99
14.	The Theory of Evolution: How it loses its Stigma and turns against Materialist Atheism	106
15.	The Theory of Evolution: How it connects to the Real World	111
16.	The Advance of Atheism beyond Nineteenth Century Evolution	140
17.	The Solution of the Matter and Energy Problems	146
18.	The Problems surrounding the Michelson-Morley Experiment	151
19.	The Problems of Newton's Law and the Separation of Bodies	158
20.	The Faulty Logic of General Relativity	163
21.	The Travesty of Special Relativity	186
22.	The True Significance of Newton's Law	207
23.	The Theory of Quantum Mechanics: Problems and Resolution	224
	Logical and Moral Responsibility after the Resolution of Problems	
24.	The Passing off of the Subjective as Objective and of the False as True	253
25.	The Proper Place of Mathematics in Reasoning	275
26.	Logos and Theology	288
27.	Objective Natural Law and our Moral Responsibility as we stand in its Face	304
28.	Determinism and Freedom	329
29.	Final Thoughts and Epilogue	337
	INDEX OF ARTICLES, PARTS, EQUATIONS AND FOOTNOTES	353
	GENERAL INDEX	357

+ +

+

+ +

+

+

THE FALL OF FALSEHOODS

1

INTRODUCTION

§1. In his most memorable address to the Nation, Mr. Jimmy Carter, President of the United States, had admitted that the state of the Union was then not good. Today, *every honest man in the world must admit that the state of our world most definitely is not good! And every man who, under any excuse, refuses to sign this statement admits by so doing his own dishonesty!* All peoples of the world have sayings to the effect that the “fish rots from the head”. This is *not* a belief imposed “democratically”, i. e., by the power of the *misguided* universal mob. It is a physical *hard* fact observed by *all* people having eyes to see the daily state of the “fish”! The proposition just made thus refers to *all* who either are appointed as, or call themselves “heads”! But also to all who choose, or acquiesce in the presence up on high of, such “heads”! That prisons do not exist for incarcerating the charged majorities for their choices of such “heads” does not release *sane* heads from their duty to regard those majorities guilty as charged! Only the naked power of the mob prevents them from applying the Law!

§2. “Democracy” as practiced today no longer means what it once meant. Nor is it the best political system ever discovered.

+

It is only a *code* word, concealing from prudish consciences the never-ending civil strife of thieves and mobsters, attempting “legally” *at least* to rob each other! Only the “innocent” may think otherwise, as they try to push through the day shivering under the tatters of honor they still dare to call decent clothes! The “heads” are called upon to devise the “laws” of this *universal* transaction, *never* hesitating to offer to the dogs even their own faithful agents, if it serves their own skins and infernal plans! Which they do with absolute relish, for the benefits it accords them! The “protection services” once offered exclusively by the mafia in Chicago are now offered by governments everywhere, on the principle of “if you cannot (or don’t want to) beat them, join them”! This is the first naked truth about the state of our world!

§3. The rest are *lesser* truths, leading seamlessly all the way down to the greatest naked lies! It is those lies that, passing for truths, form the intellectual, ethical, moral, and *only lastly* the “political” state of our world. Never forget: when we refer to this last one, we *always refer to those others*, that acting in unison, they feed it! Only *just yesterday*, a *principal minister* of the Greek government, presumably overwhelmed by the pressure of his own voters he could not and would not resist, proposed that the voters be denied the right of multiple choice from a common list of candidates, in order that the election be guaranteed of those on the top of the lists, placed there by the *always invisible (even hostile foreign)* powers they best so doggedly serve!: The new twenty first century NeoGreek-style “democracy”! Abolish the old! Who ever said that you need not first sell your soul to the Devil in order that you be admitted even as a candidate? For *any* office? For *every* office under the Sun!

§4. In ancient truly democratic times *everybody* knew who really the master was: the Demos, the *General Assembly* of Citizens, *not* a wily representation of them acting in collusion for their own rather than for the interests of the *Demos*. And Demos did *not* then mean the power of the majority voting in office the most accomplished demagogue promising flippantly vacuous castles in the air for all, without persuasively stating the exact source and manner of collecting the means, which always means all the unmentionable possible and impossible ways of stealing from each other and mainly from the weak and the uninformed;

it meant instead the now long-forgotten *ethical and moral and in the final analysis TheoLogical General Commonweal* that held them together as a mutually trusting society of free men willing for it to put on the line even life and limb. *That* was why even Themistocles the victor general of the battle at Salamis was late in life called to account for abusing the public trust, from which he escaped to Persia! *That* was why the brilliant general Alcibiades was recalled from Sicily to answer profanity charges, from which he too escaped to Persia! What then held the Demos-Polis together was the *manly common straight spine* of Faith in God and propriety! The blasphemers *were expelled, not* allowed to continue corrupting the morals! One heartily wishes to see *that* kind of Democracy somewhere restored, *there* erectly to run!

§5. How then, with that early example plain in view, did we all now get here? What byways did we all follow to get us to this precipice of the abyss? What? Did I hear that I overstate the state of the world? Who said that? Certainly *not* one who is not drugged day and night, with both *substances and ideas*, to see the world always rosy! And kindly, please don't tell me that of the two, the ideas are not by far the worst! Without ideas always in the front, we *never* get to the substances! Please realize also this: That the most fertile minds *are* satisfied to make their fortunes based just on ideas! The substances are left to those who, unable to think "productively", do not hesitate to get their hands dirty! Those others *are always* impeccable from top to bottom, in dress, manner, smile and speech! Soft, studied voices! Sending forth meanings in code! The "masses", untutored in today's code, *are* automatically excluded! For them suffice well said promises promising *nothing*! The babes are lulled *not* by the meaning of words they don't understand, but by the *music* caressing their soft ears, be it only the simplest quieting tune! The code transfers *other* messages! Of robbing, thievery, murders, massacres, sacrilege; And most of all, of *uninhibited direct blasphemy*! It is *not* for everyone, for it is not easy, to stand up and be counted, even for good, let alone for evil! If for good, at least you carry on on the promise of fair reward! But if for evil, *as you cannot ever discount the promise of just reward for every misdeed, you must be determined, and prepared to get directly to the extreme of blasphemy*, if you expect to be successful in your daily business! So, Brother, kindly do take careful note of your daily conversant, all the more so the higher he stands!

And if you vote him there, *do understand the burden you undertake for his dealings!* To the unaided eye, even the sunspots pass for light! That they too are hellishly hot is an *indirect, not a concomitant* idea! The devils do not just shine, they also burn! So, Customer, beware! The goods you buy today may be rotten, the most expensive ones, those that cost you your very soul, usually *are!* Today, it costs good money to rot the goods! So, you *do pay more* for them!

§6. Today, Greece, roughly the one six hundredth of the world, is a good example of what transpires everywhere. After all, it is not for nothing that in the name of advancing world trade nothing produced anywhere is nearly never stopped at her border! By deceit you can slide through with anything! Graft greases the entrance to country, license, office! The whole “system” is so well greased that only the tiniest fraction of corruption gets caught and makes it to the press; and *never*, God forbid, is a name mentioned—except when, *rarely*, it is thought necessary to show that “something” gets done! You see, behind such “honorable”, formal transactions, there always lurks an illustrious name! You see, today Greece proudly boasts of “Independent Commissions” instituted by parliamentary law to protect the so-called “individual personal data”, i.e., *all, and especially the grand* malefactors *and* their malfeasances! It is important that their penal record remain spotless! How else can they carry on with their “service” to society? Why do I mention today’s Greece as example of the world? Not only because it is by *such* people that in her parliament do members get “democratically” elected”, but also because in her universities professors do not get appointed without the approval of their students!!! Because parliament, professors and students have advanced such a concept of “academic freedom” that within the campuses *every* punk, anarchist and hoodlum is guaranteed impunity, but a *reasoned dissenting opinion is persecuted with howls and immediate physical attack to person!* How do ignoramus elect professors, you will ask! How else can “professors” get elected do you suppose? Do the students demand the *best and hardest* studies? *No!!!* They expect just to pass *easy* exams, get their “diplomas”, and on that “sufficient” typical ground and the proper amount of grease paid for by their parents to get appointed in a public position, paid by even less educated near idiots, from which position they look down on the populace

as well as expect to get rich by their own getting greased and finally pensioned at the earliest possible, on the highest possible pension! This is the present Greek-style paradise on Earth! So, who cares about the one promised for *real, life long, hard work* in Heaven? Am I too hard on professors, *not* educating Greek society, except for *just this* expectation? Not a bit! Just tell me, in which Church do people fail to prostrate themselves in front of the high priests, appointed to their offices *secretly*? Do I really mix salt and pepper, now saying no good the election by ignoramuses, now saying no good the exclusion of ignoramuses from the election process? What I attack in *both* cases is the *exclusion of public election by those of granite hard knowledge of all pertinent facts!* In *both* cases, people are elected whose competence and Faith in Logos¹ is neither secured nor guaranteed that it will only advance the true intellectual-spiritual needs of society. I *refuse*

¹ I shall not tire trying to explain the exact meaning and content of this unique word in the human mouth. It is by the latest Heraclitean. Its use in the opening phrase of the Gospel according to St. John, translated in English as Word, is a distortion, due at best to the total inability of a Jew to understand and then convey by means of just one Greek word to other Jews the very deepest, most fundamental Ground on which all we know is erected. Had he understood more of the Essence of Logos, he would certainly have had a great deal more to say, just in order that he explain himself, about the meaning he attached to the word. Without such explanation, the reader is very hard put to understand anything more than the ordinary, everyday meaning people attach to it, relating to the logia, the sayings, either of men or of the Lord. Even if St. John had fully understood Heraclitus's meaning of the word, he most certainly could not have expected that at least the Jewish recipients of his Gospel would be fully familiar with Heraclitean usage. On that distortion was later based the still surviving Christian ecclesiastical meaning of the word, that "theologians" continue to refuse to broaden to all its full meaning. Logos is not just the product of God's or man's mouth, and so, it may not just be confined to, at best as another word for, Jesus Christ as the second, strictly Incarnate Person of the Holy Trinity. As a product of man's mouth, Logos becomes blasphemous nonsense if it fails to deliver to the listener (which involves both him and the speaker) not just the sound of the word uttered, but the entire Being, the $\Omega\nu$, that alone by His being there, makes complete sense of everything. Heraclitus was such a succinct and austere philosopher that he realized that human speech may only be completely respected if it does not ever fail to contain in itself the recognition and cognizance of that Ground to which alone always tuned, human speech ceases to become a blasphemy

to draw *any* distinction between intellectual and spiritual needs. Those who do are exactly those who brought the world to the precipice of the final catastrophe! In *both* cases, that of universities and that of Churches, people remain ignorant of intellectual and spiritual facts fundamental to their own well being! *This* is the reason the world balances so precariously at the edge of the precipice! The peoples of the world ignorant of those facts *generally elect and offer undeserved respect* to “leaders” leading by opinion poll, *totally unable and unwilling* to lead them upward, as that is really hard work; willing only to let them slide down, as that increases the “fun” of everyone! Don’t we see just this in amusement parks everywhere? No wonder our world life has become just such an amusement park—or have we made the Earth only a lunatic asylum? In light of the material in the footnote just inserted, the source of our problems now stands starkly naked in front all having eyes to see, and consciences thin skinned enough to feel the prick! Anger and all silence therefrom shall inform the feeler of his true disposition in the face of Logos and the *hard* facts!

and becomes a Hymn. If we truly honor the ancient Greeks for having taught us how to think, we most certainly may not fail to heed Heraclitus. With him, St. John’s opening makes full sense only if it refers to the Ever-present, Complete, Perfect, Omniscient, Omnipotent Deity, Father, Creator and Inspirer of all that is good. The division of the Deity to Trinity, ceases to be blasphemy only if it is understood as a recognition of the distinct functions of Reasoning, Acting and Inspiring that Christians, in ancient custom, personified, but are certainly wrong if they understand them as distinct Logous (plural accusative of Logos) united only by Love. The functions are distinct, but the fully intellectual-spiritual Fundamental Essence of the Deity remains indivisible! Indivisibly does the entire Deity reason, act, inspire Self and believers! This is why the Lord “wondered” at, that is, chastised, the Disciples for asking Him to show them the Father! The Lord was not just the Incarnate Second Person distinct from the other two, but the Entire Indivisible Deity! Anything else that drives wedges in the Holy Trinity is blasphemous, wherever it is contained or implied, whenever it is distortedly understood! The Churches, their doctors, and the professors that all sprang therefrom are responsible for the fact that for two thousand years they have neglected to “knock faithfully at the door” requesting the Lord to help them understand what most definitely are not mysteries, that is to say, dark, unilluminated areas of the Deity, that is All Pure Intellectual-Spiritual Light Understand this, Brother, and you shall not fail to understand what I here attempt to express in human words.

2

THE CULPRITS FOR THE PASSAGE TO PRESENT BELIEFS

§7. Twenty five centuries ago, Heraclitus, the prime sage of his time, established at the center of everything the Logos. Today, in the name of “science”, itself based on logic, that is nothing if not *the* method of Logos to set all things in order, our honored sages try to persuade us that Logos is out of the question, that we have no option other than believing in *total* purposelessness, that is the *other* name of nihilism. As for the past frontier, that ought by right to be fully within the scope of science to investigate, in the face on the one hand of the Einsteinian indeterminacy coming under the more familiar name of spacetime relativity, and on the other the Heisenbergian indeterminacy coming under the name of the uncertainty principle incorporated in quantum mechanics, that, too, has been expelled beyond the limits of our reach! The sages give it all up, including (though of that they strangely remain, or so they seem fully unaware) foremost their own sagacity, in the limelight of which they bask well fed by those who truly pay the cost. If Steven Weinberg can be taken as a representative example², they declare themselves uncommonly happy, though they believe themselves and the entire universe around them as having come from nothing and are/is being destined to nothing, between which ends one despite all his best efforts can not but produce absolutely nothing! Thoughtfully, one cannot fail to ask, sadly, whether these latter day nihilist sages do not

² Steven Weinberg: *A Designer Universe*, THE NEW YORK REVIEW, Oct. 21, 1999, p. 46.

not but produce absolutely nothing! Thoughtfully, one cannot fail to ask, sadly, whether these latter day nihilist sages do not really live their own self-fulfilling prophesy, not realizing how indeed true they have proven the Chinese saying about getting exactly what they have wished!

§8. R. A. Lyttleton³, under this quote from Albert Einstein: "if most of us are ashamed of shabby clothes and shoddy furniture, let us be more ashamed of shabby ideas and shoddy philosophies", has produced an article in which, drawing a line between complete disbelief and complete certainty, transposing them in a cloud he calls bottomless emotional pit of pride and prejudice, makes what seems to be a reasonable appeal to stay clear of both those ends, however attractive they may appear, in order that we not fall down into those bottomless pits. But set those points to be the one the Heraclitean belief in Logos, and the other the current belief in purposelessness that is nothing if not the *negation* of Logos *based on Logos* that also contains according to them their "logic" of "science", *where will you* reasonably rather stand? What sort of "Logos" can it be that produces a "science" rejecting it? Can you possibly like that enough to stand by it, even if not on it? And if you, scared of that madness, try to escape to the other end, *how* indeed can you reasonably be charged of getting emotional for *standing firmly* on the point of Logos? Is not Logos the *negation* of emotion, the perfect coolheadedness? Hard indeed to kick against nails! Tell now yourself who does the kicking! Lyttleton did not think of that dilemma to try to give us his suggestion! As for "shabby ideas and shoddy philosophies", be patient. For now, let us only add that, even as *faith in Logos and Logos Himself are indeed metaphysical* as Feyerabend has argued⁴ and *it has never ceased to be what it has always been, it nevertheless was clearer faith* in the time of Heraclitus and has become *confused faith* in the present time of experimental "scientific" sophistication. Then people *reasoned*. Now, they *mainly experiment!* That in so doing they *think* they downgrade their own reasoning (going on *before, during and after* experimentation) in favor of its *wished*

³ R. A. Lyttleton: *The Nature of Knowledge*, THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF IGNORANCE, R. Duncan & M. Weston-Smith, Ed., Wallaby Pocket Books, 1977/1978, ISBN: 0-671-79050-1 p. 9-17.

⁴ P. K. Feyerabend: PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE: THE DELAWARE SEMINAR II,, University of Delaware Press.

for “results” does not in the least alter the situation! No experiment ever substituted Logos; no experiment ever shall do so! The *only* question is whether or not the *hard natural facts themselves* rather than our *willful elaborate* theoretical “interpretation” of them support our *metaphysical* faith in Logos! Current “science”, based on its “interpretation” of the *hard natural facts*, using a *badly distorted* form of Reason (that is *only an inseparable part* of Logos) chooses to conclude that Logos (the indivisible Whole that also consists of, contains, and gives substance to Reason) does not exist! I argue that the *hard natural facts themselves do show* the *metaphysical* Logos on Whom alone they stand! Said another way, however least the modern pseudo-intellectuals basking in the limelight of public attention like it, *Logos is the real immaterial substance* of the proverbial “branch” on which we have fastened the swing on which we all so very much pleased with ourselves sit, *regardless of what we say and do* that we always attempt to “explain”, that is to say, to show it is “reasonable”, that it agrees with Logos! Ergo: If we continue to be sane, we may *not* cut that “branch”! The only think we may, and indeed *must*, while we still can, cut is the rope, the near end of which *we* now instead of swing have turned into the noose that strangles us. Will we at last, before we give up the last gasp, cut that rope?

§9. How did we get here? Indeed, by failing to realize the *metaphysical and so spiritual but not in the least abstract or uncertain substantive* nature of Logos! It takes *disciplined reasoning, involving the never ending hard work* of self-controlled citizen and society as the Greeks once so well understood, to get to that realization! But that is *not* alas for the untrained “masses” struggling to put a bite of bread in their mouths! But *that was* the situation at the turn of the ancient to the new era. You need a fed stomach to supply energy to an agile brain. But *not a too well fed* stomach, as that turns the energy to fat, poisoning the brain, lulling the Spirit, persuading it to keep on seeking satisfaction in ever more food, corrupting it to seek unendingly ever more material pleasure! Alas, we never found the *needed* balance! The unlike do not mix well. The Greeks conquered the Medes, but they too, which they have *not yet* understood, were conquered by them! Yet, East and West *never* successfully married! The *undisciplined “reasoning”* of the East spread with Christianity, *an almost pure product of the East based on the Old Testament*, that only with time acquired a *thin* skin

of Greek character. The Gospels are mostly spent with feeding the hungry, with alleviating the physical pain, with only the mere rudiments of how hunger and pain can be reduced by unselfish social action. That was all Palestine could then learn, and as matters still go, the lesson has yet to be fully learned and spread. It is on that "understanding" that the Church is still attacked for not doing enough in that direction, as if that were the only objective of the Lord becoming Man. The *metaphysical* part of the Gospels has been wrapped in "mystery", the *Luminous Holy God* has been enveloped in darkness! So, dissenters dismiss it as incredible. The Church, still occupied by the ancient spirit of the Orient has done *practically nothing* to bring the metaphysical to our *conscious* understanding: In that regard, the "ask and it shall be given, knock and it shall be opened" has meant *nothing* to the *seeming* pious! Two thousand years have passed, but praying that we *understand* the metaphysical, i.e., nothing other than the Lord God, has *yet* to begin! The Church has *consciously chosen to stand against* the Logos, on the *stubbornly held wrong, yet supposedly reasonable* for its being a religious dogma that the existence of God cannot be proven; in other words, that the Maker *did not know how to make Himself unquestionably manifest by His work*; in yet other words, that the Lord God Whom the Church teaches as Love takes pleasure in His own inability to prove His Being to His creatures, leading to seeing hapless man struggle with having to choose between belief and unbelief on an equal footing, and callously rewarding those who choose belief when they can just as reasonably choose unbelief with the rewards of direct chance and the hope of a better afterlife, the chances of which are kept *jealously equal* to those of the present, the *immediate, tangible* rewards of which are here for the taking be it even by a hand drenched in blood, that by the mere rules of chance, in view of the immediacy as against the mere hope, *cannot* be said to have been spilt in vain! *Not at all* has the Church in two thousand years felt the hair raise stiff on her back at the realization that by *this tacit* teaching of hers, it is *she* who profanes the Holy God first and foremost!!! Pleadings that she at last change her views on this most fundamental point have gone unanswered! That is the power of religious tradition wrapped around a *stiff oriental wrong* dogma that *has split* God from Logos! Indeed, what can orientals understand of, and be shaken to their foundations by Logos? These people,

having persuaded themselves of their own demigodness, having named their inclination “calling” (in Greek, their κλίσιν “κλήσιν”), having spent untold hours before the mirror in order to learn the technique of appearing pleasant and good-natured to *all* viewers, consider it socially tactful to be *overly* polite: One can bet that if the Lord reappeared today and once again smashed the tables of the money changers at the Temple, *they would* turn the other way in extreme embarrassment! It is the only response that “good” social breeding dictates in the face of belief and unbelief! All else is called fanaticism! To be squarely with Logos today *is* strictly prohibited! Logos also means Holy strict Reasoning and Holy Freedom to express its findings! These *are* extremely embarrassing! Observe and listen to the “hierarchs” and politicians: What do they not say—always with a broad smile! But a *biting* Truth in Holy Anger as befits the present times? *Never!* By word *and* silence is today the Holy Lord profaned! But the grandest of all questions, that about God and Logos being One, is *not* broached! On such a matter silence is being preferred, as a forked tongue spelling uncertain words, the preferred language of “authority”, all authorities sense, is far more likely to err! But here, on the ledge over the abyss, *the silence must be broken, the prohibition ignored, the tongue mended back to a single honest whole*, so that its scream tear the abyss and reach the Heaven: “Holy Father, *truly* Thy name *is* Logos”!

§10. Strong words? Definitely! Tactless words? Only as necessary! Impolite words? Hardly! Unpolitic words? Unquestionably! An argument is seen to be this or that according to the impact it produces on a *pricked* conscience! If words are to be put on paper, for which precious forests are cut, they better *deserve* their full weight and then some. Bland words *are* worse than total silence: They disturb the quiet from which alone words worth their weight always spring. In this age of din produced by voluble worthless words coming in from everywhere in the general desperate effort to fill the painfully felt void in our speechless souls, it is unpolitic words that attract attention. But they are only remembered till the next batch of worthless news! When it rarely comes, the deafening Fall of Falsehoods rising above the general din, though unpolitic, is most certainly *not* worthless! *Even if only one, somewhere, listens!* After all, words are only for those still having ears! The rest are certain to follow on their preprogram-

med way, as always automata do! So, these are words only for those, alas now few, still enjoying to carry their precious souls in their own hands, rather than leaving them to the *now revealed dubious* so-called “care” of others. *Only such* people listen, and, having listened, weigh the precious value of words, by which they build their *informed* Spirits. The rest are only parroting! When people such as David Lindley⁵ told us in his *End of Physics* of the *insurmountable predicament of having reached the practical limit* of experimentation in fundamental physical research with such tools as, say, the superconducting supercollider, since canceled for its exorbitant cost in the face of *certainty* that *whatever could* have been learned with it *would only be a tiny fraction* of what still lies before us unknown [as it would *only* register what would happen in the fleeting interval of time during which the tremendous amount of mass and energy involved would be compressed in the tiny volume of collision at the *present* age of the universe], those still having ears, understanding the “optimism” of S. Weinberg and S. Hawking as resting *no longer on what can objectively still be learned but solely on what can subjectively be concocted* in keeping with the *already set object of such future “studies”* that is nothing other than “proving” the world pointless, cannot but conclude that the *metaphysical* Logos, Whom they feel palpable in their own Spirits, would *not* have gone to so much trouble for nothing! As a result, they *cannot but feel unquestionable the fact that Logos truly has otherwise sought to present the fact of His own presence to all honest seekers!* But in this they do *not*, alas, find the Church and the “theologians” allies; as these insist that the presence of God “cannot” be proven, failing to realize that they *only expose their “method” and their “faith”!* By which alone, lasting for two thousand years, have we come to our present predicament! And these indeed *are* strong, *not* impolite words!

§11. When Kitty Ferguson⁶ presented her *Fire in the Equations*, the best till then discussion of the question of science vs. faith in God, I couldn’t but remark that she was more polite than the question and times demanded, to which she correctly replied

⁵ David Lindley: THE END OF PHYSICS, Basic Books, 1993, ISBN: 0-465-01548-4

⁶ Kitty Ferguson: FIRE IN THE EQUATIONS, Bantam Books, 1994, ISBN: 0-553-40593-4.

that stronger arguments are not for laymen to make but for people having a *solid* grounding. The trouble is that *no* recognized authority accepts as existing a grounding solid on *both* TheoLogY and Science! Even to write them so is regarded revolutionary, and no authority takes kindly to revolutions! So, *tradition* rules! Even as *it* has come down to us from *definitely darker times*, even as *it* has brought us *unquestionably to the precipice*! Who dares challenge *these* authorities in particular?

§12. The one *says* it believes the world to be created by God, but rather than looking *deep in it* to find *its unquestionable* Author, chooses to stick to *Scriptures of men, said "inspired"*, but *not* having pegged, *not* even admitting themselves conscious of their *clear* obligation to peg, *every* word they wrote from end to end on Logos! Such consciousness could *not* be expected in places and times of darkness! The light of the consciousness of Socrates and Plato having exhausted themselves on a particular subject without finally having come to a binding conclusion, their clear disappointment at having to make this confession, from which alone a faithful follower can continue the search, did *not* illuminate distant places and the times since intervened. As they still stand, read with awe word for word, and mostly from translation, the *Scriptures both illuminate and darken*! *No* effort has been given to concentrating here *only* the Light and there *only* the dark. *No* religion has held *high the Light* and cast it around on *every* aspect of our lives. *No* religion begins with the *solid* Faith that in the beginning, *truly stood the Logos*! *Not* by Him do they hold their faithful! *Everyone* knows how indeed they do it!

§13. The other *says* it deals with the world, and how *it* came about, and whither *it* is destined. But again, it too does *not* look *deep in the world to find the answers it seeks*, but instead confines itself in producing *theories*! There *are* professors writing authoritative papers never since graduate school having done an experiment totally on their own! That is "messy" work! Theorizing lifts one up: to the clouds! Wherefrom most of them fall. *Without* a parachute! Give them a granite-solid analysis of the equally hard facts of Nature and see how they receive it! Contrary to theory? They ask for "*verifiable*" predictions of what you tell them, which they *arbitrarily* choose to call a "theory" when it is *only a binding, not an argumentative, dimensional analysis of the hard physical fact of such clearly distinct quantities as mass, length, time, force,*

momentum, polar moment of inertia of a vibrating spherical shell, energy, action! Why? So that they then commission the *messy, very expensive, making-some-rich* physical work, for an *always dubious* theoretical conclusion! So deep in theories do they truly swim that, hard facts and their proper analysis get them on the head like a reef, exactly where according to *their* theories there only ought to be clear waters! That the universe stands for billions of years on *solid Law, not* professorial theorizing, for them is *not* solid enough! The intellectual honesty to admit that the Law out there *puts a terminal end to all theorizing*, that in turn puts *them* out of business, is more than they command! The truly cunning ones *do not ever* commit anything on paper, even if they be bishops, archbishops, professors, presidents of university colleges and scientific societies, or Nobel laureates! Impolite words? *Honest true personal* observations of more than twenty years!

§14. Quite simply, you *cannot* engage in anything as serious as TheoLogy or Science without committing your very soul! Only fools may think they can escape their clutches with their souls intact! You *cannot* honestly call the standoff of the two an impasse! Frequently do unexamined phenomena deceive the casual looker! The impasse is *only apparent, to the untrained in careful examination*. Perhaps, even the apparency is necessary—to humiliate the arrogant careless, on *both* sides! Terrible to think and admit! Until you with *complete* confidence in view of the hard facts realize that, neither the “theology” nor the “science” we know were the way to come to the answers we all along have been seeking! Comprehend just this: Reality is rational and *never* deceives! So, *it truly admits of a definitive answer* even to those ultimate questions! With faith in *that* do we declare the impasse *apparent, yet, necessary* for demonstrating itself to have been the *inevitable* result *only of the tortuous way* in which we so far have walked on the road *we* marked out for ourselves to walk on, *not of the terrain itself* on which we *inevitably have had* both to mark out the *right* road and walk *correctly* upon it!

§15. Without faith in *that*, we may without fear just as well jump off the cliff—with *our best and brightest atheist and agnostic scientists, professors, and all the rest of our present “spiritual” leaders watching those others in silence, none other, leading the mad dance down the bottomless abyss!*: Because, whether ever expanding or recurring, *if* the universe is irrational, it is meaningless; and we,

having been the *chance products* of irrationality that *despite appearances could* with *far greater* likelihood *not* have brought us here than having brought us here, may follow the way of the *more likely* statistics, for all our “good” luck of appearing into being out of nowhere at all, uncalled for and unsought after! And, in the process, at least show ourselves honest and honorable believers in the correctness of our “scientific” thinking, *not just the opposite*, be it if only for precious life’s sake! If we, new Jacobs, are prepared and willing to “put God to the wall” as Kitty Ferguson so aptly put it, *we must also be ready to show ourselves capable of that too!* The arguments cut *both* ways! Rather than safely watching from the bleachers the struggle of somebody else (*whose?*), who/that does not concern us, or engaging ourselves gamely in a pointless and indeed *sick* pseudo-struggle in the mud; *in truth, the live-or-die struggle is on the narrow ledge above the abyss!* The Loving Rational God truly made the world secure! Only *we*, by *our* willful choice of guides, brought ourselves to the edge of the abyss! Still, even as we stand there, God *loves* us, for it is only there that each one of us shall prove one’s true metal! As we do *not* show ourselves ready to jump off the cliff, at least as of yet, we *cannot* shake off the accusation that *we knowingly rely on God’s secure loving embrace up there on the ledge* to keep on abusing *mainly Him*, principally with our “theology” and our “science”! We *must* drop the atheist/agnostic mask, behind which we delude only ourselves; which our “best and brightest” do best than all the rest!: There is *no honesty, nor honor* here! Even the *devil* himself relies on God’s loving embrace to keep on fighting Him! When at last will we realize that, just as the devil is neither atheist nor agnostic but a dishonorable conscientious anti-Theist, so are we, acting as we do? This is *only part* of the *all-out thoroughness and courage* that I had in mind above when I remarked that, *tact definitely limits* our discussion! Remarks such as “but this *is* brutal, uncivil, unpolitic, *improper* in well-behaved society” *no longer* have a place: We *are up there*, on *that* all too precarious ledge fighting God, beckoning to and challenging the abyss! But I agree with all those saying we are still unprepared to face the Truth! I *was* surprised that they let Kitty Ferguson publish her book! I shall be astounded if they let me, following once again her suggestion that the book I suggested *was indeed mine* to write! Was it because she was lucky enough to catch them semiconscious, or only because they

judged her discussion safely noncommittal and the object of their labors at casting doubts and aspersions against God quite secure, or was it because after such long slumber they finally realized that events *are now overtaking them fast* and they *must* broach the subject? We must give them *at least this* benefit of doubt!

§16. Still, one cannot help bearing in mind how disparate and jealous of each other the general assembly of university professors really is: Each one absorbed in his own narrow interests, defending one's own turf against all intruders, using every method at one's disposal to secure the needed funds from a never sufficient-for-all total sum. They have a choice: either total in-fighting with no holds barred that is certain to demolish the academic structure and bury them all under, or "civilized academic tact" that does *not* however exclude anything safe from overflowing to the knowledge of the outside world! Guess what they choose! My lifelong search, most intense during the last twenty plus years, to find *anywhere at least one* academic competent in *both* TheoLo^gy and Science has produced *no* finding! On *their* side, the "scientists" *may perhaps* be excused: They have *not* given an oath of allegiance to help those in imminent peril on the cliffs of knowledge! This most definitely is *not* the case of "theologians" and Churchmen in particular: The commandment "shepherd my sheep" was *not* the license understood as "feed on them, take the fat, sell the lard" that is the right of the *ordinary* shepherd. It was a reminder of the *endless caring charged on Peter, and in effect on us all, for every "sheep" lost on the cliffs, hanging perilously over the abyss!* God became man in order that He give us just *this* example of duty! And while on earth, it was as a *man*, raised by God and himself to being a *Man*, that He, too, performed that duty! For, otherwise, the Lord God *would be asking of us things beyond our capacity*—and that *would be unbecoming* of the Lord God! Yet, to this day, the Church has *not* taught the nations this basic lesson! The human race hangs on the ledge over the abyss, but the Churchmen mind only what they have all along seen to be their "ordinary" duties: they simply "pray"! "God, *if* Thou art there, perform Thy miracle!" [Just God, *not* Lord, let alone *Father!* God as a name of *rank*, like Sergeant, Officer, General! With so many "Eminences", "Fathers", "Holy Fathers" and "Most Divine All-Holinesses" (pure Byzantine this one!) around in *total disregard of the Lord's prohibition*, just *who* today calls God *Father* and means

it?] Some “faith”! That *Faith* means *action of foot and hand up there on that ledge*, is *not* understood! What’s at peril is *not* the flesh: that was always meant to be spent *like a candle* giving off its light to the darkness around, that is to say, *converting to light the otherwise heavy soul* it houses. What’s at peril is that the *light* shall be no more, leaving *nothing* to rise to Heaven! You tell all this *tactfully* even to high Churchmen. It leaves them unmoved. “The Lord has” is their answer. “Whom, what does *He* have?”, you ask. The question is regarded tactless, the conversation ends, or the line is cut! Do you not now really think that we, the whole humanity did have more than enough of “tact”, feeding academics and Churchmen, always treating each other with their impeccable “tact”? Up there, at the edge of the abyss you need *strong, secure, spiked boots* and the grip of *steeled, not soft, hands!* Papal slippers and high lustre academic boardroom shoes *are* going to get stepped on in the effort to save those still hardly hanging on! That *is pragmatic politeness*, which is nothing if not the *civil duty of the citizen to save his fellow citizen*. Alas, translating from the Greek, we lost the true meaning of *politeness* [*< polites = citizen*!] Church and Academia leave us no option but telling it all!

§17. That we still do *not* with them always tactfully in the lead just jump off Twin Tower style, we may *no longer* excuse it on our continuing curiosity! *If* the impasse *they* want us to believe is true, we have come to the *end* of our curiosity! *Nothing worthwhile* can any longer be learned—principally from them! Our curiosity is *without* meaning and *without* value! That we still *refuse* to jump off only shows *not* just how strongly we are held back by fear, but *how strongly we still adhere to Rationality and Meaningfulness, that do stand intact*, way beyond our desperate “theological” [*not TheoLogical*] and “scientific” fulminations!

3

**THE
COMMON SOURCE AND MOLD OF ALL
FALSEHOODS**

§18. (a) You simply cannot truly feel what a challenger of established authority is up against until you too ask them *face to face* to answer the basic questions regarding the source of their authority. The claim of the Holy Apostolic See of Rome is based on a *mistranslation* of the original Greek “σὺ εἶ Πέτρος καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτην τὴν πέτραν ...” as “thou art Peter and upon this rock ...”! It is one thing to be called Πέτρος and another to mention the πέτραν: The first is masculine, the second feminine! Why so? Why not simply “... and upon thee ...”? Going back even to Homeric usage, the meaning of the masculine and the feminine for rock has *different* connotations: Πέτρος can even be a λίθος a sizable rock you throw by hand; πέτρα can even be an immovable mountain! *All* Apostles were asked, Peter answered for them *all* stating, declaring their *common* faith: Such words as statement, declaration, faith in Greek are *all* feminine! So, the πέτρα was *not* Πέτρος, but the *solid declaration of common faith* on which Christianity was to be built. So, to *whom/what* was the basilica of St. Peter dedicated? To this one Apostle, or to the solid declaration of common faith? *Whatever* happened to the one believed to be “*the* Son of God”? Why was the most magnificent temple of Christendom dedicated to a *mere* man even if an Apostle, rather than to Christ Himself, the Lord God made Man, or to the *metaphysical and so spiritual but not in the least abstract or uncertain substantive* God-Logos? The ancient pre-Christian Athenians had already dedicated the Parthenon to “goddess” Athena, i.e., the Ever-Virgin Holy Wisdom; the Byzan-

tines later did the *very same* in Constantinople! *Why* did the Romans choose differently?

(b) It is clear that Rome was *not* Greece; the Logos did *not* carry there the same weight. The Empire was receiving influences from all over, but whereas the Northern European nations had yet nothing to offer, the East has always been seductive; even the Greeks only with great difficulty could resist it. The East had all along followed the “philosophy” of ying and yang, of dualism in *all* its forms, regarded as having been present for ever. As every empire built on raw force, so Rome, too, could not survive as an empire without adopting the methods of the East. The God-Logos can only love perfection, beauty, sanctity, holiness and only such things that advance those. *Every* empire begins being built on the *ugliness* of raw power and can never forget its origins. Those other ones are adopted much later, and only to the extent serving its *imperial* purposes. Eventually, there came in Judaism and Christianity: It *cannot* have escaped any careful mind that, while after the Fall Adam and Eve were expelled, the serpent *was kept in, only dubiously “punished”* to crawl on its belly, as one *cannot* imagine a snake that does not crawl! Nor that we pray to our Heavenly Father that *He “not lead us into temptation”!* These *are terrible realizations in every mind not controlled by Logos!* Such a mind *cannot but form* an idea of a “mysterious” and unfathomable God, a God that *demands love, while He also commands fear!* The later horrors of the Inquisition and *all* its remnants could *not* have come about except in minds attempting to balance the love for and the *unreasoned* fear of God! *Only Logos, a pure Greek, not an Eastern nor Roman possession, understands that temptation is the only means issuing from oneself to do also evil, that remains a mere, yet the logically needed, potentiality allowing even the ultimate state of absolute Holiness while one chooses to do only good, from which not even the Holy Lord is excluded!* This has *never* yet been the *functioning* understanding of the Christian Church (*nor of any other religion*), that *alone* educates men to self-become Men! The imperial mentality needs men of *action, be it even brutal, not Men-Saints!* The “keys” *supposedly* promised to St. Peter *fitted* the imperial purposes!

(c) Okay, drop if you will the *supposedly!* [Let us accept that every word in the Bible, in the position that it exactly appears (and kindly forget the infinite difficulties of translation) was dictated by God; about which whole problem, later.] The first who

made the bold statement of faith in the Lord deserved some, the *fair*, recognition, even if later, in a state of fear and doubt he denied Him thrice. *Why* is *every* other man “who did not even see yet believed” any less worthy of holding the *very same keys by which he opens for himself the same Gates*? In the New Testament there is no mention of St. Peter ever going to Rome. St. Luke, St. Paul and perhaps even St. Peter himself would *not* have failed to mention it, had it been true. The discovery *much later* of the body of a man under the basilica, *only lately*, by Pope John Paul II said to be that of St. Peter *fails* to convince. The transfer of the imperial seat to the East “had” to be counterbalanced by those left behind, for *purely political* reasons, to which the ecclesiastical were attached. The *keys not the Cross suffered for the love of God for man, nor the blood of the saints sacrificed in the arena* in the Name of the Crucified became the official symbol of the Vatican! In *pain* do I say this as a Christian! After the schism of the Church of England, *deliberately* was the cathedral in London dedicated to St. Paul! St. Petersburg was built in Russia as an “Orthodox” counterbalance to “Catholic” Rome! Earlier, in answer to the Roman claim, the Byzantines responded, again without a shred even of mildly convincing evidence, by claiming that the Church of Byzantium was established by St. Andrew, solely for his having been the first-called Apostle! The antagonism about the first honors, *in complete disregard* of the Lord’s all too clear admonitions, *is* beyond dispute! To this day, the Christians have *not* dedicated a *fitting* Temple to the Lord God Logos Almighty! The barbaric struggle, whether by material or “spiritual” weapons, *is about naked power here on earth!* Heaven is the mere excuse, Its mention has become a profanity! The split of the Church of Christ to *hundreds* of splinters contrary to St. Paul’s admonition still goes shamelessly on! I once asked where should an imaginary visitor from another planet send a letter addressed to the Bishop of the Church of the Lord *that is on Earth* (τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας Κυρίου τῆς οὔσης ἐπὶ Γῆς), as indeed was the form of address among ancient local Christian Churches, and the priest (a *representative* of a Patriarch performing services *as such* within the diocese of an *independent* national Church and now a bishop of *that* Church) froze as would a column of salt! I never, in eight years already, heard from him again, though I handed him *substantial material, fully within his ken to judge and authoritatively respond to!* He has been

seen on television to say “how sweet it is to be called father”, i.e., in complete disdain of the Lord’s prohibition “and call no man your father on earth, for you have one Father who is in heaven; neither be called masters [in Greek, καθηγηταί, as the professors are still called!] for you have one master, the Christ”! The good bishop ignores(?) the *mutual corruption* of those calling and called fathers! *Not* just this one bishop, but *all* the Christian Churches, taught by eminent masters-professors! Just recall what was said above (§16, pp. 24-25).

§19. Where the modern universities sprang from during the Middle Ages needs no repeating. The splinters left mostly the faith, *not* the manners! With them took even the purple and the cardinal red! I remember my professors with gratitude: I learned even from their weaknesses. My problems with [*not my*] professors started much later, when I found things the entire academia had ignored (in the beginning, only just *missed*) for three complete centuries, but now was *stubbornly unwilling* to confess! In the beginning, I simply could *not* believe such a thing could happen in academia! Only gradually did I realize that I was attacking *hardened atheistic, yet religiously held dogma* in what I thought was a garden of *free glad* search for, and cultivation of *all* forms of the *indivisible, Truth*! And only still later did I digest the fact that what holds together the members both of the churches and academia is *not* the Love for/of God-Logos and only thus also Truth, but the *naked fear* of those above in the structure of the respective pyramid. After all, *both priests and the vast majority of professors* on subjects unrelated to *pragmatic* research teach by insisting on the *exact form of words or formulae they put down*, which they *literally force* their students to memorize mechanically and repeat on examination day by rote! This may be “education”, but it is *not* learning! You ask for an explanation of the statement, and you only get a restructuring of the phrase with the very same words, that may even be ungrammatically now reset, if not downright meaning things unsuspected! Eventually, they return to the standard expression, and they call *you* disorderly, unruly, rambunctious, when you only investigate the *true* meaning, the *solid* “substance” (Plato’s πεμπτουσία) of things for which the words stand, that allows *no conflict anywhere*! For the vast majority of them, such things are wrapped in mystery, and regarded best if left alone! “Be careful” is their motto! *Don’t* shake the structure; the

termites may come out and eat us, too, not just the rotten wood!

§20. Of the two, I cannot but regard the religious far more responsible for the developments: Not only because they, though appearing under various names, have never stopped over the entire recorded history of the human race to play the most important role, especially over the last two thousand years under the name of the Church, but because it is in the nature of religion to set the general moral standard of human life. I do *not* mean a *constant* standard, as such a one would only tend to perpetuate as sacrosanct some old opinion formed under a far lesser body of knowledge lighting an *eternal* standard of conduct *remaining ignorant of solid new knowledge* obtained since, but a *never stopping to improve* standard, never stopping to weigh our conduct in the light of *old and new knowledge kept constantly under the control of Logos*. The religious did *not* act in this ever more enlightened manner; they chose instead to stick the *old* forms. Inevitably, the times left them behind: the vast majority of people *are practically left unguided* in their effort, *if they still make an effort at all*, to combine under Logos tradition *and* development! That's why they now choose the one, now the other; while the religious, remaining stubbornly impervious to the passing time, attempt to hold them back by a combination of faith in the old Promise and fear of the consequences of its abandonment! The people *want* to believe. They sense that only by believing can they keep their sanity. But *nobody* tells them what is the *proper* Belief, or its *proper* manner! Especially in the present age of "communicating information", i.e., of *willful* spread of *naked propaganda* richly paid for by those standing to make a profit, of this newest "humanitarian science" taught by highly paid professors especially in the most esteemed universities, professors advising even governments, *everybody* hires "communication and press experts", *salesmen of mostly valueless if not downright harmful ideas*! Their "arguments", *if some are presented, are not proofs, but empty words, and rehashings of expectations based on supposed, if not manufactured, protected secret "information"*! Instead of *securing* faith and sanity, this only increases *confusion*, the *unmentionable* desideratum, meant to increase the people's fear and desperation, who thus become more manageable! Today's professors, "science", and "democracy" at work! Nearly *everybody* forgets that, when you substitute fear for Faith in Logos and blind obedience to the written word for the *true* bas-

+

+

ic substance behind it, eventually all hell *shall* break loose! This is what *has* happened/*is* happening. The Lord's great patience with us was/is taken to be just another name for our own fear of fear itself. So, the "courageous" following the example of those clad in ecclesiastical and academic robes simply stopped being afraid. And our sliding started.

+

+

4

**THE
FALSEHOODS BELIEVED ABOUT
THE SCRIPTURES**

§21. None of us, however sincere one may try to be with oneself, can accurately assess the percentage of faith and fear under which one operates. *Only* the Lord can! When in the nineteenth century under the new wave of knowledge an estimate was made of the span of time implied by the Old Testament narrative, nobody really understood how deep the waters were in which they decided to swim! Taking the Scripture verbatim, the “day” as an ordinary day, and measuring the time by the human lifespan, the age of Creation was set at 4004 B. C.! The development of the natural sciences has since decided matters entirely otherwise. What were/are the faithful to do? Some, clearly pious people, still hold to the verbatim interpretation and speak of the Creation events as miraculously compressed to the span of ordinary days by fiat Divine. Well, an All-powerful God *could* perform even such miracles. But shouldn’t the pious also ask themselves whether a *rational* God, the *One and only God-Logos* would perform such miracles? Obviously, He had *all* the past time at His own disposal; *why* would He put off creating the world until 4004 B.C., and then do it all in only six days? *Why* such a hurry? When the natural sciences, that is to say, the world *He* created, tell us otherwise, we may *not*, if we insist on remaining *so strictly* “pious”, accept the verbatim interpretation otherwise but as a *divine* attempt to *confuse us yet demand of us* faith in the Scripture rather than in the evidence of His own Creation, *both* of them having been put down according to *His Will*! For myself, a believer

in One All-Holy God-Logos, such behavior of God toward hapless man *is entirely out of the question, and any insistence upon it none other than the very height of blasphemy!* Even the atheist Einstein, a *non believer in a personal God*, held fast to the belief that “*raffiniert ist der Herrgott, aber boshaft ist er nicht*” (the Lord God is refined, but malicious He is not)! *No believer in a personal God may believe less!* We have no option: We *must* weigh objectively the weight of Scripture unquestionably set down by the hand of *man* as the Word of God, against the weight of *His Creation as His own Written Word!* To deny the evidence of the world even as presented by “*science*” as wrong *is* entirely insane: For twenty years already, “*science*” *is being accused of hiding the true undeniable scientific proof of His indisputable being the God-Logos, based on its own very strictest method and findings!* The Scriptures were written by *pious men*, as best *they* understood then things moral and physical; *they were not* the mere will-less pens of God! The God-Logos respects even the sinful; He *never* dictates, only suggests; He *never* turns men to asses (reversing the story about Balaam’s ass!). Remember St. Paul stating that “... as for knowledge, it will pass away. For our knowledge is imperfect and our prophesy is imperfect; but when the perfect comes, the imperfect will pass away. When I was a child I spoke like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child; when I became a man, I gave up childish ways. For now we see in a mirror dimly, but then face to face. Now I know in part, then I shall understand fully, even as I have been fully understood”. As St. Paul spoke so, how may we believe that people having lived many hundreds of years earlier were wiser knowing so much even less than was known in St. Paul’s time? and how are we permitted to ignore the *obligation* of learning more of the Truth, *by which alone* may we come closer to the All-knowing?

§22. Adam is said to have lived for nine hundred and thirty years, and Seth for nine hundred and twelve years. Who did the counting, and by what astronomical measure? Truths revealed by God? But in the story of Babel (unconsciously of us lasting till, and worsening during, these very days with the *hundreds* of God’s Churches!), God is said to have confused the tongues of men so that they fail to reach Him in Heaven by means of their tower, *impliedly because He was afraid* of what they would do if left unconfused! This one also another truth revealed by God’s own dictation to the scribes? An Easterner, an ignorant Semite, dares state

that God so confesses. Why should a Greek believing in the Holy God-Logos Who *never commits any mistakes and improprieties*, and a Christian believing in God's self-sacrifice on the Cross in order that man *may be raised to Heaven* believe in such senseless Semitic blasphemies and profanities as Holy Writ? Would it not be much more reasonable to understand that men's tongue became "confused", in fact, their languages *multiplied* perhaps exactly because men attempted to reach Heaven, i.e., speak [as sensibly as they then could, *exposing by mouth*, as we all still do, the *disposition of their soul*] about God with such an instrument as the then human language, which though common, was nevertheless still so very very poor for such a task? But which ancient Semite could even begin to comprehend the least of this huge task? What human language is perfect unto itself? The Greek word for light ("that which makes it possible to see") is φῶς, which does *not* also convey the sense of light-weight! Now think: *What* could run as fast as light *if it were not also the lightest thing of all, in other words the fundamental photon, the true Democritean atom*? The Greek word Θεός (relating to θέω, "I run lightning fast") means God, which however does *not* relate to so running (but remember Godspeed!); Now knowing these, do you not get a *deeper* insight; *not*, of course, in the sense that God is the fundamental photon, but in the sense that our grandest and least possible conceptions *are* nevertheless connected? If the Lord Logos did not fail to establish the least of all things we can conceive, *each and every of the fundamental quanta*, do you really think that He failed to set *every detail* referring to the world He created using them? Why do you choose to forget those terribly significant words of the Lord saying that "αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν ἠριθμημένοι εἰσὶ", meaning "the hairs on your heads *are not only counted but also numbered*, as the words "ἠριθμημένοι εἰσὶ" mean *both, as you cannot count things unless you also number them, giving each of them a number while counting them*? But it is not my purpose here to rebut the pragmatic and theological errors in the book of Genesis. To some extent, I have done so elsewhere⁷.

⁷ E.g.: George P. Stavropoulos, ΛΟΓΩ ΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΙΣ ΑΙΩΣΙΝ ΑΝΑΦΟΡΑ, Athens 2006, ISBN: 978-960-85044-5-5, pp. 118-21.

5

THE
SETTING WE NEED TO FACE
THE
ATHEISTIC DOGMA

§23. My purpose in the immediate sequel here is to indicate the fallacy of the strategy and tactics followed, and of some of the arguments presented, by the so-called "Creation Science" camp of well-meaning but *clearly misguided* believers in God seeming satisfied solely with attempting to show the Genesis story not incompatible with present-day scientific knowledge, yet so visibly feeling embarrassed, for the past teachings, policies and practices of religions and churches, that they do *not* attempt to *unite* what ought always to be seen as TheoLogy (*not* "theology") and Science (*not* "science")! The only reason I can see for their reticence is the failure to appreciate the full weight of the term God-Logos. *All* believers in *One* God *ought from the beginning*, as a matter of a first article of due Faith, regard Him *without the least reservation not just as a "Father" (seen with the passage of time, of ever more dubious parenthood) but as Living Person absolutely Logical*⁸: otherwise,

⁸ We must at long last mature: Life is *not* just a characteristic of the flesh, but *also* of the Spirit! Even the amoeba lives, microbes live, worms live, more advanced animals live, humans live. The nihilists attempt to show that there is absolutely no difference except in what we visibly see as products of blind naked purposeless chance. We must at last mature! *Not* all such life is the same: The amoeba simply "lives", but I challenge the nihilists to show us that it also *reasons*! The more advanced animals clearly show the ability of rudimentary reasoning. Missing links *up* the

they simply do not regard Him as perfect enough, which must be seen as a shadow that every believer respecting himself must terminally put out of his mind! Unless we act thus, we simply have *no* future as a race of rational beings! But this is a principle that none of the established religions has yet comprehended! The belief in the separation of “theology” and “science”, so tenaciously adhered to by both sides, is solely due to just this incomprehension.

§24. The first skirmishes between “science” and “theology” appeared in the so-called age of enlightenment. The open attack

evolutionary ladder are permitted to be conceived *only as more capable of survival than even the links just below them; they simply may not be conceived as extinct!* So, I challenge the nihilists to show us that the very next step up from the ape was the creature having the ability of human speech that is just *not* about survival by food and water but about *all* the abstractions we have mastered and all the conceptions we have formed from God up there all the way down to the fundamental photon! The search for the *still* “missing links” that would cover this vast field of intellectual difference *is long since the most stupid joke ever played by willful so-called “scientists”* [they call themselves, paleontologists is their professional name] attempting by hammer on the hard rock in the sun-burnt desolate deserts of the world to unearth the intellectual *and* spiritual difference between the howling of an ape on the one hand, and Homer’s epics, Hindus’ *Upanishads*, Aristarchus’ heliocentricity, Sophocles’ *Antigone*, Plato’s *Republic*, Byzantine *Vespers’ Φῶς ἰλαρόν*, Dante’s *Divine Comedy*, Shakespeare’s *Sonnets*, Handel’s *Messiah*, Beethoven’s *Ninth*, Schubert’s *Winterreise*, Vaughan Williams’s *Lark Ascending*, Pythagoras’s *Theorem*, Newton’s *Laws*, Kepler’s *Laws*, da Vinci’s *Gioconda*, or El Greco’s *The Grand Inquisitor* on the other. As long as such “search” is permitted to go on in the midst of hunger-stricken peoples in Africa, horsewhip makers ought to be ordered fast back to work! The biochemical differences between ape and man are getting to be so small (less than 2% as of my last hearing), as the functions of their bodies, especially those of tails, hands and tongues, remain so very different that, the latter *cannot but be reflected in the remainder of the difference* of the former between the two species. The atheists *must* at long last either produce a *convincing link of cause and effect* between proteins and amino acids on the one hand, and such as *Sonnets*, *Hymns*, *Symphonies*, *Theorems* and *Universal Laws* on the other, or just shut up for good! The stupid farce has been played for far too long! As shame fails, the next word belongs by right to the whip! The truly important part of life *is that of the Spirit, not of the rotting flesh!* Better than all the rest, the scientists *must* know this Truth! Einstein was so convinced of the uniqueness of his own brain that he bequeathed it to scientific research. Laboratories all over got a slice! And *they all learned absolutely nothing!*: Except that it, too, was just another brain!

of the former upon the latter came with the advent of evolutionary theory. When people still believed in the supposed God-ordained superiority of their own nations and races over those they exploited freely, they could not but reject a theory that not only put them all on one level but also called them descendants of the apes, thus at once attacking not only the social order but tacitly even the dogma of the *special* creation of man by God! When we still do not really understand our nature, the clear uniqueness of man relative to all other animals, commands blind belief in something extraordinarily special about our nature. It is quite clear that the "theologians" still do *not* accept the *duality* of our nature, as consisting of the *same ordinary "clean" and "dirty" matter as everything material else*, and then *also* of *Spirit* dwelling within our bodies for as long as we live, that is set free upon death. That was /is much too Greek a conception, for people inclined to accept a *whole, inseparable, special* nature of man as a result of which he has been destined to be raised whole in Heaven. To this day, the Church (and all monotheistic religions that alone properly are concerned with this matter) *refuses* to be specific about how matter eventually becomes Spirit, in the face of the understanding that Heaven means nothing other than pure Spirit. Simply because *they know nothing substantial about either matter or Spirit, and they have not prayed for understanding!* Naturally, the theory of evolution attracted attention both from within the sciences proper and from without. The dust has *not* completely settled yet. The original evolutionary view was too simplistic to be accepted unexamined, and examination resulted in substantial changes of the theory aiming at fortifying it, though only against *formal* attack. Even so, *all the real questions* regarding the *pragmatic* problems the theory still faces remain unanswered.

§25. (a) Leaving all other details aside, no evidence can be stronger against evolution than that the organisms found in the fossil record are *all* having organs fully developed! When the basic idea of the theory is the survival of the fittest under an "order" of things developed on mere chance, that "order" *cannot be other than that of chaotic disorder!* Having worked professionally in ferromagnetic mines, I, too (as *all* others in the field of mining), *never* found the most rudimentary utensil made of ferronickel (or such)! Why? Because the "law of oxidation" runs supreme, and *overruns* the so-called "law of pure chance"! *Everybody* familiar

with the structure of *all kinds* of “organs” can *only assure you that not one of them is getting in place without a consciously guided hand! Never in all the laboratories of the world has a scientist declared that he found things in order in the morning that he left in disorder in the evening before, absent all human intervention!* That the organs of living organisms are all found functioning properly except in case of sickness, and that the fossil record uncovers populations exhibiting healthily functioning life when they were alive *demolishes* the idea of functioning blind chance. The laws of physics, the laws of chemistry and the laws of biochemistry are *all* much too exact and austere to have come into being by pure chance, that by its very nature *cannot* set precedents: That a deck of shuffled cards comes in a particular order does *not oblige all the subsequent decks of cards to come out in the exact same order!* Science is *not* the study of such a “principle”!

(b) In this, the fossil record resembles fully the living populations: They both are marked by the near total absence of *failed* “attempts” of Nature that should have been in a far greater abundance than the successful “attempts”, if evolution were indeed a lawless, unguided, blind process producing things solely by chance. If chance rather than law is at the foundation of things there is absolutely no reason why like should beget like rather than unlike in all monstrous combinations, for before such combinations are born there is absolutely no telling which ones may survive and prosper!: E. g., what is so compelling about the number five of digits in our limbs that we should all have five of them, so much so that, say, six digits is an extreme rarity and indeed a teratogenic form; and, say, three, seven or any other number of digits an essentially forbidden option, if no law but pure chance is the fundamental process by which we come about? What is so uniquely advantageous about the five digits from the “survival” standpoint (that evolutionists so value) that not even blind chance dares experiment profusely with any other number of them?

(c) The evidence of Law, *and only thus of Creation* is precisely in the *abundant* presence of laws such as this *only apparently “simple* law of five digits” that alone permits us to recognize immediately as teratogenic even a single failure of such a law. It is exactly the extreme rarity of teratogenic forms that compels the honest observer to pay attention to the law itself and to demand a *logical* explanation of it that is totally beyond the ability of pure

chance to establish on populations, their embryos, sperms and eggs. There is no greater, deliberately dishonest misrepresentation of the objective evidence than the insistence of evolutionists so grossly to ignore the norm of the vast majority of cases, even as they pretend to be scientists, i.e., students of Natural Law, rather than of figments! If evolution based on chance were true, the thalidomide babies would, could and should *never* have been recognized as terrible! Evolution as an argument for the defense, had it been presented, would have been thrown unhesitatingly but correctly out of the courts. The defense was not then so stupid as to present such an argument, and no evolutionist is so stupid as to dare present such an argument. The evolutionists seek *only cunning ways* to undermine our faith in Logos! This is why they have *not* called for the abolition of medical research and the closure of hospitals in defense of their beloved “theory of chance”; instead, they too run to them to be restored to the order of *no fortuitous law* that is called “perfect health”! The cunningness of atheists and the healthy pity believers take even of them when sick is no reason why the creationists should treat them in arguing with feather gloves, rather than demolish their pseudo arguments with the *living examples all around us*! The evolutionists deserve to be laughed out of court on the *sufficient* evidence of their *bad* “logic”! The creationists *must* provide the *correct* arguments that *cannot* fail to produce the spontaneous laughter, though the matter is hardly one for laughter. The atheists have overplayed a totally sick “argument”. It is high time that they be laughed out! Figuratively, *kicked* out!

§26. There can be no question that the theory of evolution was a genuine product of the time and social circumstances in which it appeared. This is why it was immediately embraced precisely by those who had a worldly interest in casting doubt about the existence of God, whose number since has vastly increased. This of course, as *we must be honest*, in front of the backdrop of the great and vast in number sins of the Christian Church! It is *precisely for those sins* that its leaders have *wrongly* made the matter of God a matter of pure “faith”, totally unguidable by Reason, foreign to Logos! Without in the least realizing that the separation of God and Logos they thus enforce in undisciplined minds as true *is precisely the unpardonable sin*, that *officially through Church sanction* renders God at least indifferent to Reason, *against* Christ’s

plea that we love God “and with all [our] intellect” also! To understand the damage thus caused, we only need consider what abominations so-called “love” is capable of when it is not guided by Reason! This is why the Church *still remains mute, willfully totally uncomprehending* not only the matter of evolution but also other scientific matters that bear so heavily on our lives and souls. Evolution as a theory of the “survival of the fittest” pardoned *all crimes the “fittest” ever committed and continue through the centuries to commit* against the *thus construed to be “less fit”*, among whom are also found the men of scruples! It was thus that the field opened wide to the whims and wiles mainly of the most powerful, who by the fiat of the “law of the fittest” canceled *all* scruples!

§27. (a) What is unknown by laymen and ignored by those regarding it their intellectual duty to challenge the shameless falsehoods of professors poured down on students from their high chairs is the *implied* probability of all the biological riches to have come about purely by chance, given the knowledge passed on by the studies of Gauss!: Just imagine him facing a modern-city one-way street: He knows that vehicles can go up or down the street, but here he observes all vehicles going one way; does he conclude this to be happening by chance or by law? The probability of ten vehicles going one way by chance is

$$p_{10} = (1/2)^{10} = 9.766 \times 10^{-4}. \quad (1)$$

That of one hundred vehicles is

$$p_{100} = (1/2)^{100} = 7.889 \times 10^{-31}. \quad (2)$$

That of one thousand vehicles is

$$p_{1000} = (1/2)^{1000} = 9.333 \times 10^{-302}. \quad (3)$$

Again, just imagine a deck of cards perfectly shuffled and then opened, only to be found that they stand in perfect order! The probability of that event is

$$p_{d1} = 1/(52 \times 51 \times 50 \times \dots \times 5 \times 4 \times 3 \times 2 \times 1) = (52!)^{-1} = 1.240 \times 10^{-68}. \quad (4)$$

The probability of that event occurring twice in a row is

$$p_{d2} = 1.537 \times 10^{-136}. \quad (5)$$

Now remembering that the whole universe contains the mass equivalent of only about 10^{80} atoms of hydrogen, if you assume it to consist solely of hydrogen atoms, your chances to pick up a *particular* atom is only $p_u = 10^{-80}$. Just compare the above numbers and see how the astronomical chances stand in comparison to those of only one thousand vehicles moving one way in a street purely by chance!

(b) The evolutionists must be asked the number of *distinct items that are all needed* to form a *single* human body, and to give us the probability that all those items fall in their proper places purely by chance, generation after generation of *all humans* that ever lived; and then of all species that ever lived!⁹ Even professors *must* be made to feel the shame of *deliberate* lying to their students from their chairs! And even the most high priests *must* be made to confess what they have allowed to pass from right under their noses all these centuries! Humility is taught from the top down, not the other way up! These people have shamelessly reversed the teachings of the Lord Christ! Darwin in Galapagos! What did he *really* see there? The survival of the fittest, or the *most fitting accommodation* of life to the *local* conditions? Did he discover there the remnants of *all other species that were unfit to the local conditions and only for that reason did they drop dead*? We now know life to thrive at great oceanic depths of total darkness. Only yesterday, we thought those conditions far too prohibitive for life! Didn't the physical conditions preexist the appearance of life? But we find gradual adaptations from species to species, that allow us to conclude evolution in action? Evolution in action based on chance demands the presence of the remnants of untold failed attempts, untold "thalidomide" fossils, for every successful one! *Where* are they? Doesn't really the presence of gradual adaptations show the operation of a scheme, indeed of a Grand Design for life that contains the mechanism that adapts its forms to the (*changing*) conditions? Bearing in mind the numbers given above *and* those asked that they be given to us by the biologists, *what* must we really say? That behind it all we only have benevolent yet blind chance, or an *all-considering* Mind, a *Nous*, *the* Logos? Far and wide over this earth have evolutionists traveled in search of support for their theories. Did they discover anywhere a hut, however humble, that got there *all by itself*, with no maker or craftsman, let alone an architect? There can be no escaping it: Evolution as taught is a naked desperate attempt to avoid confessing *the* Logos! Shame on you, Professors, *and* High Priests!

§28. Starting with evolution, God has been declared superfluous not because science proved Him to be so, but because the

⁹ As for the probability of the entire universe to have come about from the Democritean atoms on up by pure chance, we shall need a great deal more to discuss first. So, please be patient!

unscrupulous from seats of power would not recognize the legitimacy of the moral predicate that here ought to act as a determining impediment in their rush to exploit all others. The moral horrors of industrialization, colonization and war were much too obvious to those relishing the fruits of blood and tears of others, the "*less fortunate*"; who *had* to be declared "*less fit*", less advanced on the "evolutionary ladder, for only thus could the first enjoy their relishing in complete abandon! The "civilized humanists" needed *psychological* justification for their abuses, and the professors obliged! Evolution provided the proper release from the remembrance of the sufferings they themselves forced on others! And those with similar behavior in their pasts which they hoped to recapture, or in their dreams of a future which they hoped to build with the blood of others could only welcome the release from moral responsibility that the theory of evolution provided. Starting with St. Augustine the Church *adopted* the theory of "just war". Only recently, yet another highly regarded archbishop, while admitting that all religions prohibit killing (manslaughter of any kind) nevertheless acknowledged that war is a "more complicated matter"! The Church still *refuses* to stop providing the still needed fig leaf! Now, we have advanced to the idea of "*preventive*" war: Anyone now suspected of *perhaps* turning tomorrow against us, and anyone who *may perhaps in any way abet a possible* enemy in the future is *today* declared our *present* fair "game"! In the first category, also belong the present children! In the second, women and the present girls! So, *nobody* is excluded!: Our enemy is *anyone we call so!* The Brave New World of the new century!

§29. (a) This is why the theory of evolution does so well indeed! This is why it is being treated with feathered gloves! For indirectly, even those that publicly attack it even in the courts, privately live upon it! Without crime, we need no lawgivers, no policemen, no judges, no jailers, no jail-builders, no executioners, no war industry, no armies, no generals; even no priests to forgive our related sins! Just imagine the unemployment we would have if we ever came to our senses and begun living by the commandments of the Lord engraved solely in our souls! This is why the theory of evolution and all godlessness is not exposed in all its moral nakedness to full public view! Evolutionist "scientists" and all those others going along with them are only the mere and pitiful intellectual mercenaries of the far-flung "philosophy"

of willfully continuing barbarism masquerading under learning, science, culture, civilization; mercenaries hired solely in order to provide what the *kept ignorant or colluding masses* need as “scientific” foundation, justification and augmentation of our “philosophy” of unending barbarity!

(b) The success of creationists such as Morris and Parker (of the Institute for Creation Research in Santee CA) and others in exposing the fallacies of evolutionary dogma (that remain even after all the twisted sophistication of its present argumentation), will remain modest, elusive, unappreciated and unknown to the general public as long as (a) the social foundation of that dogma as presented above is not fully exposed, and (b) the creationists themselves do not cease to see themselves as appendices of the established religions, having accepted the duty to provide what “scientific” support they can for their Scriptures. In other words, the creationists will do a great disservice to their own cause as long as they continue to see “theology” and “science” as separate compartments of human activity and respective properties solely of “theologians” and “scientists” over which *they* alone have the first and last word, rather than as a *common and united realm* of intellectual activity open to *all rational* thinkers. Belief in a Personal Creator is a *total* commitment from which absolutely no one and nothing escapes! This is especially true for the Christians, who *cannot escape from all consequences* of the belief of God having become Man *for all and not only for some*. It takes a *rational*, fully committed Christian to see this clearly and conduct accordingly not just his “life”, but his *entire vibrant intellect also!* Unless he does just that, he has delivered himself to the wild winds of *uncontrollable by himself religious sentiment*, however well he may try to hide it first from himself (hiding it even under the name of “science”, that *as such is nothing other than just another cryptic religion!*); yet a sentiment that *is masterfully controlled by others using him as a sheep and a pawn!* The Good Lord had a *far better* than this idea for Man! Are at least the Christian creationists, obedient inescapably to God’s idea for Man, prepared to undertake the effort for the *complete* transformation of society, that as such is a *complete, united, moral and intellectual effort*, of which Science is but a part? Unless they are prepared for this, their “creation science”, rather than becoming a source of enlightenment and pure joy for all, will remain arid, and an embarrassment mainly of themselves!

(c) Carried away by current practice, many creationists feel it a duty to be careful, and they attempt to separate creation science from theology. But a creationist who feels embarrassed for his own theology is *not* likely to succeed, however modest a scientific goal he sets for himself; and a Christian who feels embarrassed for his own God is a far far sorrier spectacle than any atheist or other polemical anti-Christ-ian, and indeed becomes their best ally in their well-disguised but no less fervently avowed efforts to see the name of Christ and all its derivatives expunged from the human vocabulary. Even pious people, acting in good faith, think the issues easier to handle if kept separate. They *don't* understand that this notion of separation is of a *fundamentally atheistic* nature; nor that those adopting it provide unconsciously their services to the opposite camp; nor that they only manage to exhibit a faith that still needs time and deeper thought to come to maturity. We miss all this only because we fail to realize how generally successful atheism has already been. That the issues are easier to handle if kept apart is a *fundamental mistake*, of which the careful unbiased reader *will* in the end be persuaded. This at any rate is my intent.

(d) *God is the source of all Reality, both scientific or other, except of sin! Sin enters Reality solely by our choice of action!:* In order to be perfect, Reality *must* include human freedom; and that involves *choices between potentialities!* That of sanctity and that of evil! Without freedom sanctity is *out* of human reach! For sanctity to be within our reach, the *potentiality of evil must be there, too!* Both sanctity and evil enter as *potentialities, not as unavoidable obligations. We must choose, and the Lord must judge!* In the Name of Holy Perfection! *Only patent fools* demand that God had prevented evil from the start! He *could* have had, but then *we would not be free, and Heaven would be out of our reach!* They don't like to be called patent fools? The *only* remaining legitimate choice of name for them is *haters of Heaven! Their choice!* Once again: Evil enters as a *potentiality, not as an unavoidable obligation;* for without it, freedom first and *then* sanctity, the opposite to evil potentiality as a *conscious free choice* standing opposite to the *potentiality* to commit evil, *cannot* exist! It is by *our own free will to choose sanctity that it, too, enters even the present world!* It is by *our own free will to choose to do evil that it, too, enters and thus becomes real in the world!* We *cannot* hope to resolve *any painful* issue in the Spirit of Truth, that

involves *only* painful issues, by which alone *It* is transformed to Beauty, unless (a) we recognize that *It* is at the center of all good things, that in order to be such require as *potentialities, yet not to be chosen*, their opposites; and (b) *we finally free ourselves of all atheistic bias* cunningly inculcated in our culture either by *patent fools or haters* of Heaven, as each one of them selects the identity of one's own choice! Note!: License seekers *are* Heaven haters!

§30 *All* atheists and *all* anti-Christ-ians operating within Christian society deliberately distort the Truth and use and abuse the *essentially benign* character of it in order cunningly to exploit and subvert it ever more safely for themselves from within. *No* mistake may the Christians make of this! Take as *sufficient* example the Church-State separation dogma as understood in the United States. If the Founding Fathers lied in declaring that "all men are created equal", no faith may be given to any article of the Constitution than is deserving the statements of liars. If so, the American Christian experience is a foredoomed exercise in futility. If the Americans as a nation believe in the opposite, they must also believe that the Founding Fathers also *truly* believed in the Creator. Yet, hardly is a spectacle in the United States historically sorer than the misconstrual of this doctrine: Christian tolerance was inserted *solely for reasons of human freedom* understood to be kept *within* its God-ordained bounds, *not* in order to eject God from the social fiber. The misconstrual, initiated for *secular gain by seeming*, so-called Christians, eventually surrendered society to the hands of *active* anti-Christ-ians and atheists who hastened to turn the Country *de facto* atheistic, by giving willing practitioners an essentially *free* hand, who then converted Religion, Churches and State to servile maids of *their* particular interests. For this reason only do the churches continue to be tolerated and to be granted the privileges they enjoy: because they deliver servants obedient, pliable and unthinking to a progressively *ever less* Christian and *ever more* atheistic State serving *such* interests. If the proper teaching of Religion, Ethics and TheoLogY must, *as it must*, be removed from the hands of the "churches", it is only to be done for their obvious failure [due to the absence of faith of their prelates in God] to defend the Country successfully against this horrid internal subversion. Proof first and *sufficient* supplies the splintering of the churches, that is anything but benign. The so-called "ecumenical" efforts *are* laughable, the matter anything

but, the theological immaturity of the prelates evident to all having eyes to see. Quite simply, the churches have simply failed the Nation and are a cause of embarrassment to the remaining believers in God, who are obligated to cut a fresh path, or at least *retrace the original path* that the churchmen abandoned to the weeds. World leadership has meaning and acquires respect *only as it supplies moral leadership also grounded on and guided by a solid faith in God*. Economic, military and political power are *not* their own objectives, but only the means attracting attention to the *moral prerogative!* The Country does *not* give evidence of the *spiritual agony that accompanies the provision to the world of this worthy example*. Relative to it, the highfalutin words the politicians unendingly mouth are infantile blubbering! By what right do I make this charge? By that of a man daring to see what the world *could have become but has not* after two thousand years of the true, *yet still absent*, Christian example! Now, the torch has been passed on to the United States! *Do we* understand the obligation of shedding around the moral light the world now needs, that *would oblige the Lord* to crack an approving just visible smile at us? What does *maturing* mean?

§31 If today there are bona fide Christians who still fail to see the *totally seamless* spectrum of human activity, that we classify variously as cultural, intellectual, moral, philosophical, theological, theoretical as well as practical, this is only a clear *proof* of how little we have understood of the implications of God and Man. We need to re-examine the *entire spectrum* of issues and problems implied by Creation, *real* for believers, *still potential* for unbelievers. Nothing would be sorrier than to be shown that the so-called "Christians" and "creationists", too, are just another group of special interest merchandisers determined to meet *for monetary profit* the particular, psychological if nothing else, need of the "marketplace"! Here, I only attempt to identify the *true* source of the *one* Problem of the World and the Universe, and to suggest, as far as I can see it, the vast area to which *all* intellectuals respecting themselves *need to pay attention*.

6

THE
SUSPICIOUS
ORIGIN, GROUND AND PURPOSE
OF OUR PRESENT THEORIES

§32 Now, an implacable rationalist cynic may well ask *whether without ever confessing it, unconscionably yet truly some have made it their sworn purpose to bring us to the brink, by so designing their teachings as to bring us just there, whether by the one or the other means!* Please consider:

(a) Theory Number One: The “unprovability” of God, that most of us have swallowed unchewed, missing the fact that God’s *being* [the question of His *ontology*] is being ignored and only His “existence” [the question of His reality, presence or absence] is being “discussed”, by which *trick* t hidden from view goes the attempt to avoid this *difficult yet crucial* distinction, *and* our *illicit* categorization of Him with about anything else of which we do *not* discuss the ontology but its mere reality as an *ordinary material res*, said non-existent when we cannot examine it as the rest! With this teaching, *identically coming down by common, agreed on, seemingly learned opinion* from both the very highest chairs of “theology” and of “science”, the faith of *all* (except only the *few* willing to dig deep in the diamond-hard ontological and existential core of the matter) *cannot but be skewed and subverted* and nothing can be believed to exist that a hardened hand cannot feel, an untrained myopic, astigmatic eye cannot detect, an untutored mind cannot comprehend, and an undisciplined conscience unaccustomed to the endless pain of minute examination of *all* received messages cannot fathom! Of course the atheist stands to gain by such

a teaching! But doesn't the "theologian" understand that, by his own *identical* teaching, he plays, *supposedly* on behalf of the Lord he claims to represent, a *cruel* game of heads or tails at the expense of souls that *cannot* bear the strain and stress? A "theologian", especially a churchman, is *not* an ordinary "intellectual", nor a professional interested in making a fast deal, but a man sworn to mind the *true* safety of people's souls, *not* the *temporary* soothing of their psychological anxieties! For these, *there are better* specialists, medicines, means, and far more pleasant ways of spending one's time in order to distract oneself! Among the theologians of *all* three monotheistic religions serving the spiritual needs of half the population of the world and affecting the lives of us *all*, isn't there *just one* man having enough faith to stand up and declare that Holy God *cannot have, barred by His own Holiness*, so arranged things as to remain undetectable by men's intellects, allowing that *only by our ever doubtful sentiments* may we approach Him? So *really little* is the faith in God of them *all*??? And isn't the "scientist", *if* he prides himself as a *scientist*, a man dedicated to solving *difficult* problems, to elucidating what *seems* mysterious, to pushing ever out the curtain of the unknown that prevents our panting lungs from breathing in ever more, ever fresher air to oxygenate the brain spending itself right at the front of that curtain? Why then does he reject the *true and worthy* pride for solving that greatest of all problems and feels satisfied with the *always doubtful* pride of a Nobel prize that tomorrow may prove to have been wrongfully awarded, which *only by collusion is never confessed*?

(b) Theory Number Two: The theory of evolution both as originally conceived and as developed to date *denies all rationality* acting under what *it insists has been a totally fortuitous and undesigned* "scheme" of selection! Unquestionably, *it* was the first of the modern "*scientific*" theories that held high the banner of rebellion against *all* underlying rationality! *It* was behind which there *later* gathered all the "hard" sciences led by atheists and "agnostics"! It was *easily more than sixty years after its* appearance that physics under its own banners of relativity and quantum mechanics could at all with any semblance of "good" conscience arrive at the "conclusion" of meaninglessness! *It* first showed the way to that "conclusion", now openly proclaimed by "all authorities and all serious scientists", *humbly proclaiming first themselves and*

all their sayings meaningless! But even as the theory *still restricts itself* to biology, *no one* can deny the underlying physics on which *it*, too, operates and by which *it is* inexorably carried to wherever the underlying physics leads! Why, then, do “all authorities and all serious scientists” *not* regard themselves *duty and honor bound* to spread *it* [the theory of evolution] out to make *it* a *general theory of evolution underlying all “hard” sciences, all the way back to the Big Bang?* Surely, an implacable rationalist cynic *will* say that *there must be some reason even for that!* Could it be that it hits much too close to home? A general theory of evolution *cannot* start from the amoeba! *It must* start from the Democritean atom! The amoeba subdivides, the Democritean atom does not! If anything subdivided at the moment of the Big Bang it was the *whole universe*. But then it is *arbitrary, gross* to say that it subdivided to just atoms of hydrogen! They, too, are composed of sub particles! *Why then universally to just atoms of hydrogen? What totally fortuitous and undesigned “scheme” of selection brought that subdivision about? Why don’t “all authorities and all serious scientists” regard it a duty to give us the mathematical probability of that subdivision? Surely, the numbers cited earlier give them some idea about the procedure, even if things at the moment of the Big Bang worked in the reverse. But then, Friends, remember: Gauss stands on the side watching over the probabilities! Does he conclude lawless chance or Law at work?*

(c) Theory Number Three: Relativity: the theory that attempts to make the point, as much as Einstein could make the point stick, that, above all, underneath all, controlling all, in the place of the old Absolute Designer-Intelligence God, there instead stands a new *Absolute Principle-Goddess*. The difference? The old God was believed to have established a *well-behaved scheme based on Law* determining *all* relationships, including the physical, that could in brief be called *relativistic Determinism*. *Einstein definitely wanted this arrangement canceled and this way of thinking foreclosed!* So he *reversed* the nominative and the adjective! He made a new substantive out of the old adjective, and demoted the old substantive to the adjectival position of a mere characteristic! He called the new Goddess “Absolute All-determining *Relativity*”! The difference? Where the stiff Law stood, there now stands the *view of the observer*, in the “science” of this new “physics” called the “*observer’s* system of coordinates”! In plain language? What *anybody*

says passes! Down goes the old God! Now, up stand all and everything as co-equal "gods"! Accounting, reporting, apology? No longer there! The "gods" do *not* report to anyone! Total release from responsibility! *All* pangs of conscience *gone*! Freedom at last! Or is it *absolute license*? For, *of course, as always*, who has the upper hand wins! Only now, the upper hand no longer belongs to Reason and the Holy Logos, but to brute physical force! Don't be impressed by the ostensibly austere looking mathematical formalism of the theory! That is a mere dress to impress the ignoramuses! Underneath it all the king stands naked. But the cognoscenti do not mind: first comes the business! And to do that well you need good psychology! Already with his paper of 1916, Einstein *was* sincere: he did *not* intend "a system ...as simple and logical as possible, ...but that the reader ... feel ... the path ... psychologically ... natural ..."! Without these explanations, the difference between *relativistic* Determinism and *deterministic* Relativity *appears* subtle; with these explanations, the difference *is* shown to be *fundamental*! Without these explanations, all seems theorizing, beyond the reach of the uninformed reader; with these explanations, everyone can indeed understand how the initial conditions determine the outcome: how wide, *worlds apart*, stand the old and the new visions of the World!: True: Einstein *insisted but solely on his sort of "absolute rationality"*, operating so as to make *Relativity* Goddess Maxima! To *whom* he *knowingly* sacrificed *even the possibility* of making such *definitive fundamental distinctions* as those of here/there and before/after, that *are essential* even to *any* Goddess Maxima honor bound to respect her good name! Because it was *only* for the sake of *Relativity of the psychologically affected observer* that he insisted that there be *nothing other* than the physical universe understood in *his own way*, that *essentially undercut even this his only "Goddess"*, by *knowingly denying her all possibility of spatial and temporal self-knowledge*! What this makes even of *his "absolute rationality"* based on *such all too dubious* ontology as *so compromisedly* conceived by him *is now obvious*!

(d) Theory Number Four: The now accepted Quantum Mechanics. *Equally obvious is the fact* that, even as Einstein thus *played with fire* drawing the above *not at all "subtle"* distinction, but *not* eliminating the idea of the Absolute though now reserved for *his Relativity*, under the banner of the theory of quantum mechanics, his "scientific" opponents have wanted to remove *all men-*

tion of the Absolute! *Curiously essential* to the edifice Einstein built *was indeed the door of the Absolute!* But Einstein *designed that door both as a terminal shrine to his Relativity and forever closed to the all-out uncompromising Rational Absolutism of Intelligence!* *Even more curiously, his opponents, too, have wanted this door both kept and walled in!:* They *do want to have full access to it and use it for their purposes, but they also want all "illicit" connotations coming with it left unmentioned!* Thus must we see their insistence on the superiority of quantum mechanics, to which they adhere with *an even greater, and worse than medieval, religious fervor and awe; refusing, as no believer ever refused to question his God,* to question its all too obvious irrationality, that must remain unmentioned in order that all outsiders never learn the proceedings, developed and written by the initiated solely for themselves! A mathematical theory replete with infinities! *All* magically expelled, in officialese "re-normalized out"! To the body of the theory we shall return later when the time for it comes. Our present intention is other: to expose the moving impulse, that also *is* the intended objective; which is none other than the banning of the Absolute. The means is called "Indeterminacy, or Uncertainty Principle". A mere *principle* [based as we *shall* see on a *misreading* of physical Reality]! On the basis of which, Heisenberg was adamant: that we *not* see under even the name "electron" *anything* physical, but only the *mathematical* expressions!: Now even five year olds carry along their cellular phones, on which they can download even what is best left unmentioned. [Back in 1990, I recall, I had commented to my lawyer and then also a judge that half the proceeds from nocturnal telephone calls of lascivious nature were ending up in the coffers of the telephone company paying for high-end research and the Nobel laureates in its staff. Even he did *not* like the comment!] Imagine how the high priesthood of "science" like the mention of *their* dubious practices, just as also any suggestion of the existence of "hidden variables" operating in subatomic levels. Which, however, does *not preclude their empty theorizing* about quarks, chords and the like! But variables suggest *all too clearly stiff laws operating directly in that level of nature,* which not only blows up the uncertainty principle, but even opens the door to admit the Intelligence having laid down those stiff laws, that *they* want kept out with the tool of the uncertainty principle! In obedience to which, we are asked to submit no questions embar-

raising the professors! So it is that our professors want us all of all ages down to babes to gasp in amazement as if in a circus. Pigeons out of hats? Wonder! A miracle! Priests, professors, jugglers, astrologers, fortune tellers? All "humble" servants of the Unknown Unknowable, that likes particularly the *fat* sacrifices! Intelligence? Unless it refers to that of professors, *Its* mention is insolence! Unfaithful, you shall *never* get a degree!

§33 But now, with the "philosophies" and intentions of all these four great "scientific" theories exposed to full view, *what* indeed is our cynic to make of *all this openly concerted* "scientific" effort? That our "best and brightest" do *not* know what they are doing; thus insulting their intelligence? Or that they know full well what they are doing, having an *all too clear* objective in mind; thus doing all due honor to their intelligence, but exposing their now *all too naked* motive? Which is none other than that, as Kitty Ferguson put it, "[b]y offering a plausible competing explanation, t[o] make unbelief a reasonable alternative" to belief; to place *irrationality on a par with Rationality*; thus profaning the Holy God-Logos?

§34 In her "*Fire in the Equations*" Kitty Ferguson (loc. cit.) has made a study of the of S. Hawking's sayings, whom she admires and respects for his courage "in the face of overwhelming adversity". It takes a deep believer in God to admire and respect even "an avowed agnostic" for his virtues. But, I submit, it is high time for us all, adversity-stricken avowed agnostics by right of obligation included before us all, to ask even about the *source* of their admirable virtues! *How does a meaningless purely physical universe produce such generally recognized admirable virtues*, that are nothing at all if not *spiritual* products? Values *can* be found even in an *untreated refuse* dump site: Poor people collect all salvageable values, and birds feed. So, I submit, this is *not* a good enough approximation of total meaninglessness. That can only be approximated by refuse *so thoroughly mixed as to make it forever impossible to collect anything valuable from the homogenized heap!* How do you extract admirable *spiritual* values from *there*? An "avowed agnostic" *is honor bound to ask and satisfactorily answer this question before all other ones!* If he succeeds in doing that, he *must then ask himself whether he may still call himself an agnostic!* Ferguson states: "[t]o say that Hawking or any other theorist has shown us there is no God is premature to say the least". I *must* ask: *How does a theorist show us the existence or nonexistence of anything?* Does it not

take an archeologist or a paleontologist, i.e., *practical* men willing to get dirty digging deep and examining minutely a site to state the existence or nonexistence of findings in it? A theorist can only present us *his theory and his assumptions; nothing* more. Then it is up to *practical* men to investigate the *hard facts* and determine the compatibility of the theory with *them!* Particularly in the case of Hawking, the hard facts *are his evident virtues!* *Does his theory explain at least them?* If not, where indeed is the value of “avowed agnosticism”? One who doesn’t understand the complexity of today’s advanced scientific theories, the core of which is accessible only by the few, nor the whole package of side issues in which these theories are ever so carefully wrapped, *cannot* evaluate the caveats and takes the mere statements of the theorists before even they are put to the test as a proven truth! Laicization of science is useful, but only when *every word is put down and taken with infinite care;* otherwise it is bound to mislead! When, as Ferguson puts it, we dare “put God to the wall”, why shouldn’t our cynic question how Hawking *from his wheelchair* dares ask “what place for a Creator?” After all, even a “complete” *man-invented* “theory of everything” *cannot* be more than an *exercise on paper!* Is it possible that Hawking is ignorant of what it would take to translate *our* scribblings into Reality, that it took *our entire civilization to date* to put a man on the Moon for just a couple of days? Will Hawking’s “theory of everything” *also* explain how *his* scribblings, “written” on *no paper at all,* made *this real* Universe? As his effort is to avoid the initial singularity, for his proposed theory to be correct, *it must prove the impossibility of any law already discovered or to be discovered in the future* explicitly expressing universal physical operations in terms of a *definite age* of the universe, as that *automatically* introduces the notion of *Beginning,* that the “experts” attempt *so clumsily* to hide behind the term “singularity”, *adopted only in order to confuse the uninitiated!* For, obviously, *you cannot ever have more than just one singularity, as the two terms cannot but remain synonymous!* Our incorrigible cynic will insist: *if* Hawking is such a good theorist and “avowed agnostic”, *rather than remaining only an one-side advocate,* why doesn’t he first *also* spend an *equal* time on theorizing on and examining the *alternative possibility* that the *true fire* suggested by the equations is none other than the *creative intellectual and practical power* of God by which He called the world into being, so that *he, Hawking,* can then compare the two

alternatives and present to us the results of *that* comparison also? Now *that would be* something before which *any cynic would take a* pause!

§35 Alas, our best our brightest *cannot* escape the grip of the cynic! Kitty Ferguson obviously concurs with Hoyle whom she quotes saying that "I have always thought it curious that, while most scientists claim to eschew religion, it actually dominates their thoughts more than it does the clergy"! Our cynic will reply: "But this is *not* curious! There is an *obvious* reason for that: *Both* camps deal with the problem of Reality. But they *arbitrarily* cut it down the middle, into an emotional and a logical part. The clergy take *only* the former, the scientists *only* the latter. The clergy regard God as an *unfathomable* Person, but *not also* as the *Supreme Logician, Scientist and Engineer* whose material product is the world *they too touch*; which if we carefully study, we all *can* arrive at understanding *more than just that* aspect of God's nature that *is thus* accessible to us! The scientists, on the other hand, *correctly* regard the clergy's *half* God a figment of the human imagination, but *wrongly reject even the possibility* of God being the *Complete Supreme Person*! *Wrongly* the clergy stand unconcerned about the *hard fact* that the world *is a logical product* of God, that *thus connects all* to the world of the Spirit; and *wrongly do they abandon the world's fate entirely in the hands of the Lord*, instead of correctly insisting that we all give a hand steering it by our best Reason; nevertheless they *believe and do not contest* God! Emotionally exhausted, they *can* sleep! The scientists, however, trying to understand the world, are *constantly* faced with the dilemma either (a) to accept *it itself as God*; in which case, as they examine it *functioning*, they act as *anatomists of the living physical God, who however does not respond as he should* to the proddings; or (b) for their *also* being most puzzled by the *obvious absence of a physical source of the logical structure* of the world, to *admit, as a consequence*, the clergy's proposal that the world is truly a product of an *otherworldly* God's creative action, *which they hate to do*! Not that they have determined that structure and there only remains to discover its source; but that *even before discovering it, they are persuaded of its logicity, that alone justifies their own labors in the lab, that would be pointless if the structure of the world were not logical*! At rock bottom, for all their *false sayings to the contrary*, the scientists *do very much believe in God as the Supreme Logician, Scientist and Engineer, while they re-*

fuse to accept Him as the Supreme Spiritual Person, He above all else is! Thus their logic is split down its middle: Palpably in all they do, feel they only His Presence, that would be impossible were He not there! They are puzzled by His unresponsiveness to their physical-anatomical proddings, only because they choose to regard Him as physical! In desperation, instead of confessing the world different from a living man stretched on an anatomical bed [in whom alone body and Spirit react and produce a living reaction] and separate from God [unresponsive solely for that reason to physical-anatomical proddings], because they hold only the body, they consider it logical to declare the Spirit of God nonexistent! This, while they are awake. For soon after Morpheus takes over and the Spirit in them relaxes, the nightmares begin: Fully as Diotima [what for a woman magnificent name: "the God-honoring"! Just please attempt to compare that to what we here describe! Alas, there still are plentiful pitiful patent fools who dare call the Hellenes idolaters! Those who, far beyond mere marbles, sculpted immortal even more the holy words!] explained, their Spirit's one half seeks to unite with its other, the one they rejected while still awake! Man asleep with his God unites! Cold sweat wakes them up! What awake they hate the most is their far better half with which they unite upon falling asleep! Regarding themselves men of cold Reason, they reject the divine emotion of feeling complete! And in fury, they deliver themselves to the never confessed raw ugly emotion of hating all that is Heavenly! So much having in mind, of course fall asleep they cannot! You can now imagine the mood they are in, by which occupied they return to the insane "sanity" of their zombie-like fully waking life!"

§36 Here indeed are three examples of how they try to cope:
 (i) Since we first learned of imaginary numbers, we also learned they are inseparably associated with negative numbers, which in turn owe their existence to our arbitrary setting of the zero at some definite point of our choosing in mathematical and perhaps now even in geometrical "space", without showing nonexistent the space to the left of said point. All negative numbers and all negative physical quantities owe their "presence" in our science to some such convention; they are not real! Hawking uses imaginary numbers (i.e., second-class unreal "things" hanging on the convention of first-class unreal, negative, "things") in order to circumvent first, the singularity not just of a conventional mathematical but of the

physical zero, and second, the inexorable logical necessity of having a Logical Creator that alone can bring into being the logical physical reality science investigates out of the physical nonexistence the physical zero represents! Our recalcitrant cynic will insist that this second one has been Hawking's real objective all along!

(ii) In the section titled "The Relation of the Four-coordinates to Measurement in Space and Time" of his seminal 1916 paper, Einstein saw fit to state that "It is not my purpose in this discussion to represent the general theory of relativity as a system that is as simple and logical as possible, and with the minimum number of axioms; but my main object is to develop this theory in such a way that the reader will feel that the path we have entered upon is psychologically the natural one, and that the underlying assumptions will seem to have the highest possible degree of security", which we quoted abbreviated earlier (§32c, p. 50)¹⁰. Our cynic may justifiably read this statement thus: "It is *not* my purpose in this discussion to represent the general theory of relativity as a system that *is* as simple and logical as possible, and with the *minimum* number of axioms; but my *main* object *is to develop* this theory *in such a way* that the reader *will feel* that the path *we* have entered upon is *psychologically* the 'natural' one, and that the underlying assumptions *will seem* to have the 'highest possible' degree of security"! Are we to deny this reading (namely, with the emphases indicated in bold italic) and its implications? To *this* day, we have *no* proof that the theory *truly is as simple and logical as possible!* Einstein *admitted* that it was *not* his purpose to *represent, let alone prove,* that his theory really *is* such! We only know that *no other theory has been permitted* to surface! The theory *is* admitted to *have been developed* in *such a way* that the reader (but *which* reader? The reader *willing to believe* this theory? To this day, *not every* reader!) will *feel, not be shown to his satisfaction!* What? That the theory is *psychologically* the "natural" one! Now, this definitely was *the first instance in the world annals* that a fundamental physical theory claimed validity *not on solid scientific argument but on psychological feeling of what is physical-natural!* Finally we were told, the assumptions underlying the theory *will seem, not be proven,* to have the "highest possible" degree of security! Our persistent cynic will ask: Would a theory as fundamentally challenging now-

¹⁰...Approved English translation in A. Einstein's et al. THE PRINCIPLE OF RELATIVITY" Dover Publications, Inc. 1923, 1952, ISBN 486-60081-5, (Library of Congress Catalog Card Number A32-9845), p. 118.

established dogma as general relativity was back then be allowed today to appear in the scientific press, if it made *such* representations? Would *you* say that the theory has since been verified; post hoc ergo propter hoc? Lindley states (loc. cit., p. 87) that “[t]he true accuracy of Eddington’s test *has been debated* by historians ... Since then other tests of general relativity have been devised and performed; nevertheless, because directly measurable effects within the confines of the Solar System are so tiny, general relativity *remains* a theory whose wide acceptance owes *at least as much* to its overwhelming conceptual power as to any empirical support. The theory, *fully grasped*, strikes most students of physics as something that *has to be right* because it *seems* so right” [all emphases added]! Lindley proceeds (on p. 88-90) to discuss what must be the very best “evidence” today in favor of general relativity: the Hulse-Taylor pulsar. After admitting the long-standing failure to discover gravitational waves, even in the case of this (“*true or believed*”?, our cynic will again wonder!) binary, he states that the observed gradual decay of the orbit of the binary “was enough to persuade most physicists that the strange distortions of spacetime, so fiercely debated ..., so contrary to the common sense ..., were real physical phenomena”. But this *is pure post hoc ergo propter hoc* reasoning, based moreover on a *substantial number of ad hoc assumptions* Lindley was much too loyal to mention *superadded* to those used to build relativity! In addition, the “proof” *makes no allowance for, and Lindley mentions none of, such unobservable phenomena certain to exist in such a close binary, as are tremendous tides and possible transfer of matter, that drain gravitational energy, but remain impossible even to calculate except on a large number of entirely dubious assumptions!* Our cynic *cannot* be persuaded that the theory of relativity has at all been proven, especially as Lindley himself admits that “[o]f all the great theoretical constructions of physics, general relativity is the least demonstrated”! This brings us back to the beginning: *What* were the *real* psychological reasons that pushed Einstein to devise his theory, that since 1905 (or 1916, if you will) even the most strenuous scientific effort the world has yet *not* managed to prove? Looking back over his own life, *every true genius will admit the fact* that at the ages of 26 and 37 (respectively, Einstein’s in 1905 and 1916) he had *no substantial body of personal experience* and wisdom in the ways of science or the world permitting him to speak with *authority* on its fate! What Einstein did have in abundance were his

self-confessed rebelliousness against authority, forcing him to deny even the personhood of the God of Israel, and certainly, the wounds he carried as a Jew in the Christian milieu, that made him so greatly desire a scientific scheme that would permit him both to deny reference to ultimate absolute authority and to claim the correctness of all points of view! Without doubt, that was the psychological force majeure behind his lifelong scientific efforts!

(iii) In the section labeled "Newton's Theory as a First Approximation" of Einstein's 1916 paper, there exist at least five unevaluated assumptions without which the title point couldn't and still can't be "shown", assumptions superadded to those made before! But if any one assumption be given an equal probability of being right as of being wrong, for five of them to be all right, the probability is 1 in 32, or just over 3%! Neither Einstein nor anybody else has offered any, let alone solid, arguments that even only those five assumptions indeed have very high probabilities! On "average", each of them must be right by at least 87% in order that they all together just have a 50% chance of being right! The great significance even of the number of assumptions used in building scientific theories has not concerned the scientists! With such surfeit of geniuses around, can it be that they all have failed to notice the significance of these statistics? Or are they so confident that nobody will notice it and call their bluff, that it is upon such poor chances that they play their game of world poker—with God, none other? [In view of the clear experimental end of physics, may I humbly suggest that some honest mathematical physicists consider forming a society having as object the identification, enumeration and evaluation of all assumptions underlying each now separately yet reverently standing and each proposed theory, and all these theories put together, vis-à-vis the integral problem of the world, a project that certainly surpasses the ability or avocational time expenditure of any one individual scientist? I am certain that the scientific world, not to mention the laymen, will be astounded! Even if none of them rises to the challenge, our cynic's conclusion regarding affairs in the state of "Denmark" will be crushing!]

7

**THE BONE OF CONTENTION
BETWEEN
RELIGION AND SCIENCE**

§37 At this point, our now so familiar cynic shall not be able to repress interjecting that there has really been a *very great deal of willfulness and wishful thinking* in the making of our most revered scientific theories! And we *cannot* ignore the thrust of his remark, even if spitefully made! On reading Kitty Ferguson's book, one is left with the impression that "the scientists would *not* object to accepting God, if he were not a person"! I consider this idea crucial for the arguments that must now be made. She quotes Joseph Ford saying that, "[m]ore than most [scientists] are content to live with unanswered questions". I *don't* think that anyone can deny that *far more* important than deciding whether there is *some* "God" is whether there *is the Personal God*! After all, when people ask the question, it is a *personal* God they have in mind! She closes her book with: "Religion is far more optimistic than science that in some manner beyond our present concept of human reason, we can know 'everything important'. Perhaps the most significant difference between science and religion is that science thinks that on this quest we are entirely on our own. Religion tells us that although we who seek the truth may ride imaginary horses, Truth also seeks *us*!" But if she does, then she is *not* just a concept in our mind! Eggs in pigeon nests do not exist before nests, and they do not exist before pigeons! Pigeons can be out feeding, but they *are* there! God stands in the place of the unseen pigeon. We are the eggs. The world is the nest. The *single most important* difference between religion and science, surprising as it may appear, *is* in the *fact* that religion *is* closer than science to the ground point of Logic: the question of

the *Personhood* of God! *That* is the bone of contention, and religion *wins!* Any "religion" that dismisses this point or yields to the hyenas is *not* a Religion, and unworthy its salt! Because, "truth" is *not* Truth unless it *affirmatively* answers, *as it shall here be shown*, this ground question! And "science" is *not* Science if it thinks that we are on our own in the quest of 'importance', when we *must* be guided by *It* in questing the Truth by *Knowledge* (that is the other name of Science)! *Do the "scientists" really yield on importance*, do they admit that "science", *their science is not* (quite) "important"? That truly *is* News!

§38 With regard to *either religion or science*, we are *equally* on our own, no more alone and no more "together"! With regard to them *both*, and a point they *both* miss, we are who we are, *whole and indivisible!* Since at the very end of her book Kitty Ferguson capitalized Truth, I might be excused if I stated my personal sense of it: When, in 1964 (then aged 30 and a graduate student at Imperial College, London) at a time of intense concentration and agony I first realized the sheer magnitude of *all-including* Truth I, too, was seeking, its *total* penetrating power, its scope over *everything seen and unseen*, I felt my hair stand on end as I then *sensed* the *Close, Warm, Personal, Severe, Loving, Peace-giving, Joy-radiating, Safety-producing He-Presence, talking to me both from inside me and outside me* from a distance of about two-to-three meters *from beyond the wall yet inside the room*, asking me whether I *truly meant* it that I desired to know *the Truth!*: *Truth and God is a real He!* Since then, I have found the doubts beginning to drop out of my thoughts and statements on matters of Religion and Science, and I acquired the sense of *total* conviction given *only* by Absolute Logic, the Holy Logos! No! I am *not* saying that *all* I say is Absolute Logic! What I *am* saying is that where I am wrong, I am wrong *only because I have yet to unite still more perfectly the unity of Logic* (of which Science is but a part) *and Faith in God* (for which the ordinary "religion" dispensed by Churches is but a *poor* substitute)! If, remembering Lyttleton, faithlessness is on the left and Faith on the right of what I say, then *the way to Truth is not on the left, but the right!* It is in *this Spirit* that I *can* say that whoever has *not* sought Truth *at least as strongly as to feel and sense it as I did* back then, he/she has *not* known *either* the separate *meaning* of Science and Religion, *or their indivisible unity*, and *cannot* speak with *any authority from personal conviction!* It is with such conviction that I

state that *both our Religions and our Science have been much the poorer for our failure to see their intrinsic unity!* Please, don't misunderstand: I *don't* blame the Bible for not being scientific enough in the way scientists would like it to be, or science for not producing in us mystical ecstasy in the way the religious people would appreciate! Each has its audience, and each its language. And the language of either, to be written down at all, *must first be* understood by those hearing it in themselves and writing it down! Then, as religion addresses *all* people, it *must be stated in words understood by all* people! Of such a language, we may *not* expect ultimate accuracy or precision of expression, as we do of the language of science, for the *sufficient* reason that *not all* people speak *such* a language! But we may and indeed must expect from all religions respecting themselves to preach and live by the very highest standards when referring to the Ultimate Reality, that *cannot* be Ultimate unless it is *also* Personal, free of *all* blemish! If ever comes a day when *all* people become capable of *such* a language as to persuade them of this Ultimate Hard Fact, then indeed Truth *shall* inform them of Her Ultimate Unity! Before that time, *all less is big juvenile talk*, be it even based on *current* theory! Again, *not all* recognition of Truth will come to us all in a flash. *We must grow, arduously*, into Truth! Both religion and science are as much personal as they are communal affairs! As a result, they require the *gradual* development of the language tools needed for their expression and dissemination. But before we produce those tools, we need an inner understanding of what *it* is that *must* be expressed. In that, not even our present science has succeeded! Because, *it has not thought through* either what *it* is that needs to be expressed, or even the significance of what it itself has said so far! The union of Religion and Science into unity *will* indeed take the *whole* of our education and of our culture! It *cannot* come without a *radical reformation*, obviously for the much, much better, of our *entire* civilization! If that is "the ultimate cultural imperialism", so be it! God *is* indeed the Ultimate Imperialist, though with a *vast* difference! After all, isn't the Kingdom *His*? Only anarchists may object! If our "best and brightest" object to Him for being who He is, *why* do they not also object to all those far lesser pseudo-imperialists who as from high above teach the world *obvious* falsehoods? *Why* do they *not* object to their own cultural imperialism, that, as I proved above, *has* grown far, far worse than it was back

in 1905 and 1916? For not doing that, their rejection of God *is* suspect! If they feel strong on their own convictions, I will tell them that they have defeated *no* God, if they have not defeated the *Ultimate Personal God* and *His Science*! I will also tell them that they have done *no* science, if they have *not* done *His Science*! I will also tell them that, by the method of their maniacally concocted and desperately convoluted theories, *no whole* science worth its salt can come about; but only by the *only truly scientific method* that *His Personhood* requires! In the spirit taught by Plato in the *Timaeus*, I will tell them that, *only after they advance the better argument regarding Faith and Science may the wreath become theirs!* I will challenge anyone speaking of God to deny that when the idea of God first comes to his/her mind, he/she is *not automatically* thinking of God as a *He-Person*! If we *force* ourselves to speak of Him otherwise, that *is* oppression! No! That is *not* due to social conditioning! It is due to our *innate sense of what is the most logical!* It is *not* just mystical or cultural that *all* people speak of God in *He-Personal* terms! It also *is* Logical! No people who ever lived was freer than the Hellenes! Their theogony speaks volumes to those who understand its deeply philosophical-logical steps of development. In the end, they installed Zeus, the most solid *He-Person* ever conceived by human intelligence! Socrates and Plato were *not* mystics! To the degree allowed by their age, *and* ours, they were Logicians! Our own problem is that we since have developed a *very skewed* idea of the "person"! When we speak or write to someone, we do *not* address ears, eyes, or brain! We address *only the mind and spirit!* That is the (*essential*) *person!* Those others are only its *mask!* The Ultimate God *cannot* Logically lack what we all consider our *essential* person! On the contrary, His being Ultimate, *requires* that *He be the ultimate Person!* *Nothing can be, and thus nothing is higher than the person, and ultimately the He-Person!* *All else is paying toll to Cerberus, who only guards the entrance to Hades, not Heaven!*

8

**HOW
(THINKING OF)
THE PERSONAL GOD
SIMPLIFIES THINGS**

§39 Once we accept God as the Ultimate Living Mind Spirit Person, things get *greatly* simplified:

First: He does *not* hide; He is *not* afraid of *anybody*! Our failure to see Him is only *ours*! We simply *do not know how to look for God*!

Second: He did what He did with a *purpose* in Mind! *That* purpose is the *last* cause! *That is how* the last cause becomes *also* the *first* cause! Accepting as logically inviolable that there first be a first cause that *desires* a purpose and *wills* the means of its achievement, we *avoid the temporal and logical impossibility* of an uncaused last cause coming from the future to justify what has *already* become! [That *solves* the most nagging problem of the so-called “anthropic principle”!]

Third: He did what He did with *ultimate economy* conducive to *His* purpose! In other words, *it is not obligatory that everything be arranged from the beginning, unless this is how it is most economical for the objective-purpose to be achieved! This allows for “miracles”!*

Consider: *No* scientist creates a fully functional laboratory and locks it behind him, forever forbidding himself to intervene in the proceedings within! His next appearance in there *is not a miracle, but part of the logical course of events!* What he does *not* do as a matter of *pure* logic, he may *not* demand that God *must* do as an inviolable part of His own laws while he does *not* know either what God’s purpose is, or which is the *most economical* means of its achievement!

Fourth: Considering the analogy of a painting, we *distinguish, and are not mistaken in so doing*, between the pigments spread on the canvas from the “way” (including the *manner of brushstroke, overall technique and the overall design and scope*) in which they are spread! The same quantity of the very same pigments *can* be spread in *innumerable* ways, either by many creators or by the same one creator! What in our present case does the “way” of the creator represent? Succinctly, the *law imposed on* the pigments! We thus see *clearly* how material things are *one* thing and the laws of their operation are *another*; how the two do *not* mix but are *matched and made to cooperate* towards the perceived purpose! Why then must we assume that *God did not act similarly* and did *not* impose laws upon matter? *Where* indeed did we find that the laws are *intrinsic* properties of matter and are *not* imposed on it?

Fifth: As we *cannot* do anything unless our hand or agent *does* pass over *every* spot of our creation (think of a canvas being painted: where the hand or brush does *not* pass over, the canvas does *not* get painted there; and a spot on the finished product that has not been touched means *not forgetfulness but design*, just as silence in a symphony), and as the whole work (*and* the empty spots in it), by the care we lavish upon the whole speaks of us, so too, *every* spot of the universe God created *speaks* of *His* existence and presence, by the way *He made it stand as His witness!* *That* is the touchstone, by which, we *must* agree, we *can* recognize Him! Unless somebody has a *yet better* way of doing so; in which case let him propose it!

Sixth: Our ordinary *common* sense by which we judge ordinary things is neither correct *nor wrong on the whole, only unaccustomed and as yet untrained by the trainers that are us, in the ways of God's Logic!* Fearing nothing, *He had no reason to endow us with faulty common sense!* Nor with a sense incapable of reaching Him! We have *all the tools we need* to understand the world *and* God! What we *objectively cannot ever* understand, we simply do not need it to attain our objective, which is *not* beneath Him! If there truly be anything that we shall never be able to understand, that we *could* understand had we the tools, *is* superfluous in view of the objective ahead; and its presence *would* destroy the *perfect* economy of the *perfect* Creation! We must *not* ask for the unneeded!

We could go on, but I think these *will suffice* as to how we *Logically must* think of God in the context of science. Alas, we no longer

examine the *evidence* of Nature as the *witness* of God, we *only* spend our *precious* little time and the energy of our geniuses in producing *theories*, and expending for *nothing* the *real wealth* of others in our *fatuous effort* to “*verify*” them, as all along we know that they cannot truly be verified! Science is not license, nor of course is religion. God’s economy forbids *all* kinds of licentiousness: Truly, because the Lord stood against it, was He finally crucified! Doing “science” as another way of doing or boosting business is *dirty* “business”! And so is “religion”, that does not hesitate to exploit even bereavement, the dead and the naked fear of souls; selling “hope” as if it were a material product, along with incense!

§40 Let us be clear about this most important point that is usually missed: In thinking of God as just described, we do *not* create Him in our own image! While *we truly have no other or better way* of thinking about God *than the measure alone we naturally possess, which is ourselves*, our so thinking about Him does *not* create Him! It only establishes, *by our natural lights, the minimum requirements of perfection He must possess in order to exist*; and if somebody thinks that we here have missed something *important*, let him show it and we *will* add it! Whether He *truly exists still* remains to be decided by the *evidence* of Nature! *All other ways of thinking are wrong*, especially those guided by arbitrary, *elaborate theories created ad hoc on a multitude of unverified assumptions*! Let’s repeat it: Theories *cannot* be better than what they assume! *A different or opposite opinion, must be proven*! *Enough* all too precious time has been lost! *Enough* all too precious gray matter, particularly that of our “best and brightest”, has been wasted on *lost* causes!

§41 Now, how according to the Bible are we capitally called to think of God? “In the beginning God made the heaven and the earth”. “In the beginning was the Logos”, *not just the mere “Word”*! Which of these two was then the *earlier* beginning? Were heaven and earth created first, *without* Logos? Could God be *without* Logos when He created the world? *No*! The Ultimate God *could not make anything without applying His total indivisible Being*! Was *ever* God *without* Logos? *No*! The *complete* Logos, namely the ability of *all three*: to think Logically, *and* to express Himself Logically, *and* to be *infused* by a Logical Spirit, *is intrinsic* to His nature, and He *cannot* be other than what He *is by His own Nature*! These negations do *not* indicate incapacity, *nor* yielding to some extraneous superior

necessity; it is an *inseparable* "part" (in *limited* human language) of the *one indivisible whole* that is God. We, therefore, go *much too far* when we, following mundane philosophy, "see" divisions in Ultimate Reality where *none such* exists! We are *much too* conscious of our human incapacity, and *much too* wrong in letting it dictate the terms *even of our understanding of ourselves*, as when we think of the products even of our own mind (*not* of our hands) as something extraneous of it! I am referring especially to Mathematical and Logical Consistency. This is *not* external, but *part* of the mind. As we grow, our mind *deepens*, and in *its* depth do we find even the mathematical and logical consistency, but *more as a shadow of the real thing than the real thing itself*! This is why *we do not know fully what exactly* the famous Mathematical and Logical Consistency is! This is why *we in fact theorize about it also* when we say it must be this or that! But what is of *any our theory is of our own mind*! In the world out there, we may or may not find something looking *like* what is in our theory. What looks *like* does *not verify any theory*! If we truly care to find how the world *was made* (by whomever, to take the agnostic view), we *must* abandon the theories and look *hard* at the evidence/witness *after we learn to separate what is truly out there from what is only part of our theories*. Thus, what Kitty Ferguson capitalizes calling it Mathematical and Logical Consistency *also is the product of a Mind out there, as it too cannot exist outside any mind at all*; and it certainly is *not* in our own mind, as we have *no* idea about what exactly *it* is! Once for all, we *must* understand that Mathematical and Logical Consistency is *integral, not differential*! It contains *exactly all that is and excludes all that is not*! As against that, *we only produce differential theories*; the real value of which remains, moreover, unknown; theories that for being differential *cannot* fail to "predict" (nearly) *everything*, and thus *truly predict nothing*! Our theories are *much too "soft"*; yet, *it is by them* that we dare, *pedantically* test the *far harder than diamond* Reality out there! We *must swallow hard and at long last admit* that, if we find Mathematical and Logical Consistency to be the *sine qua non* of the world, what *in fact we shall admit as sine qua non is the very Mind* within which *alone* Mathematical and Logical Consistency can at all exist! In this context, we must also admit that, if I happen to hit *perfectly* on something existing out there with my mind, that something does *not* become a thing only of my mind and cease to exist out there! This is the *other*

side of what we argued just above to the effect that what is in my mind does *not* get out of it to exist out there independently of it! However, when between what is in our mind and what is out there that is also part of a mind we find that there is *perfect or seeming perfect* agreement, *we must exercise good judgment!* At first sight, we *cannot* admit that perfect or seeming perfect agreement as much more than the similarity of two *perfect or seeming perfect* twins, who *may or may not* have the exact same idea about something! What we see at first sight are only the *envelope-ideas* (of the *second* kind described just below) enclosing the *important content-ideas* (of the *first* kind). The *contents* of the envelopes *are separate* from their envelopes, and *it remains to be seen* whether the contents *also are* identical! This is why people declare they agree when in fact they do *not* agree at all! They agree, or almost, on the *rough shape* of the envelopes, when they have *yet* to agree on what to put inside! Consider: That *one plus one equals two* is an idea that I have, that you also have. But *this fact* is the *kernel or objective ontological body* of the idea of the *first* kind contained in the *corresponding envelope-idea* forming in our minds to contain *this objective fact*. When asked about something we answer "I have no idea", it is usually this idea of the *second* kind we do not have in mind, and thus lack the *context, pigeon-hole, envelop* in which it is proper to enclose the *kernel* of the question. When asked about something we answer that "I do not understand what you mean", it is the *kernel-idea* of the *objective facts* that we do not understand! *Clearly*, by using either expression, we do *not* deny the existence of the objective ontological body of the kernel-idea. *Equally clearly*, we need knowledge of *both* the envelope-"idea" *and* the kernel-idea in order to process satisfactorily *all* the facts. Even as we have or have not, may or may not form, in our minds the kernel-idea of the objective fact, the latter does *not* therefore cease to be having its own ontological body, if not in our minds, then in *some other* mind, even the one "hiding" behind the objective facts of Nature! *My* (envelope-)idea and *your* (envelope-)idea *themselves* of the self-same ontological body *remain separate and intact in themselves*, as separate and intact *remain* our two minds, whether they are thinking of the same idea or of something else. But the kernel idea, even as it is housed in those envelopes, *remains nevertheless independent of them: Clearly, even as it is housed in "here" and is a part of our minds, it is no less a part of the Reality out there!*

So too, *if out there* we find what we call Mathematical and Logical Consistency, that “lady” *necessarily belongs first in a Mind out there*, even as by recognizing her we also make her a part of our own minds: *One ontological body thought by two, or more, minds simultaneously!* The Mind out there is *no other than the Mind of God!* We must *not* commit the *great* mistake of thinking of God *separate from all that belongs intrinsically* to His own Nature that *also includes* the Mathematical and Logical Consistency! Because we *think* this consistency as a product solely of our scientific minds, and because this consistency has *not* been considered by traditional “theologians”, this consistency is *no less* a *wholesome inseparable* “part” of the Mind of God! The ancient Greeks thought first of “God”, then of Nous or Mind, and only then of Logos: They found “God” to be *unworthy of their respect if he did not have a mind at least equal to their own!* Then, as they realized that having a mind does *not* protect from acting *illogically*, they recognized *logos to be the true essence of mind!* Thus they went back and *revised* their idea of “God”, and decided that, *only* if he had an *absolute* command *not* just of logos at their own fallible level but of Logos at the *Ultimate Infallible level*, would he become *He* and worthy of their *total* respect; in which case alone, thus *by right*, the “he” becomes *He*, and the quotation marks drop from around “God”; who thus becomes the *pure Ultimate He-God!* The human mind conceived *Logos* to be the *highest possible* category of Being, and I need *not* spend more time showing the Mathematical and Logical Consistency *to be only a “part”* of Logos! It is *thus* that we *cannot* conceive of a yet higher category! It is *thus* that we *only regress, and no longer progress*, the moment we deviate from this basic principle! It is *thus* that we *cannot* think straight about the Reality out there, unless we *first* put *all* these things in their *proper* order; in which effort we spent the time so far, I putting down on paper all that lies above and you, Reader, reading it, with interest, I trust! And if you, Friend, can put all this in fewer words, yet clearer still, *yours* is the wreath!

9

BINDING CONSEQUENCES
OF
DISCIPLINED REASONING

§42 And it is *thus* that, faced with the *inescapable* idea of the *highest possible* perfection that we cannot but associate *naturally* with God, we, starting carefully and impartially, also *cannot* but admit of *only two* possibilities: Namely, **either** that *this* God is *none* other than the *physical* universe itself, which constitutes the essence of classical philosophical materialism; in which case, *all* the highest attributes (*including* that of self-knowledge, *and* that of self-control by means of *physical* laws) that we above associated with the Ultimate God *must* be discovered to be *of, not just in,* the physical universe; **or** failing that discovery and in view of the *fact, if it is a true fact,* that the universe *is* controlled by Laws of *other than its own devising,* that those attributes belong to an *entirely other, now no less but even more real, immaterial (and so) spiritual (not idealistic, as opposed to the philosophical materialistic, nor of course "spiritualistic")* category of being, and characterize a Being *having the power not only simply to think of this world, but also to reason, and reasoning to bring it into being, and set it to function under those Laws.*

§43 And it is *thus* that we *cannot but must* undertake to examine the *objective evidence for the Laws out there, not "laws"* of our own devising, controlling the physical universe, in view of the *inescapable hard fact* that the universe is *not* lawless: *If* the Laws are *from and of* the universe, to be considered as *proof of materialism, thus having adequately been shown;* and *if* they are *not from, even as they control and are thus found in,* the universe, to be regarded as *the adequate proof* of that Pure Spirit Ultimate God as the

highest outside authority by whose *willing* command alone those Laws could take effect! [In this effort, we must *not* allow ourselves to be perplexed, let alone being intimidated, by some such *basically illogical* juvenile questions as we normally hear about “who created the creator”! Especially this question encloses a fundamental logical fallacy that has escaped modern philosophers even of the level of B. Russell: We *may* speak of creators of things but *only after things are examined and found to need* creators! The process of scientifically examining things *necessarily stops at the physical universe*, that is *naturally* regarded as the highest category falling under our so-called “scientific” examination. In asking to find the Creator of the universe we are *not* acting capriciously or illogically, but because we find that the universe *needs* a Creator when the Laws that govern it are shown to require an outside Author! True, so far this determination has *not* been made, but it is *sensed* that the Laws come in from the outside. It is exactly in order to eliminate the doubt surrounding *this* sensation that we ask we look for the *true* source of the Laws acting. Removal of doubt means determination of the source. Those asking the question “who created the creator” have not yet, as it *is* their duty, asked the question “who created the universe”, and in fact are attempting by asking the former question to evade asking and *determinately* answering the latter, that logically *must* be answered first, as it is from the *universe* that we advance the question to the level of God *after* we find the question *unanswered* at the level of the universe! We may *not* ask “who created the creator” before asking “who created the universe”! *Nor* may we, seemingly in order to avoid the infinite series of questions about creators of creators, that Russell has attempted to argue as being inevitable the moment we ask about the first creator, stop asking the question about the creator of the universe, which *is within our ken* to answer, as it is in fact being demanded by atheists, even wearing the formal vestments of professors of physical science! God does *not* belong in the category of things that can be subjected to physical scientific examination; and for this *sufficient* reason we may *not* field the question about His creator, because it is beyond our capacity to ask at all whether, let alone determining that, God truly needs a creator in order that He exist! Besides, and in terms of the strictest possible reasoning, it is an *inescapable* part of our conception of the Highest Logical category of Being, in which we

+

+

classify God *as its sole member*, that He does *not* need a creator! This is *not arbitrary, but obligatory* reasoning: The Highest Logical category of Being *cannot* have a *yet higher* reference! B. Russell's and *all* similar argumentation *is* fundamentally flawed!]

§44 And finally, it is *thus* that, *beyond the troubling statistics mentioned above and the other problems already discussed*, we find *additional most powerful physical arguments* to be made regarding God and the world *from within science itself!* The era of modern science started in 1888 with the Michelson-Morley experiment. Before that, three were the important stations of classical science: Newton's dynamics, with his law of gravitation appended; the concept of energy and its conservation, come into our consciousness gradually during the middle of the nineteenth century; and Darwin's theory of natural selection. As for light, we *still* are left with Newton's "corpuscles", and Young's "waves"; our knowledge of its *true* nature has *not* advanced! *Without that knowledge did we agree* to move on to *other* discussions, including relativity and quantum mechanics! The arguments, *strictly reasoned*, refer all these.

+

+

10

REASON CONTRA BIBLICAL COSMOGONY SCIENCE

§45 With the theory of evolution having been the first to stir the stale waters, let us begin with its subject matter. Before the idea of evolution was introduced, there was no view other than the traditional, having all living organisms created separately by specie. Still faithful to this view, creationists such as Morris and Parker draw a sharp distinction even between what they call “theistic evolution” and the traditional view of creation, grouping the former with atheistic evolution, for considering the two indistinguishable except for the question of whether or not God enacted the natural processes, frameworks, mechanisms examined and discussed by science and believing that creation by specie can still be successfully juxtaposed to, and win, evolution both theistic and atheistic. Faithful to the old view, they continue to hold that the entire issue must be judged on the basis not of scientific but theological criteria¹¹, yet avoid to state how this can be done to the satisfaction of all thinking people.

¹¹ Which, alas, demonstrates the old common fallacy of having the “theologians” uniquely qualified and empowered to decide all that falls within the theological purview! A fallacy based on *forgetting that all “holy scriptures” are works of men*. Enlightened? *Only to the extent they could bear, under the lights of their time and the understanding it could provide of the Divine! No so-called “holy scripture” is a work truly of God, only of man! The only true God’s Scripture is none other than the world He created, which the “theologians” belittle cunningly in favor of their own word, which they have passed to the “masses” as having come ex-*

§46 (a) For indeed, unless we be willing to charge God with Logical arbitrariness and malice [this, doubtless, in order to confuse *us!*], which is *unpardonable* profanity, especially when coming from “theists”, we *must* admit that, even if He took only “six days” to create the world, those six days *do indeed imply some kind of “evolution”*, if only of the conditions needed to be established on each “day” that would be conducive to the success and survival of the creative work *He had planned* for the following “days” of Creation. God did *not* divide His creative work into (six or other) segments for nothing, but for a *reason!* As this *must also* be juxtaposed to the *immediate, in zero time and of zero duration*, creation of the world, remaining ever since totally unchanged as He created it and exactly as we find and know it, that *must also be considered within the power of an all-powerful Being*. The special Creation which the creationists advocate, would only be fully-truly special if it were carried out in *such zero span of time* and involved, if it *demonstrably involved*, only materials so different and disparate from each other, yet so unique to each species, inorganic and organic, as alone would demonstrate as a scientific *fact* this kind of Creation! But this *would be seen at once as many, simultaneous, parallel and independent of each other creations, a mix of foreign and unrelated and inert to each other worlds thrown for no discernible purpose together, that by no stretch of imagination or goodwill could be conceived as one Cosmos or Universe created by an all-powerful-and-wise Creator!* (And I need not discuss, only just mention the question of *what would serve as food for living species* in such a world!)

(b) On the contrary, a *one and only* Creation is recognized as such *and* as product of Divine Wisdom only when it is organized all the way from the designing to executing to functioning under

act to the letter and the last iota and comma from Heaven! Of all that is or is not *true* Holy Scripture, *only* the Logos shall decide and tell, which *cannot* by the nature of the Divine ever conflict the Truth, the Righteousness, the Justice, and all that is “written” in Nature, clearly *not* by the hand of man, “scientist” or “theologian”, but by the Logos of the Creator! The “theologians” *cannot* decipher Nature’s language! Which the atheist “scientists” constantly struggle to contort, to say what *they* want to be said! But as the sequel will show, of all them the time *has* passed; as for years twenty plus by now, *falsehoods knowingly do they continue to teach*, under cover of Churchmen, no less!

Law and Order, with all its parts harmoniously fitted to each other through space and time, as *one indivisible and meaningful whole aiming at a purpose!*

(c) I may not at this point avoid mentioning that even Morris and Parker (in their "*What is Creation Science*", p. 264) admit of a "creation period" and a catastrophic even if brief, lasting only for a few days, deposition of sediments (obviously, Noah's cataclysm), which is clearly an *evolutionary* process! So, the above sort of instantaneous creation is *not* what creationists have in mind; and they certainly would *not* blaspheme God by calling Him illogical, arbitrary (i.e., unaccountable even to Himself) or malicious! In light of which, they too *must* submit to the *logical* dictates of an *at least* rudimentary "theistic evolutionary", to the extent demonstrated in Nature, creation of the natural world by God; since *all* of it is composed of (let us briefly say) light, protons and electrons (the true nature of which still remains to be learned), i.e., materials *clearly common to all higher species, which demolishes right from its physical foundations the idea of a creation by specie of the living organisms!* Further evidence that creationists too subscribe to the general view is that Morris and Parker (loc. cit., p. 228), *unawares of its significance*, state "the testimony of the true facts of science is thus in full support of the Creation Model. That is, at some point of time, say T_o ..." ascribing to the first moment of Creation an *unspecified* time T_o , rather than an unequivocally *zero* time $T_0 = 0$!

[Statements such as "true facts" and "some" point of time, pointing to yet another and *substantial* common confusion due to inadequate understanding of the true facts, are taken straight out of *atheistic* "science", along with the statement "... the Space/Mass/Time cosmos was simply created, brought into existence in fully developed and functioning form right from the beginning" immediately following the above. At best, this language is imprecise for it leaves just as unclear what happened at T_o , as it does the standard atheistic science. If T_o were only *some* point in time and not the *zero* time, the act of Creation is left *undefended* and *can* be interpreted narrowly, as a simple act of organizing the previously unorganized elements of Space, Mass and Time, i.e., as a *limited* act excluding the creation of these three, that *must also be included* for creation be *the complete* Creation of the Natural world!

In the first place, this leaves the door open to the co-eternality of God, Space, Mass and Time, thus removing the *absolute uniqueness of God as alone being eternal!* This is an *unintended* offering to the atheists, who freely admit that at the moment of the Big Bang [the atheistic code-word that succeeds in talking of *Creation* while hiding from direct view the *Creator!*], on physical evidence, all three came into existence, their "possible" pre-existence being purely speculative, thrown in solely in order to save the atheists from having to confess the Creator as the *direct* Cause of the Big Bang, and left totally in the dark in order to avoid telling how they too came about!

In the second place, the phrase "in fully developed and functioning form right from the beginning" seems to deny the phrase "the fact of a creation period"! The only way that avoids confusion, clearing all matters as far as we can yet see, is stating that, "Yes, at $T = 0$, *both* physical time *and* the world were created; the latter *not* fully developed as we know it now. In truth, we *don't* know whether the development was ever completed, or whether *indeed the world continues to develop as it ages!* We *must* distinguish Creation from development. Development takes time. Creation took place at the definite moment of $T = 0$. How long ago that was is still open to question. We do not commit ourselves to a definite age and development period, but only to such as were *necessary* under God's overall Plan of the World. As even in historical times when faced with our sins and profanities God has shown Himself to be *very* patient, we have *no* reason to think that God created the world in a hurry, only to be very patient later! Our God *is consistent in all* He does. Consistent with *His own* Plan. We shall *not* compromise what we believe to be God's Creation of the World as a unique fact and outcome of His Creative action for the sake of arguing when it happened, or how long it took, or what its exact mechanism was. These questions have *not* been settled. *We stick to strict reasoning based on what we truly see, not on what we speculate based on arbitrary hypotheses!*" (The Reader will, I hope, appreciate both the detail and the tone of the language. These are *not* light matters, discussed speculatively in a professorial lounge! They are matters deciding the fate of souls! So, let us *all* take every due note!)]

By not explicitly and thoroughly denying the existence of time <

T = 0, at least the creationists either admit co-eternality (which most certainly is *not* their intent as it leads directly to pantheism), or to an unspecified period from $T_0 = 0$ to T_o , that only confuses matters intolerably. Only in the manner suggested above can all conceptual difficulties be avoided.

§47 (a) *Only in a beginning measure* do the above show the great complexity of the question of Creation, that *cannot* avoid detail. In God's infinite Wisdom *everything must admit of a single and simple answer!* Some creationists even dare speak of a "Creation Model", tacitly thus admitting as logical the *possible* existence of different models! We *cannot but be totally comprehensive*, for the *sufficient* reason that God-the-Creator by definition is thorough and perfect in all that He designs and does. All who accept even a rudimentary evolutionary process (now shown to be anything *but* rudimentary!) between the first and last moments of Creation, are obligated ipso facto to believe that Creation was a process *not in the least* haphazard, arbitrary or incongruous, and so not at all rudimentary, but absolutely tied down to *detailed Design conceived, based on Law, obeyed in Nature*. So we *all*, theists and atheists, gnostics and people pretending agnosticism, believers and non-believers, monotheists and polytheists, quiet zealots, fanatics and well-hidden bigots; profound-pretending professors de profundis deciding the fate of men and priests from on high murmuring prayers even they do not understand to a God *they definitely do not* understand, *must all* take note: *the time of tales is over!* The pretense of not understanding the basic issue of our being shall no longer wash! Before us stands the Creator! So far, *we*, telling mostly blasphemous tales, *have judged Him!* Now, *He is ready* to sit and to judge: *us all*, by Truth!

(b) There is a reason why I so insist on detail: The strength of *all beliefs and all theories*, theological, scientific or other, is judged by the number, simplicity, cogency and (not just seeming) veracity of the principles and a priori and ad hoc hypotheses on which they are built, *not* on the number of followers or their polemical power. The fewer the principles and the hypotheses a priori, and the total absence of those made ad hoc, the better the theory, or belief. Moreover, even beliefs are *not* just of statements that are impossible to prove to the satisfaction of Reason! You *cannot* just believe that a dog once barked, and, lo! the universe showed up! You are in need of a house. You pray: God, give me a house! Do-

es a house just come to you? Not even just any house, but the house we call universe? Doesn't *somebody* have to design it, to find a place to put it in, to build it, to furnish it? It is getting dark and you need light. Now, you may just turn on the switch, and there is light. But light just does *not* come on from just nowhere! When there were no light bulbs, no cables, no electricity, no power company, no engineers, no mines, no, earth, not even the universe, still light once came; but in *no* sense could this ever eliminate the *real* substance of the light that came, *nor Him* who sent it on, *nor Him* who thought through of it, *nor Him* who desired it! That the dog barked just doesn't wash! He knows that day also means light, and night means also the absence of it. But the dog has no conception of the *substance* of light, and to speak true, for all our "science", still neither do we! Yet, we dare, in the name of just that our "science" say that those three other ones are not needed! That is just another belief, as believable as that about the dog that barked and brought the light! Ultimately, even behind beliefs *there is a concrete doer, or else the belief cannot stand!* And he better be *reasonable*, or else, the belief is just for the dogs! Beliefs send directly to the Doer! While the theories are constructed to give answers to questions about the *steps* leading up to the Doer. The more cogent the answers, the more seamless the connection of steps, the better the theory. But as Plato showed in "*Parmenides*", *giving answers is still not quite good enough! For we must also think through all the consequences of the answers we offer!* Note this: we *shall* need it later.

§48 (a) Take, for example, the "hydraulic"-cataclysmic possibility creationists offer for the fast deposition of sediments in a matter of a few days: A world-wide flood covering the entire Earth required far more water than we now have. Where has all that excess water gone? The question can be avoided by claiming a *then* smaller difference in altitude between the peak of Mt. Everest and the deepest hole of the Mariana Trench¹²! But that *would*

¹² Based on the volumes of the four great oceans, if the entire Earth were covered by water, its average depth would be somewhat more than 2870 meters. If the Flood occurred from an atmosphere at 50°C and 95% relative humidity, the water level would rise by only about 1.20 meters; and if the entire atmospheric pressure were due to moisture, on total precipitation the water level would rise by only 10.33 meters. If the

reduce, for the absence of altitude and inclination, the hydraulic effect: The water and the mud would flow from a *much* lower altitude at a much lower speed! But even so, how long did it take, *before* the Flood, for the ground to erode, in preparation for the catastrophe that carried the sand and silt to the oceans? The catastrophic deposition of sediments you imply requires not only highly turbulent conditions (now seen not to have existed on account of the very much lower altitudes crossed), but also washing off (perhaps down to the solid rock below), stirring, mixing and burying at sea *all* fertile soil along with all the seeds in it, thereby destroying all land vegetation! In scheme of events, there simply was no time to restore all this destruction! Moreover, this "explanation" of the Flood because of the concomitant burial at sea of all that highly mixed burden *is most definitely not supported by the observed purity* of the sediments, requiring *unstirred conditions and a slow chemical, not mechanical* process! Then again, the deposits of coal layers *are incompatible* with this scheme of the Flood: Logs, being lighter than mud and silt, simply *cannot* be buried under; at least not before they rot in the absence of air, which *cannot* happen in just a few days; just as forests do *not* grow almost overnight, tree rings being sufficient witnesses! Moreover, a more even terrain over the entire Earth at the time of the Flood can only mean that the ruggedness of the ground we now observe developed later. But then, earthquakes and tsunamis of an unimaginable magnitude must have occurred *following* the Flood, of which however *not* a word is included in the Scriptures, "remembering" the earlier event but "forgetting" the more recent ones, that inescapably ought to be described too as due to the rekindled wrath of God! As a mining engineer, I have directed underground operations in a lignite mine, the deposit being of the Miocene or Pleiocene period: Compressed tree trunks and leaves were beautifully preserved until exposed to air. The entire coal deposit of two to five feet in thickness was composed of lignite

average height of Antarctica is taken to be the average height of its 50 highest mountain peaks, and one half of its volume above sea level is taken to be water, on melting and level spreading over the entire Earth, the water level would rise by only about 84 meters. These numbers show that there could never have been a world wide Flood. Local floods thought to be world wide in coverage are a totally other matter!

only, totally unmixed with silt and debris (that one *would* expect from a mud slide), as if the entire forest had been felled in situ covered by its own foliage and protected from penetrating silt. The next layer up was pure gray clay! The lignite deposit had a *low* ash content, just as all good quality hard coal, *sufficient evidence of the absence* of conditions expected from such a creationist Flood episode! These hard facts *cannot* be accommodated by additional ad hoc hypotheses! So, the choice being unavoidable between the "Creation Model" based on the narrative of the Scriptures (written, I repeat, by men trying hard, given their own unknown even to themselves ignorance of the hard facts, to keep on the moral line an uneducated, undisciplined and blasphemous people, and passing down the generations their writings as the verbatim hard Word of God) and the *objective evidence* of Nature operating *directly under the Logical Law* of God, and offering us even our food, rather than tithing us as do the "men of God", it seems to me, and doubtless to all people of good will, that we have no option; or else, God-respecting scientists are *not* serious and do *not* honor their academic titles! They may *not* be, nor appear to be, as, or more, illogical as the atheists; or else, their well intentioned efforts are far more likely to be counterproductive.

(b) Thus creationists *cannot* avoid being much closer to what they call theistic evolution than they care to admit or indeed realize. But thus also, the difference between theistic and atheistic evolution is not merely in whether or not God is behind the very same evolutionary processes, but in whether *the so far presumed as natural* evolutionary processes were those adopted by the Creator. Atheistic evolution seeks to do away with God. But it can do so not merely by adopting each and every unqualified element of the triad of "time, chance and the intrinsic properties of matter" that Morris and Parker identified as the physical foundation of atheistic evolution, but by adopting (a) time as forever from all eternity; (b) the intrinsic properties of matter as intrinsic to it from all eternity, for only thus may its creation be denied altogether; and (c) chance as the sole creative force, for its alone being the only alternative to Divine Wisdom and Its power to effect Creation in a fully Logical and controlled manner. We may *not* ignore, that God is positively profaned when depicted as "throwing dice" [that He did not even create consciously as *dice*] and awaiting something good to happen by such a random process that in fact

excludes the existence even of well formed, that is to say, *designed dice* [without which even the mathematical study of probabilities is altogether impossible!], as if He could or would no better! [Even Einstein, a self-confessed unbeliever in a Personal God, rejected vehemently the notion of "God" playing dice! Just imagine how atheist indeed are those in the far "left" of the atheistic camp who oppose(d) him, presumably on the grounds of quantum theory, that they nevertheless still attempt, unsuccessfully, to reconcile with relativity!] On the one hand, the cunning atheistic evolutionists do *not* rely on the basic evolutionary element of pure chance when it comes to designing and conducting their own well-controlled experiments [thus assessing to themselves greater wisdom than either to a personal God, or in His absence to the Pantheistic Nature, which they thus also deprive of built-in wisdom even as they claim to be seeking the Universal Law under which Nature operates; thus also mutely declaring *themselves*, pure products as *they* claim of blind chance, as the *sole* worthy of note "correctly" thinking and "wise" elements in the whole of Nature, even as they *ignore* the inescapable fact that, were such a Law found, it would only prove the Presence of a *complete* Process *capable of establishing* such a Law, *or else they would have to start an altogether new game of picking literally out of where(???) that Law*! And on the other hand, the *stupid* churches, not realizing what they are doing, give divine sanction to chance by themselves exploiting the human weakness for gambling, that they thus aggravate, with all sorts of *unholy* "games" of chance such as bingo, lotteries, raffles etc., as they, finding themselves unable to inspire their congregations with Faith, reduce themselves to the ways of the Mammon! The enemy believers try to defeat *is already let inside*, and presiding over the multifarious church functions that have nothing to do with the Spirit! How can we, outside the clerical and professorial classes, seeing the follies on either side, more saddened than bemused, hope to succeed, unless we stay well clear of *all* unreasonableness?

(c) The distinction between theistic and atheistic evolution lies exactly in these: (i) that time as we know it in life and science is (was) *not* there from all eternity, but *was itself created* (as Plato already *knew*, see his "*Timaeus*"); (ii) the intrinsic properties of matter were *not* from all eternity but inscribed to it *according to Law* when matter was created; and (iii) Law, not chance, fully

+

+

deterministic God-given Natural Law is the fundamental and sole worthwhile feature in God's Creation of Nature, without which, "Space, Matter and Time" are totally blank and useless. "Theistic evolution" uses, is indeed obligated to use, these elements *as* described here. But as described here, these elements are entirely foreign to atheistic usage, because only in this way do they give flesh and bones to God's creative Design and its product, that was the World.

(d) I cannot overemphasize the importance of Law in God's Design: it must be comprehensive, deterministic, non-redundant, least yet complete, and non-self-conflicting. Blank matter was ordered (in both senses of "organized"- "set in order" *and* "made to obey") by God, i.e., God inscribed to it properties according to such Law, and *only thus* were the properties of matter recognized as such. And time (the *age* of the Universe) since Creation was established as the fundamental physical variable by means of which the Natural Law could take effect and function in Nature. Atheistic evolution accepts "time, chance and the intrinsic properties of matter" as cabalistic mysteries not to be further investigated, as intrinsic to the nature of the pantheistic god, or as absolute a priori non-investigable elements of Reality. It is now clear that there is an abyss between what Morris and Parker call theistic and atheistic evolutions. The two are more clearly distinguishable than day and night, and as such, they *cannot* fail to be even more distinguishable by pure, *correct* scientific means as well, as in the sequel shall be shown.

+

+

11

THE ORIGINS OF THE NOTION OF UNFALSIFIABILITY AND THE METHOD OF FALSIFICATION OF ATHEISM

§49 Following the widespread current philosophical beliefs, and believing they can protect their opinions from attack, Morris and Parker state that their version of creationism is to be considered as an alternative aprioristic model of origins, in itself incapable of being confirmed or falsified, just as atheistic evolution! While the method of falsification of atheistic beliefs including evolution remains to be presented, in view of the discussion already presented so far and especially that of the previous chapter, I submit that, no conscientious reader can any longer agree with the Morris and Parker contention regarding their explanation of biblical creationism! This is an important subject on which I feel I may *not* munch or at all contort my words in order to avoid hurting sensitive hearts; I *must* tell things as clearly as I see them: (i) Even today, there are darn few people who dare to advance their TheoLogical reasoning beyond the level of their revered ecclesiastical authorities. (ii) Those, daily preoccupied mainly with the *always pressing yet ordinary* affairs of their empires, and so having *little* time even to defend even the part of their histories they can even from fair attack [I insist on this triple even!], simply *do not have the ample time needed* to meditate on the *true substance* of their beliefs. (iii) So, if they are not simply annoyed in their serenity even by the mention of things like that, to the extent that they do not even acknowledge receipt of suggestions through some fourth-level secretary, they rely on *external* intel-

lectuals and bona fide philosophers [and most usually on those with whom they are in good social terms, that *exclude* discussions of “sensitive” matters!], who usually however deal with ideas *trickling down to them* from the high Halls of Science, where the focus is *not* on the philosophy even of science, but on how to reach first to a finding that will secure the next Nobel prize! (iv) Philosophers learn of science second hand; scientists learn of philosophy second hand; ecclesiastical authorities learn of the fundamental philosophical-scientific developments *third* hand, and are thus *practically incapable* of judging their significance; which is why the latter choose to fall back on their familiar ecclesiastical traditions, which they believe safe, especially if they name them “unfalsifiable”! (v) Even pious laymen thus come *mixed fourth* hand to ideas that need a *deep balanced knowledge* of *all four* Logic, Philosophy, Science and TheoLogY, and naturally they *cannot* easily judge after the daily drudge! (vi) Ordinary laymen, simply depending on ordinary laymen’s hearsay, “believe”! Today, everybody “believes”!¹³ Where each one falls is solely for oneself to determine! I fear it is all too easy for untrained and/or undisciplined minds to fall victim of the widespread *yet blatantly false* belief and so-called “principle”, that dear of people lacking

¹³ A well-known priest-professor of “theology” stated on public TV that he has an “unlimited respect for Einstein”: What relativity does to TheoLogY was *definitely beyond* his conception! Even in the principal “first world” countries, the spread of centers of intellectual and practical substantial activities, and the splintering of interests is so wide and deep that only rarely and briefly if at all people personally active at the fronts of Logic, Philosophy, Science and TheoLogY ever meet. One can only dimly imagine what happens in countries where those fronts are heard of in the news from abroad! Today’s Athenian, e.g., does not even think that the Theseum, the Temple of Hephaestus in the center of Athens, is more ancient than the Parthenon, the Temple of God’s Wisdom; and that the former, a beloved God, was lame due to a hammer that fell on his foot while working furiously at the anvil! The point? Ancient Athens was a *concentrated* place where inactivity was shameful; *all activities were in quarters placed closely together*; Logic, Philosophy, Science and TheoLogY were in *constant close* interaction; and it was considered a *greater honor* even for a God to be lamed at work than to be a recluse withdrawn to his “other” world! The Hellenic conception of God is of a *complete Person* involved *both* in contemplation *and* activity, and as such *perfect in all that is honorable*, with *no* shades or shadows about Him. The myste-

in *logical* arguments, catch-all-winds politicians, souls so insecure that they play it ever “correctly”, *particularly when they aspire to and hold the highest positions in the world*, who in order to escape from the terrible clutches of Reason, with the sweetest of smiles and an overall bearing putting saints to shame, state that “the existence or nonexistence of God cannot be proven”! Thus keeping themselves pleasant to all, amicable to all passersby! *Shameful*, I say! But this is where *professional* “theology” [as empire, as a market trade for profit, or at least for just earning a living, not daring oppose *every* “customer who is always right”] leads! These people forget that the matter of God is *not* a matter of ordinary *supposedly* “respected” *opinion*! Today, we respect the *opinion*, *not* the person expressing it! We *kill* the person, but *respect* his opinion, even if it be trash! That’s why we have killed God but continue to speak about Him—as of course we do! God IS the matter par excellence: it pertains not just to the physical world but to the whole Ἄιδιον Πνεῦμα, the Everbeing Everlasting Spirit and Logos [that is *more* than mere Reason], and to the Moral Essence of God *and* Man, and to the ultimate salvation of Man’s soul. These are *not* matters of “easy”, social conversation, but of the *deepest agonizing* contemplation! Let me put it flatly: A God who is not a person, nay, *the* Person, is *less* than a person, and as such is *not* worthy of the adulation and worship of persons! A person who believes in such a God is *not* worthy of respect! A God who has designed the world in a way His presence cannot be obvious to *all honest and well-formed minds* is *unworthy* even of the least possible respect!!! That the churches advertise such a God and prosper hiding behind Him is *the* measure of their shameless blasphemy, than which there can be *no* greater!!! For they prosper behind a God-Casino where the salvation of the souls of men de-

ries were *not* referring to the mysteriousness of God, but to the unspeakable respect the mystae (worshippers) felt for Him, as deeply as they freely conducted *serene* debates about His Being! Today’s Athens is a place of daily rioting demonstrations for less work, more leisure and pay, and certainly no contemplation! In today’s world, thanks to theologians and professors, even the word God is better not to be spoken! So offensive has it become! Today, in the name of God, rivers flow of blood; symposia to celebrate His splendor, where no one ever gets drunk but is only inspired to still greater God-pleasing endeavor, are unheard of! Thanks to theologians and professors, we *have* returned to barbarity!

pend on the choice of heads or tails at the throw of a *perfect* coin! And a man who so gambles his soul not only does he not know what his soul is, but is also unworthy of salvation regardless of the outcome of the throw!

§50 (a) God's existence and His non existence:

(i) Are they really propositions *equally unfalsifiable*, or are they indeed propositions that are *both falsifiable*? The difference? In the first case, you can believe *either or both, without any anywhere support, not even in Logic*: hence the "*or both*". In the second case, when the one stands, the other *definitely* falls! Questions: Are we so bereft of all confidence even in ourselves that we cannot depend even on what we call "sense", if not "logic"? And this in the name of *both religion and science*? Are they really *both* these abandoned in the hands of *such* people? Are churches and universities and research institutions truly insane asylums?

(ii) But are they not also *logically opposite* propositions, the one of which *flatly denies* the other? If Logic truly cannot tell them apart even as regards the unfalsifiability of logical opposites, what indeed becomes of Logic *and all* that is based on it??? Is truly Logic a mere figment??? On the basis of *what* would you answer this question affirmatively, and expect that we all do so?

(iii) And are they not also questions pertaining to the *Ultimate Truth and the Ultimate Falsehood*? Are these also equally unfalsifiable? If even these are placed on a co-equal footing, *how indeed* are *we* to distinguish between lesser lies and truths? Does this not demolish the *entire* edifice of ethics and morality civilized man has so painfully tried to erect throughout his History? Or is this the *well hidden* intent? Have we today become so thick, so impregnable by *all* light, so ignorant of *secure* past learning, that we have lost even this so far thought *secure* compass seeing us through the starless abyss? And for the sake indeed of *what*? In the name of *what higher* value? Is this Philosophy? Or is it Theology? Or is it perhaps Science? Or, rather, it only can be sheer unadulterated madness, that sees everything in reverse?

(b) One shudders to assess these even to the followers of other religions based on the words of mere men! But how indeed can one expect this of Christians, *and* high priests among them, too? These are supposed to believe in and serve not just *some* God *they* concocted, but *the Incarnate* God! Can a God who cannot be told whether He truly exists get believed as being able to incar-

nate Himself? And for *what*? If unbelief becomes rampant on the grounds of unfalsifiability, is the faith of Christians to be kept just for decorum, in order to have a priesthood that *fundamentally doubts it believes and teaches such trash, but insists on living at our expense* by singing this trash as “learned faith” in Him? Does their shamelessness indeed know no end? Only by *such* “leaders” led may we declare the choice between these *supposedly co-equal unfalsifiabilities* a matter of taste! They dare to call this *taste*!

§51 We Christians have it from Christ Himself (and the fundamentalists may *not* argue the point, or they destroy the foundation on which they stand) that Man is saved by his faith and perishes by his faithlessness, for either of these truly guides his life: “thine faith hath saved thee”! “I truthfully tell thee that today thou shalt be with me in paradise”! Both told in response to *sincere* declarations of Faith. But Man can only be saved by his sinlessness (perfected by God’s Grace supplementing his efforts) and perishes by his sinfulness (when not even God’s Grace can save him, for such is then his depravity!). So, that “sincere” is *not* just a mere word; but *life* itself, or *death* itself! And these may *not* be decided as a matter of mere “taste”! Faith *is* virtue, and faithlessness *is* vice and sin, *not* matters of taste! Reality, therefore, *is not, nor can it be* such that faith and faithlessness, sinlessness and sinfulness, Truth and Falsehood are at base co-equal, for this makes mockery of Reality itself and of the relationship of God and Man, and declares empty and pointless Christ’s Mission and Sacrifice for the sake of our salvation! Which is *exactly* what the anti-Christians want! So, I also *must* ask: *what* sort of company do we really keep?

§52 *Only* for the immaturity of *their personal “faith”*, at least today’s “men of the cloth” could not resist the insistence of atheists that the existence of God cannot be proven! When Christ has told us that even by a grain of faith we *can* command mountains into the sea and see them obey, our inability to demonstrate God’s existence, on Whose service alone mountains move, the fault *is purely ours*! Cunningly the atheists capitalize on this! And the “believers” concede as true the *untrue*: that the existence of God *objectively* is unprovable! Thus were the gates opened wide to faithlessness and to sin, by the influence of *such* company on the “believers” *soft* faith, who were unable to realize that the doctrine of unfalsifiability of the enemy’s position and of the co-equality of Truth and Falsehood was atheistically inspired and inculcated! Remove Logos, and the Gates of the Abyss *are* opened wide!

§53 By adopting *this* false doctrine as a matter of faith, in effect *we strengthen the general faithlessness and deny* God the possibility to prove His existence *through our* faith in Him! But by adopting this doctrine as a matter of science, we do something *even worse*: we also deny God His inalienable right to prove His existence *through the Logic He built in His own Creation*, the *objective* physical world out there! It is an *atheistically* inculcated doctrine that the objective physical world and science cannot prove God's existence!: The atheists had a *vital* interest in advancing it. The "believers" adopted it only for their *diminished faith and undisciplined reasoning*! The proud "men of the cloth", being *un-Christian* in direct proportion to their pride, *because of it would not and could not* recognize that there is *more* to faith in God than *they* had said ostensibly "theologically"! And the proud "people of science" who learned their lessons, even the lessons in pride, at the knees of the "men of the cloth", also for *their* pride, in turn, *could not and would not* recognize that there is *more* to science than presumably "scientifically" they themselves had had to say! In this, the "scientists" were joined by the atheists operating under the clothing of "science". *Together* did they develop "science" as *counterpoint and negation* of religion, failing to realize and unable to confess that, they too did all this on a foundation of faith *equally religious and equally faulty to that of the other sort* that passed as *the Faith in God*, which they rejected! *Thus* was it that the ostensibly abyssal separation of Science from Religion was conceived from the pride of men and their *little faith in both God and Logos that are not two but one*, which now engulfs all our lives. And so is it that, if, early on, the "faithful", for their basic honesty, had to concede that, God's existence "*was perhaps objectively unprovable on the evidence then had*", now that the atheists rule the waves, where they too find themselves in the *same* predicament regarding *their* position, it is a strategic blunder on the side of God's honest people to believe them as retaining any scruples of basic honesty! *Atheism, from its inception, is a system consciously sworn to dishonesty*, and the atheists will *never* grant naive people the co-equality they seek to obtain from them!

§54 Creationism, as the *firm belief that it took indeed the Creator for the world to exist, not as a worthless counter unprovable belief*, *must* revise its strategy if it truly wants to win. Because God's existence *can truly be proven*! But in order for this to be confessed, *a lot on both sides must first be done*! On the side of Faith, the faith

on Scriptural man's every iota and dot must be dropped. I am *not* suggesting stopping respecting the Scriptures! I *am* suggesting starting to study them *carefully*, in order to take from them *all that truly and correctly* pertains to the Holy God as HE *truly IS*, *not* as men of the dim ignorant past conceived Him to be! More specifically does his apply to the Old Testament, being a *hard mix* of tale, myth, *biased* national Jewish history, and holy Jewish men's insights into the Holy. But it also applies to the New Testament, also by Jews written, not yet freed from the old Jewish *so mixed* mode of thinking! We *must* understand that God IS! [I refer to the *ontological* sense of the verb "to be"; *not* to the predicative (as in grammar) sense of the verb "to be"—this or that.] As also that, man's understanding of Him is a *totally other* matter! *The TheoLogy* pertains to the Lord as He IS! Whereas the "theology" is at best only a collection of men's *opinions* about the Lord! I fear that, the *vast* amount of men's sayings about the Lord is solely about opinions! And it is a waste of time trying to justify them all! If we men, mainly by what we do (including writing!) expose ourselves, beyond even our conscious comprehension, we do so *logically inescapably*: We give egress and venue to part of what transpires inside us. In proper Greek, λέγομεν τι ἐκ τοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν Λόγου. This Logical inescapability applies to God also, who, however, is *fully conscious* of all that He says about Himself through His Work! If the world is His Creation [I say this "if" as a scientific question yet to be answered], the world as it stands is *an expression of some part* of God's Mind: Just as a building is an expression of its architect's mind and its details and functioning expose his care, so it is with the world! We only have to look not just *at* it, but *in* it, to turn *every* stone upside down, inside out, and surely there, we *shall* find the *sufficient* evidence we seek! Actually, the work is *not* as laborious as the words here make it out to be—only in order to show that *absolutely nothing* has escaped the Lord's attention: God, even the atheist Einstein admitted, is *not* malicious! So, He has *not* made it impossible for us to find Ariadne's thread, that *safely leads out* of what we consider to be Minotaur's Labyrinth! What we seek is the Plan; and the Plan at its center contains the Law of construction around which *every* detail was spelled. If the Law is found and shown that it *can* be instituted (legislated, executed, controlled, overseen) by none other than the inanimate matter that makes up the physical universe, that *also*

contains *all* the properly functioning mechanisms necessary to this institutionalization (also containing, never forget it, *everything that applies even to our intellectual and psychological makeup, including, lo, the religious!*), analogous to the social mechanisms we institute for the proper application of man-made laws, then indeed the atheists carry away the wreath and inanimate Nature is the God. If the Law *is* found but shown that it *cannot* be so instituted, and that the universe does *not* contain all those needed mechanisms, then indeed the *Law, by its incontestable presence in the absence of the necessary physical support*, shall have incontestably shown its extra-worldly origin, and the theists shall have conquered the field! The proof that God indeed IS and is *not* malicious is *sufficiently* provided by the presence of just *that* Law, right under our own yet unable to smell it out noses, for more than three hundred years already! In fact, the Law has indeed been in place since $T_0 = 0$. Three hundred years ago, it was only “discovered”! It took another three hundred years for its full consequences to be realized! It has taken another twenty years so far during which, now only for their indefensible pride, spite, profanity, the intellectual powers, both “theological” and “scientific” that torture us have yet to acknowledge it publicly! *All that has happened during the last twenty years of evil is in direct conscious, on the side of those powers, disdain of the Sitting Judge!*

§55 Such a proof has an additional advantage: If today I commanded a mountain into the sea, it *would* immediately be discounted as an act of magic. The atheists would still *not* be persuaded, as they were “not” even as they *were* by the countless and no less impressive Miracles Christ performed in person in their midst, as also have never been all committed anti-Christians of *all* ages. Just as they then said “this is no Miracle, even as we cannot explain why it is not a Miracle”, or else they would have to believe in Him, so today they would still say the very same thing; and I do *not* think that I say this merely to cover my lack of faith to command the mountain, though I am quite aware of this my shortcoming! No Miracle I could ever perform would persuade the atheists, who chose not to believe God in person! But if I prove God’s existence in the way the atheists themselves demand that the proof be produced, by *Reason and Science*, then indeed they *shall* be caught in their own snares, and they will have no rebuttal, no Logical escape, Logic being what they say

they prize above all else! I do not think this is a way much inferior to producing a direct Miracle. For, by disclaiming it as miraculous from the start, the method I suggest *does in fact reveal in all its glory* the First Miracle Christ performed, that was no other than the Creation of the *entire* World! It is *that* unique Miracle that the atheists shall thus have to explain, that, as it involves the *entire* World, hits at the heart of what they regard themselves expert on!

§56 (a) Now, you will perhaps say that this is a very tall order indeed. Well, if you think about it, it is not really that tall! And the reason is that if God had made it that tall, He *would* have made it that much harder for us to prove His existence. This was *not* His intention, for *we then, by our weakness, would have defeated His purpose!* His intention, rather, was to make His presence *plainly evident to those who would be willing to look systematically at the full significance* of the terms they use and the natural record before them, totally unencumbered by *false* human preconceptions! God *cannot* be proven that He exists, unless He be assumed perfect in *everything* He is and does! Those unwilling to see Him so will never “see” Him at all. For only thus can He both be present and seen to be present by those who believe in Him, and at the same time *appear* “non-existent” and “unseen” by those whose wounded arrogance does not permit them to see Him in His absolute perfection that stands so very much higher than they think about themselves. For only thus can He avoid exhibiting His presence, that *would be unbearable beyond all imagining* to those who do not want *freely* to believe in Him, who then would be *forced* to believe in Him; in which case, first He and then they *would* discount the value of *free* belief, that retains its *full* value only if it remain *totally free and be not forced!* It is alone out of His love for us that He so tries to “hide” Himself! And it is for *this* reason that *we cannot hope to do correct Science unless we also do some correct Philosophy and TheoLogy, all three together!*

(b) We remain perplexed because we *don't* do all these correctly together. We think they do not mix, when in fact they are not but *one!* Instead, we think mixable logical *opposites*, and attempt to live by them as thinkers, believers, theologians, philosophers, scientists; and we cannot, as a consequence help feeling perplexed by the Reality we thus conclude as inscrutable! What *is* utterly falsifiable, and indeed falsified already, we still regard as unfalsifiable and a matter of taste (recall what we said in §50a, b, p. 85-6)! What was most pertinent to be regarded to need the

most solid foundation on Reason and Logic, Einstein *impertinently* [both meanings meant!] chose to make it only “psychologically satisfactory” (remember the quotations in §32c, p. 50 and §36ii, p. 56 from his general relativity paper)! For what from its inception was meant to *deny*, supposedly based on “science”, the God-Logos-Creator, uncomprehending priest-professors teaching society retain an “unlimited respect” for their author (remember the comment of Footnote 13, p. 83)! Based on their *supposed* unfalsifiability, Truth and Falsehood are declared co-equal; and so, they open the Gates to the Abyss over which we hang (see for a moment again what was said on §6, p. 14; §52, p. 86)!? Even there, we choose to remain simply perplexed! Somebody dares to speak about the spiritually awful state of our world (see again §§1, 2, 3)? We pale aghast at the impudent suggestion of its rotten head! But a rotten head *naturally* cannot foresee. So, it *cannot* surprise that, when calamity strikes, *it*, simply scared, seeks to overscare all those living below, calling them to gather around to face the new threat, that now comes even as children (*simple* boys and girls), and women that shall carry more children (recall end of §28, p. 42)! Instead of providing the spiritual leadership *by example* the world thirsts for, the absence of which (see briefly §30, p. 45-6) *is the true terror*, we choose to execute yet another war, against “terror”, that we now personify no longer as ourselves, but as boys and girls [and even as infants yet to be born!], that *we* now teach how *even worse* to send up to Heaven profanities! The prelates of *all* of the world’s churches, religions *and* sciences *must* be called to account for their *total* failure to foresee the consequences of their teachings of *open and well hidden* faithlessness to Reason and the Most Holy God-Logos, Whom they disdain, attempting, by climbing on the people below, to rise above Him! From that height are they now about to fall! What the *careful* Greek reasoning had already resolved twenty and five hundred years ago, *cannot* be now or ever undone! They have no excuse! *None!* Plato in the “*Parmenides*” (see §47b, p. 77) forewarned of the need to *preconsider* the consequences. He who fails to act as Prometheus, neglecting *carefully* to *preconsider* the consequences, inevitably lives to regret them: *All afterconsideration is only pitiful lamentation!*: whether it comes as apology, or incoherent protestation: Tartarus is the proper to him habitation! The Holy Logos has *preset* a value and a price on *everything*. And that *cannot ever* be overset.

12

WHERE THE DIFFERENCE LIES BETWEEN MAN-MADE AND NATURAL LAW

§57 Here is a good example of what I mean saying that we must look at the record free of misconceptions: Morris and Parker (loc. cit.) state that the first two laws of thermodynamics are compatible with, and indeed implied by their Creation Model. This is *not* obvious: The “unwinding” (if one chooses correctly to call it so) implied by the Second Law, namely, the fact that energy becomes progressively unavailable for the production of useful work, as far as we can tell is a fact, but nothing so far shows that it did not start either way back in all eternity, thereby making the physical world co-eternal with God; or following some kind of automatic earlier “winding”, thereby making the world independent of God’s intervention. *Only if these two propositions are both untrue* is it correct to say that *somebody* did the “winding” of the world, that thus started up at some *definite, not infinite* past time. However, this becomes a crushing argument only *after* it is shown that the world *did indeed get started, but not on its own, at some stated definite* past. When Morris and Parker state (p. 227) that “the First Law testifies that the Universe could not have created itself”, one fails to see why this must be true. If the Universe has always existed, the First law becomes a tautology and proves nothing! The issue becomes important *after it is shown that the universe had a definite beginning, due to an outside agency, which however cannot be shown from within thermodynamics!* Then, again, what Logic does the Creator exhibit by creating energy (presumably along with the physical universe) and henceforth holding it constant

according to the First Law, but making it constantly unavailable according to the Second? If an excellent reason for things to be so ordered cannot be demonstrated, the “logic” of such creation, suggesting an inexcusably whimsical behavior, becomes suspect! And Divine Whim is *not* a way conducive to universal human faith, let alone to faith based on proof! *Where, in which* particles of matter does God choose to hide the unavailable energy? Remove the word “God” and ask: “with the total energy constant, *where* is the unavailable energy hidden?”, to which not just the creationists but *all* scientists ought to have devoted a far greater interest than indeed they have, which is *none*!: The question has *never* come to the fore! Besides, despite the so-called “experimental verification” (of which in a moment) of the two laws, there is a *huge* logical conflict between them, that has *not* been recognized, *nor* faced: *What indeed is energy* if it can both be present and unavailable? The “thermal death” notion is conceived of closed systems that *remain at equilibrium, after they have reached it*. As such, it is a logical notion, but *nobody* has truly observed such systems with *proper instruments, sufficiently diligently and for long enough as indeed is needed* as to establish the eventual “thermal death” as a *fact* of cosmological significance!!! We may *not* forget that thermodynamics and the associated notions were developed *long* before it was learned that the universe expands. Thermodynamics and Cosmology have yet to be united! *The full true significance of universal expansion has yet to sink in!!!* So taken in are we by the so-called experimental verification in close quarters!: We both demand it when it suits us, *and* forget it when it does not! The scientists and not only the creationists so far *choose to ignore the entire set of these and related issues!*

§58 Indeed, what *is* energy and what *is* matter, and *why* are they told to be the same, as “science” believes following Einstein, when dimensionally they are *not* the same at all (energy having the dimensions of $|ML^2T^{-2}|$, and mass of $|M|$)? “Science” has offered the most superficial reasons for this *claimed* “sameness” (see §63, p. 99), but *only in order to give all the legitimacy it could, that was definitely lacking*, to that other atheistic attempt, presented as a true fact, of equating the man-made “laws of physics” to the *true hard-fact* Laws of Nature operating out there, of which attempt we shall say more later (see §62, p. 97-8). When scientists are taken to task on this “sameness” and on the naked irrespon-

sibility of their answers that touches on frivolity given the *huge* dimensional difference, they again exhibit the impenetrability and imperturbability of the Sphinx: they almost have as much to say! So, *what* indeed makes us think that the answers human "science" gives are the answers God would have given, and *has* indeed given?

§59 As is well known, calorimeters are the ultimate means of measuring heat-energy, and *all* other methods of energy measurement are indeed referred to some "standard" calorimetric measurement. The very best calorimeters today and the best enthalpy tables have uncertainties no smaller than ± 25 cal./mole, or even ± 50 cal./mole. In a typical low of 10,000 cal./mole, this amounts to an uncertainty of $\pm 0.25\%$ or $\pm 0.50\%$. In a typical high value of 100,000 cal./mole, the same absolute uncertainty reduces to a relative uncertainty of $\pm 0.025\%$ or $\pm 0.050\%$. Unquestionably, when the "Law" of the conservation of energy was first proposed in the middle of the nineteenth century, such "accuracies" were unheard of! But even today, are these numbers really sufficient to establish the First Law as true? Suppose that the relative decrease in energy is 10^{-10} /year. The inability of the very best calorimeters to detect such a rate of decrease is plainly obvious. Constancy however means a relative uncertainty of $\pm 10^{-\infty}$ (% if you will!) How then do we show that the Laws of thermodynamics we hold on to today are indeed Nature's or God's? Thermodynamics is indeed a marvelous edifice of human scientific capability, but this, it is now seen, does *not* make it necessarily true! Thermodynamics as it now stands *is only an axiomatic system of thought, plainly not established as a hard fact of Nature*, observed to apply in Nature only approximately, as the difference between $\pm 0.025\%$ (or any such number and $\pm 10^{-\infty}\%$ plainly shows!

§60 Even the so-called "Law" of mass conservation is *not* much better established! Here, we must not forget that *we do not even have mass meters but balances weighing forces* (having physical dimensions of $[\text{MLT}^{-2}]$) acting on masses, so much so that the confusion of a gram of weight and a gram of mass is *not* entirely unjustified until the vast difference finally sinks in! In weightless conditions *only the weight vanishes*, that is to say, the *gravitational* force acting on the mass; but *how much* is truly the mass and how do we determine that it truly conserves? Had we been born and aged under truly weightless conditions, would we have a *correct*

sense of the *true quality and quantity* of mass? As for its quality, the mere presence of mass in a spaceship in deep space supplies *some least* measure of it, but its quantity *cannot be directly* determined as on the Earth, nor can its density! In deep space, a liter of lead and a feather stand in mid air side by side! We sense that there is so much more mass in the former only by the *effort* we make to move it around. But effort means *force*! In other words, *we truly do not have a direct means* for measuring the quantity of mass in a(ny) body, though we do not doubt for a moment its presence!¹⁴ Under gravity, microbalances do the required detailed work; but since high school, in three universities, two postdoctoral appointments (one in a fourth university, the other in a most prestigious national research laboratory) and many many years in the field of basic and applied research, I never heard of chemists, or others for that matter, correcting when using microbalances for the positions of the Sun and the Moon, though their gravities in the surface of the Earth relative to that of the Earth stand respectively in the ratios of 0.0006049 and 0.0000035 and vary twice that much daily! I myself have used microbalances extensively and never seen in their instruction manuals the solar and lunar effects discussed, or how the measurements are to be corrected for more precise work!!! So, even the "Law" of conservation of mass *is in reality also axiomatic, not factual* as it now stands. Until, that is, we contemplate the issue of the *true physical unit of mass, that cannot be other than what was once called the Democritean atom*

[conceived *not* just as the smallest unit of *each* macroscopically understood kind of mass, but as the smallest unit of the *one only kind mass*, to which *every* mass of *all* macroscopic kinds analyses, being composed *not* just of *different numbers* of Democritean atoms, but *also* of such atoms organized in *different ways*

¹⁴ In this regard, mass is not unlike time: We do not doubt its presence either (despite the efforts of some to denude it of its physical existence and dress it up in "psychological" garments); but we need a *mechanism* such as a clock, whether in the universe (where we "see" the daily motion of stars) or on our wrists in order to make time (through its inexorable *passing*) solid enough for our more satisfactory understanding! The difference between mass and time is that whereas mass comes in chunks called Democritean atoms that *together* constitute all the univer-

giving rise to the *different macroscopically seen kinds of seemingly different materials!* For otherwise, the universal Law applicable to *all masses cannot* be the simplest possible, for it would *also* have to consider the *different qualities* of the Democritean atoms, *if these be unique per kind* of material! Our present understanding of electrons and nucleons on down suggests *mutely just this one only kind* of Democritean atom!],

so much later confused with the chemical atom! If mass (that is to say, *each and every* Democritean atom) do not conserve, not only does the *number* of Democritean atoms not conserve, as some of them inevitably vanish—or are created, but they also dissolve in *different kinds*, on which the simplest universal Law *cannot* possibly apply! If *each and every* Democritean atom do not conserve, the universe *is* inevitably involved in *this kind of constant creation-vanishing play*, that is either uncontrolled or requires *additional* Laws added to those known (or thought to be known!) in order to be fully and correctly controlled by the entire set of Laws! Creationists and all kinds of “scientists” *must* come out clearly on what they, whether by mere belief or or else *solid* proof, consider to be the case! Otherwise, none at least of those that choose to remain silent can be taken as serious!

§61 So in fact *no one*, whether creationist or scientist, acts wisely continuing to pin arguments regarding the universe on

sal mass there is, time in reality comes as a *continuous whole* called the Age of the Universe, that we *think we cut in arbitrary* time chunks!

And while we are at it, let us not forget the third fundamental dimension of our daily and “scientific” experience, namely, length: We *think* we have a *standard “meter”* deposited in Paris! The significance of universal expansion has *yet* to sink fully in: With the entire Universe inexorably expanding from a *zero-size* initial point, the *only true* Universal length at any one moment is its radius: At *best*, our *standard “meter”* is *only a constant fraction of the Universal radius*, provided that the meter *remains unaffected by its position relative to the center of the Universe!* For otherwise, we need *additional* laws determining the when and how it turned *absolutely* constant as we think of it!

So, it has *yet* to become our common understanding that our daily activities are regulated by *universal* quantities (ignored even by the “scientists”), interacting with each other according to *strict Law*, and entering *only because of it* our consciousness in our customary daily activities, scientific or other! That in *fact*, the very security of our lives depends on *those universal quantities and the Law* as on to an anchor!

axiomatic statements that have yet to be shown to be facts of nature! Particularly the creationist must *not* look to man-made axioms, *but directly to Nature itself as the direct and genuine handiwork of God*, as only in it will he find the *true Laws (no longer axioms)* on which *He* set it to function. Further, the creationist is honor-bound to reject *all* claims of chance, uncertainty, indeterminacy, doubt, and *every* kind of muddled thinking as intrinsic to Natural Law! This is not to deny that *some* of the axioms already accepted may indeed turn out to be true as Laws; but those that are, are *not* so for the reasons already given by "science" that are far from foolproof. Nor to deny that we humans may indeed face some natural limitations of our ability to conduct measurements of ever greater accuracy.

§62 What the creationist must deny is what the atheist asserts to be the identity of man-made and Natural Law; which the latter *deliberately disguises* under the *supposedly neutral* term of "physical" law" or "law of physics", exactly in order to *avoid* the otherwise *due* distinction between human invention and *hard* Natural Fact! Such Fact is either Nature's own (Pantheism); or established on her supernaturally by God, in which case it constitutes the *correct refutation* of atheism! In either case, it is the refutation of human "science", that is reduced, except by mere serendipity, to being "castles in the air"! This juxtaposition frees us of the obligation to accept as correct theories of intrinsic doubt. Whatever the degree of "experimental" corroboration or "general acceptance by scientists", theories of intrinsic doubt, as are the theory of evolution, the theory of relativity, the current quantum theory, these three "scientific" pillars on which atheism today stands, *cannot* be correct theories of Nature! Every engineer worth his salt knows that he *cannot* do anything right, unless he knows full well what he is doing. How much much more applicable must this be either for Nature-god; or for God Himself, Who *could not but have preconceived perfectly in His Mind everything* He later proceeded to create, *beyond every* humanly conceived measure! But the atheist does not want to admit even the minimal moral consequences that are introduced pantheistically! This is why he insists on debasing even Nature with his concoction of chance as the ultimate ruler of the world. The "pantheist" (in truth, *atheist*) Einstein was still enough of a determinist to object to the quantum-mechanically introduced uncertainty, but he totally failed to

see anything wrong with the relativistically introduced spatial and temporal uncertainty that he himself introduced; thus at any rate *atheistically making a total fool* even of his own pantheistic god, for not knowing *and* being unable to know (H)imself, even in principle! All this is, of course, well known to the “pantheon” of atheistic “high science”, as these people are not fools; which is why they never discuss in some serious depth, nor permit, these matters in public; which would soon debunk their false pretensions. And it is pitiful to see how they discuss them in private, how childish, totally flustered their reasoning reveals itself! The creationist must know his enemy very well indeed before he can entertain hopes of victory. God’s creation of the world *can only be subject to a fully deterministic, non-redundant, non-self-conflicting Least Set of fundamental Laws permitting in their structure and application no uncertainty whatever!* Otherwise the operation of Physical Nature *would* be fumbled, tangled, bungled! No human theory is, can be, correct, but is flatly false, unless it *is* compatible with this Least Set. This much must already be asserted as the basic Logical requirement, or else, Science *is* a total fake! This means that not only must thermodynamics be made compatible with the least Set of Laws, but also that the theories of evolution, relativity, and the current quantum mechanics *are out as not fully deterministic, and thus as incompatible* with the Ultimate Engineer’s [be He Nature, *already* rejected as we have seen (on §54, p. 88-9) for her complete inability to institute and administer the Natural law entirely on her own, or God] grand plan of creation!

13

THE PROBLEMS OF LIGHT AND ENERGY

§63 Energy, one of the most important concepts of modern science, was debated extensively in the mid nineteenth century, when first it was stated to conserve. It comes in many forms, among which it transforms with various degrees of efficiency. Light is regarded as the most refined form of energy; heat as the crudest; low-grade heat as an almost total waste. [True, we *can* extract heat from a relatively cold outside to warm up a room by reversing the process of ordinary cooling an air conditioner performs, but *what is the total universal balance?* On aggregate, we do *not* really save energy, *we only spend more* of it!: The second law of thermodynamics is *not* defeated!] Except for gravitational, atomic and nuclear, all other forms of energy on earth derive their existence from the light of the sun. Most of the solar light impacting the earth transforms to heat, stored in bodies in the form of vibration of its atoms. Both light and radiant heat are recognized as forms of electromagnetic energy. The other forms of energy stand between those two, but are not regarded as electromagnetic. The thermal energy of ordinary bodies is attributed to the internal vibrations of their atoms. Chemical energy is a form of energy stored internally in atoms and molecules of reduced and oxidizing matter (and in the case of plants generated by the action of light energy during photosynthesis), whence it is released upon combustion. The effort to unite the forces recognized as acting in nature is also an effort to see all forms of energy as essentially one. Energy in all its forms is expressed in terms of $(\text{mass}) \times (\text{velocity})^2$, having as already stated (in §58, p. 93) the physical dimen-

sions of $|\text{ML}^2\text{T}^{-2}|$. Newton believed light to come in *material* “corpuscles”. Young, by analogy of observations in water and air, “found” it to be “waves” of what he thought was a *material* continuum called “ether”. In 1888, the Michelson-Morley experiment *proved* the “ether” nonexistent. but we *still continue* to regard light as vibrations of a *continuum!* The situation was *not* “saved” by the relativity theory: “Spacetime”, the *new* continuum, what “physical” (*how* indeed *physical?*) still remains when *all* matter (*all* mass *and with it also all* energy, given its physical dimensions) *is totally* absent, has *no* material substance, and therefore it *cannot*, vibrating, carry energy nor cause a gravitational field ¹⁵ (both understood *only* in terms of mass, velocity, acceleration and distance

¹⁵ The gravitational field is a conception associated with the gravitational force (namely, the attraction) *every mass exerts upon another mass at a distance in the absence of any medium* (such as a pulling rope) transferring the pulling effect. A force understood as the product of (mass) \times (acceleration) has the physical dimensions of $|\text{MLT}^{-2}|$ (see §60, p. 94). The gravitational field due to a particular mass M_1 at a distance r from it is the product $\mathcal{G} = GM_1/r^2$ (where G is Newton’s universal gravitational constant). The product $\mathcal{G}M^2$ is the force of gravity acting between the two masses. In §14 of his 1916 general relativity paper (as reported on p.143 of the work mentioned in F/n. 10 on p. 56 of this work), Einstein stated “[w]e make a distinction hereafter between ‘gravitational field’ and ‘matter’ in this way, that we denote everything but the gravitational field as ‘matter’. Our use of the word therefore includes not only matter in the ordinary sense, but the electromagnetic field as well. Our next task is to find the field equations of gravitation in the absence of matter” Yet, in §2 of *his* same work (p. 112-3 of the work mentioned in F/n. 10 on p. 56 of this work), Einstein saw it fit to state that “[n]o answer can be admitted as epistemologically satisfactory,* unless the reason given *is an observable fact of experience*. The law of causality has not the significance of a statement as to the world of experience, except when *observable facts* appear as causes and effects” [emphases in the original], and by the asterisk he referred to a footnote stating “of course, an answer may be satisfactory from the point of view of epistemology, yet be unsound physically, if it is in conflict with other experiences”.

It is thus quite remarkable and totally inexplicable how in spite of these *his* all too clear statements in his §2, he still saw it proper to make the above cited statement in *his* §14, by which he permitted himself to speak of “the field equations of gravitation in the absence of matter”, i.e., *contrary to all three*: his own stated epistemological precepts, the observable facts of experience *and* the physical unsoundness of attributing an effect (the gravitational field) to *no* cause at all (in face of the *total* absence of both matter and the electromagnetic field, in reference to which *alone*

between *material* bodies) to exist in *totally empty* space! When in his "The Field Equations of Gravitation in the Absence of Matter" section of his 1916 paper, Einstein *explicitly specified* the word "matter" to *include* "not only matter in the ordinary sense, but the electromagnetic field as well", it is a *non sequitur* that the gravitational field, *requiring mass (es and the distances between them and the measured universal gravitational constant) in order to exist and to be expressed mathematically*, is taken by the theory to exist *even in the absence of all these!* It becomes a *double non sequitur* that light, a form of electromagnetic energy *thus excluded* by Einstein from the concept of "spacetime", *is nevertheless taken* to be "undulations of spacetime"! It gets to be a *triple non sequitur* that light, appearing in experiments now as *particles* (photons) and now as *waves*, and *being unquestionably energy* (that Einstein himself wrote as mc^2), *is believed to be massless!* It is a *quadruple non sequitur* that as a result of the theory of relativity the classical concept of conservation of energy *has surreptitiously yet definitely lost* its sheen!: Because, the heretofore *conserved total* amount of energy (expressed under relativity as Mc^2 , where M is the total mass in the universe and c the presumed constant velocity of light) *necessarily sums up all forms of energy!* But *how* is the summing up done *physically?* This has *never* been explained!: With *all* other forms of energy remaining the same, the kinetic energy *depends on where you measure it from!* Two observers in motion relative to each other will generally *not* agree on the kinetic energy of bodies! And so, *neither* will they on the *total* energy of the universe! E.g., the earth as seen from the sun (one revolution of a relatively tiny planet per year) and the sun as seen from the earth (one revolution of a relatively huge "planet" *per day!*) do *not* possess equal amounts of kinetic energy, though the potential energy of the sun-earth system works out the same whether from the sun or the earth due to their mutual gravitational attraction as per Newton, a concept to which even Einstein saw it necessary to adapt his general relativity theory, though claiming Newton's gravitation to be a "first approximation" to his own theory in the §21 section of his general relativity pa-

could one at that time speak of field equations)! No longer so!: We since have "advanced": Following *this his* example, "scientists" now, *more than he ever did*, proceed to speak of all sorts of *mostly imagined* effects *without* the slightest rational hesitation of mentioning their causes!

per! However little liked and even less discussed, this nevertheless *is* the state of “understanding” permitted by the bulk of modern theories [to which we still attempt to marry the current quantum mechanics (of which a great deal more later), failing to comprehend that the continuum and the conceived quanta *even conceptually simply negate each other*, and any *seeming* marriage will only be yet another “scientific” hat trick!] with which we attempt to investigate even conceptually the state of the world and determine the “Equation of Everything”! But there is more!

§64 The science of motion we nonchalantly have *invented* permits us to conceive “operations” *running backwards* in time. Though we have *never* seen a *natural* clock running backwards (and even if we saw the sun to reverse course we would *not* develop a sense of *time* running backwards!), we nonetheless feel ourselves *free* to play even “scientifically” with the idea; aided “scientifically” by the theory of relativity! And based on current “knowledge” (i.e., *without true knowledge of how fundamentally universal time affects universal operations*), we have the temerity to run the history of the universe *in reverse*, and to *believe* operations to have taken place in the *normal* course of time, *without taking due account of all the assumptions we make tacitly in the process*! So, we *believe* there was once a time (“epoch of decoupling”) before which, the entire mass of the universe was hydrogen so hot as to be ionized thermally and the universe was optically opaque due to the very strong interaction of light with protons and electrons. Much further back *we must also believe* based on theory, though theory runs *very thin* as regards what happened back then, there was an era of *much* higher temperatures when *all matter and energy*, compressed unimaginably, were nevertheless *present in the form of pure massless radiation*; as a result of which, the universe must have then been transparent! Ordinary matter other than hydrogen is *believed* to have formed in stars *following* the age of decoupling; when, due to gravitational instabilities of *unknown* origin in the gas, masses of it coagulated locally, compressed themselves under high temperatures into stars, in the interiors of which were formed the other elements of ordinary matter. *Totally ignored* remains the *fact* that, as the original transparent pure-radiation universe cooled, *there necessarily was a first time* when the temperature and pressure *was as high as hypothesized* to have existed in the interiors of stars following the age of decoupling!

Why ordinary matter did *not* form then (as it ought to have done, since thermodynamically it matters *not* how the conditions are arrived at but that they *apply and result in* their effects), but *all* matter passed on to form hydrogen that *only later was recompressed* according to standing theory, this *basic inconsistency* modern science has *not* bothered to explain! Nor was it ever explained how or why hydrogen, constituted as “understood”, was picked to play this pivotal role! But take a present-day scientist accepting, as he does with fervor, our present-day scientific knowledge of *fundamentals* to be eternally true, transform him into a non-physical observer and send him back to the era of pure radiation with orders to conduct measurements on energy and the universe. With mass *yet* to come into being, he would be at a *total* loss to say ought about the universe or the energy, that he would not even be able to see at all due to their total transparency! With these in mind, *we are logically bound to take it to be totally unscientific* to make theories claiming resolution of our questions about the universe, when, based on them, we conceive of epochs during which under *identical* conditions the *same particular result now did not obtain and now it did*, while our most fundamental *supposedly eternal* concepts would *not* be able to find their *due* correspondence with the *then* observed facts! How *little* the situation then in effect is understood is further shown by the accepted “explanation” of the so-called “background radiation”; believed to be a *direct, unaltered, and the same everywhere* remnant of the original “fireball”, rather than *the local background radiation field in which we are immersed*, as it is *presently* formed by *all* universal processes to date!

§65 The problem of energy shows up even in nuclear particle research: When particles are accelerated, they are *assumed* to consist of *only* the mass they had *before* the acceleration. When highly accelerated nuclear particles are smashed in collisions, fragments are found *heavier* than the particles from which they are supposed to be coming, in which they are *said* to have been contained, the extra mass *believed even gravitationally unseen*, before the collisions! Black holes, the *supposed not quite perfect* (according to Hawking) holders of unseen matter, *do nonetheless betray* the presence of their contents by their gravitational effects on the surrounding world. *Not* so with the nuclear particles, even as they are *not* black holes! Totally unabashed by these *horren-*

dous logical conflicts, we proceed to make theories about nuclear and subnuclear (*so-called* "elementary") particles, and to build hugely expensive machines intended to test these our theories, that hardly ever fail to be "verified"! Thus emboldened, our theories (that is, *we*) *continue to ignore all such conflicts*; and so far at least, we continued to build *ever bigger* particle-smashers! Early in the twentieth century, we thought we had come to the end of the particles line: The world with just the electron, the proton and the neutron seemed simple enough. The neutron did *not* present us with the above conflict: its mass *exceeds* the combined mass of the proton and electron to which it disintegrates when left in free state. The conflict arose when, after great acceleration, the nuclear particles were forcibly smashed. And we then *never* stopped "finding" *ever more, ever heavier and ever more mysterious* particles hiding inside those early three! In fact, if all this activity is on the right track, those three represent a sort of a *bottleneck in nature!*: the "elementary" particles, perhaps hundreds in number, all hide inside those three, through which (when smashed) alone they make their presence known to the world above, that also consists of a very large number of atomic and molecular particles! As the "elementary" particles proliferated, it became obvious that, *for their sheer number alone*, they could *not all* (if *any* of them) be truly elementary! Back to the theory-drawing-board: other theories were drawn up to take care of this situation, and "particles" like quarks made their appearance (these surely only on paper, since they are supposed to dwell even deeper inside those other ones and can *never* be examined *in vero corpo*), that *again* began to proliferate much like the previous generation! In truth, *all* subnuclear particles are *never* observed *in vero corpo*: only *traces* of condensed vapors of *ordinary molecules* in cloud chambers are observed, and these traces are *interpreted* as paths of the sought after fast-moving particles, based on *heavily-assumption-laden* theories! Question: If we insist that the world is rational, on which basis alone we continue to do science, may we also continue to uphold theories about particles that make the world look progressively *irrational* as a result of all those particles *supposedly* "found" in nature? *How short, as a minimum, must the life of a particle be* in order that we may decide that we deal with a real particle, rather than with a *forced coagulation* of mass-energy that proceeds to "disintegrate" (can this be the right word in this case, or is it per-

haps better to use *relax*?) the moment the mass-energy concentration-pressure falls below the corresponding certain level? Utilitarian nuclear fission and fusion work *can* proceed *without* recourse to results of work based on such "advanced" theories of nuclear "structure". What then is the *real* value of such theoretical work, conducted moreover *without any* parallel effort to resolve the all too real physical-philosophical issues raised by it? Whatever the results of such work, *not all* reasonable people, if experience to date can guide, shall be satisfied with their interpretation! Even if Nobel prizes are dispensed! Even people moderately versed in the structure of "science" and society *will* understand the shock, cultural *and* social, of the admission of these facts and their consequences: *A very great deal* of current science and science-supported philosophy *must* be abandoned! And *all* those currently employed in the multi-billion-dollar industry built around the efforts of "verification" of the theories involved *must* find *other, meaningful*, employment! It does *not* take brains to understand that the shock *shall* be all the greater the simpler is the *correct* solution of this problem, that indeed *is* simple! No amount of tact can lessen the impact, while *any* effort to be tactful about all these interrelated matters may perhaps be taken as a *double* insult! *Factual* language *is* the better part of valor and tact!

14

THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION: HOW IT LOOSES ITS STIGMA AND TURNS AGAINST MATERIALIST ATHEISM

§66 As it now stands, the theory of evolution insults our intelligence *not* as a theory of evolution per se, but for insisting along with all atheism of which it *has* become a part, that *all* we value is the product of *meaningless and purposeless chance*, which it substitutes for Purpose, Logic and Will, in a single word for *Logos* (*clearly of God*, in the face of the *hard fact that the material universe has been proven, as the sequel shall clearly show, to be without such on its own*); which is the antithesis of the *Principle of Engineering*, i.e., of *consciously making* (note the significance of this term vs. that of “*just happening*”) *anything at all for a freely conceived and pursued clearly seen objective, that cannot be gotten except through disciplined and well organized effort*. The moment it is realized that the creation of the world could *not* have have come about by chance, but *was* subject to Law (necessarily conceived in a *Mind capable of conceiving its own objective and all the means needed for its attainment*), evolution *loses* its stigma!

§67 Divine Economy dictates that the *most economical method* of Creation be used. Anything less *would be totally unsuited* to be God’s method! If God used preexisting cells, almost identical to those found in the monkey, the horse, the dog or even the amoeba to construct the human body, are these cells anything other than just “*dust and water*”; or do they become offensive simply because they also exist in the bodies of lower animals?

Are they not, rather, *already precious materials for having proven successful in sustaining lower life*, thus being the *best candidates* for sustaining also the ultimate form of life, Man, with only minor adjustments where and as needed? How is it possible for the higher forms of life to exist at all in a *universe* [please, go back to the etymology of the word to remember its *true* meaning!] built to contain *all* life appearing externally in material form, without the lower forms on which they feed, solely because they need food [which *only* the lower forms provide] which they digest, namely break down to such components that alone they can assimilate (put in place, where needed, in their own bodies), food which they find in the substances created in the bodies of lower life forms for *their* sustenance, *all* according to a clearly conceived and enacted *universal Design* in order that they thus be truly useful to the Purpose of the whole Creation?: Does this not necessitate a *single* Plan for the formation of *all* living things, *only thus feeding on the common stock* of “dust and water”? Creationists believe that God took *special* care in creating Man. Can they suggest a still greater care than the one just outlined fully within the most economical Plan of Creation? Can *any* objector suggest a *better* Plan, some *better* materials? If not, *all* other plans *must* be worse! But then, who are we to constrain God to adopt a less economical, less logical, less elegant method in performing *His* Work? And how indeed is the Creation of Man any less “*special*” when, *clearly*, he *is* so very much far more than the sum of the molecules of his body, despite the great molecular similarities of him and the ape (please recall F/n. 8, pp. 35-6)? When Creation is seen in this light, what in it is insulting God, rather than *proving* His Wisdom, far beyond otherwise *empty* “biblical” words? How then is *any* objection not *proof solid* of the *ignorance*, or *else neglect*, of the *complete picture of Creation*, and *disdain* for the Gloria Maxima that *is* God’s?

§68 It is a fundamental mistake to ignore all this, and attempt instead to uphold and prove Creation by the methods of the nineteenth century, concentrating our attention to what are now seen to be clearly *unimportant* structural, biological and biochemical differences and similarities [except when the *complete* structures are seen to be *perfectly suited* to the life of each specie!] between man and monkey, as if that alone were the principal

ground for comparison! It is as though in the age of the hydrogen bomb, some still insist on conducting the battle as in Waterloo, with the lead soldiers supplied by atheistic materialism! It is depressing to see the creationists content to play this now clearly seen to be a *silly* game with the atheists. For if materialism were honest and true to itself, *it* would first ask for an *exact* explanation of the very same questions the more thoughtful theists pose!: If matter is all there is, why is the matter in Man *alone*, so very much alike that in the ape and the lower animals, asking questions of the very highest significance, even about God, while the very same matter in the ape is not? How can it be said that Man is a fool for asking these questions that embarrass the atheists, and the ape is not for not asking them, thus proving himself to be truer to the "spirit" of materialism? And why, if so, do the materialists come in the shape of man rather than that of the monkey? How can it seriously be said that, of the two, the ape is the wiser, as *is implicitly thus maintained* by profound-sounding professors totally unconscious of the fact that *they* thus first insult their very own human shape? Since when can better science be done with the *lesser* evidence? Is there not, therefore, something *fundamentally dishonest* when highly regarded professors choose to associate with the apes in conducting their studies aimed at proving atheism, rather than conversing with the more thoughtful and challenging theists, who are a far harder nut to crack, and thus far more likely to put science itself to the test than are the apes, and thus far more likely to contribute to a *real* advance in science (or is it exactly *that* that the professors fear the most?), in an honest effort to discover what after all *is* this "matter" that strives to surpass itself, to evolve beyond materialism? How can the evolutionists, as men also of basic honesty and not just of "science" ignore this attempt at *further* evolution even as they pretend to believe only in evolution, that is thus showing itself striving to go *beyond* its own materialist confines? Is this not plain old naked casuistry, and one of no high order at that? Who here is an obscurantist and who an enlightened thinker: he who dismisses as "insignificant" (like the Aesopian "sour" grapes) the abyssal difference in Spirit between Man and monkey, or he who wants to know the reasons for the uniqueness of Man for asking the Questions? Is not the materialist science positively silly when it pretends disinterest and indifference in facing the greatest exist-

ential question before it, which is how the Spirit springs forth from matter, if materialism be true?

§69 Returning to the theme of §60 (pp. 94-6) solid arguments can be made that the true fundamental particle of matter is of the order of 10^{-65} g. This places it some 39 orders of magnitude below the electron!: Even the electron *is* a veritable universe composed of some 10^{39} fundamental particles! How the electron and the proton behave *is thus coded deep inside them*. So, to make the greatest leap in complexity, when we are born and when we die a natural death as physical units is indeed coded deep inside us! Is such a hugely complex code truly the blind result of chance in Nature, or is it, far more likely, the outcome of the *conscious* effort of God so to organize matter as *it* to act as *He* determined, so that in turn *we* give meaning to *our* life, rather than surrendering to the consciousness (*cunningly, viperously*, inculcated in us by the very professors supposed to be studying these matters in order that they, on *our* behalf, at *our* expense, extract from them *all* the lessons of Order) of meaninglessness? If obedient to the code inscribed on it by God, matter at the appointed universal times transformed some species and *without error* produced new kinds of living species, were such acts any less than *special*, or were they rather *real proof absolute* of His Wisdom and *total control* over Nature? When creationists deny theistic evolution as the handiwork of God, in favor of an *uneconomical* process of what *they* call "special creation", they deny themselves the ultimate weapon that guarantees them *complete* victory: The atheists adopted evolution solely because it offered itself, so they thought, as a tool and argument against God's existence. Little did they expect that their own weapon would in the proper time turn against them! They wanted evolution at the level of the nineteenth century thinking? At the dawn of the twenty first, the time has come to update the argument *and* the science! Let them have evolution! To embarrass them completely, "theistic evolution" does *not* have to prove that such (by definition *the* most complex) phenomena of science as the sudden transformation of one species to another are fully beyond the ability of blind chance and of, if that be true, *undisciplined* Nature to bring them about entirely on her/their own without an inscribed, fully detailed code; though the very formulation, as here attempted, of the question almost *makes* the proof. *It more than suffices to show that far simpler, and*

+

+

indeed the simplest by definition, Laws of Nature are totally beyond her capabilities to institute upon herself on her own accord! As also to produce the altogether crushing statistics against the order of the world to have been won and, without a single miss, to keep on being won by every single "Planck time interval"! Which both shall later be shown!!!

+

+

15

THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION AND HOW IT CONNECTS TO THE REAL WORLD

§70. Both the development and traditional discussion of the theory of evolution have taken place *independently of*, and one is tempted to say, *in spite of*, the substantial underlying issues of chemistry and physics! In this, this theory too indeed resembles *all* great scientific theories that so far have developed *in isolation* from the surrounding *great balance* of physical *and* logical constraints that *naturally* bear upon them! It is only later that the theories are “adjusted”, or rather *manhandled*, to “fit” the requirements of the real world! *So* it has been with the theories of the continuum, *ignoring* the hard fact that real things (*all “real” things except time*, despite the illusion provided by clocks!) can be, and are being, cut up. *So* too it has been with the theories of the quanta, built *ignoring* the hard fact that there can only be a *definite* natural limit to the process of division for *all* things dividable, as is sufficiently shown by those other hard facts (a) that cutting endlessly by half finally ends up to the size of $(1/2)^\infty = 0$, and (b) that the sum even of an infinite number of zeros is just zero, and nothing tangible! *So* it has been with the theories of *atomic* matter, built *ignoring* the hard fact that *there is indeed a uni-verse out there to the laws of which they too must comply!* The theory of evolution has distinguished itself by *ignoring more problems than any other theory!* The *uni-verse and its parts has yet to be seen as a whole* that ignores *no fact and no “detail”!* For us to continue along that “time-honored” venue *would be* patently irresponsible! Rather, we must first try to see what has truly transpired around that

theory and then return to see the development of the living species *as a part of the whole physical problem!* By having reached so far in this discussion, *this much is already clear to us:* Once the underlying physical world *proves the existence of God*, opining that the theory of natural selection can still dispel the need for God is as responsible as opining that an 80th-floor penthouse can on its own dispel the need of the structure below on which it is built!

§71. Even about this theory too, there has been sufficient damaging confusion! For one thing, Charles Darwin himself did *not* discuss the *deeper* causes of evolution! He did *not* say that it was, or was not, from God! He did *not* have either the scientific support, nor a Faith sufficiently reasoned to allow him to make a *definitive* statement on that matter. It seems to me that, all that is said about his *real* beliefs can be *only* conjectural. This however is certain: Coming when the theory came *without a reasoned statement* on that subject, it could not but *create* a furor! And for another, even today, *the vast logical difference* between (a) special and general creation, on the one hand, and (b) an *unspecified* general creation and a *specific* general creation *designed and devised from the beginning such that it produce exactly all and nothing less or more than were conceived to be produced, when it would be logically possible (and thus also good for them) to be produced into being*, on the other, both *remain uncomprehended*.

§72. At the time the theory appeared, the *special creation by specie* was the *only* mode of creation conceivable. It still is today in most people's minds. *It* certainly was the kind of creation implied by the Book of Genesis in the minds of simple people of all ages and times, people unfamiliar with the *deep logical* problems involved in Creation! But consider:

(a) For one thing, the Hebrews were *not* a scientific people and what they thought, or was revealed to them in words *they* could then understand, *cannot* be binding to the *very last word simplistically understood* over us all for the rest of time! Just as the language we use to talk to babies *is not* binding over the adult world! This has been *one* source of confusion.

(b) And for another, under the "parabohical and many interpretations" theory of the Bible, what was/is *first* implied *does not exhaust all that is implied or was meant by God to be well understood by all people of all ages and times*, who inexorably depend on their *advancing* understanding of the logical issues involved in Crea-

tion. What is binding over God is what *He* did, not what *fallible* human minds “understand” and “interpret”, and what *fallible* human hands write down on *corruptible* papyrus, that is later “restored” according to the “understanding” of the “restorer”! If it were possible to be observed by *anyone* of us standing then as a non-physical observer, the *specific* general creation detailed above *could not and would not* fail to be interpreted as *special creation by specie*! God being *pure Spirit, as pure Spirit* did He create the world! He *could not* have materialized in the form of matter *not yet created* to create the world by hand! *Nor* would He later have appeared in material form during an essentially *inelegant* process, solely in order that from soil and His saliva He create *by hand* the living things and *us*! *All* specific items comprising the world *necessarily* appeared in time as products of *special creation by specie*, even as *they were only designed from the beginning to appear in such times as were specified for each and built in the universal equations of Design of the Specific General Creation!* To this very day, not even the “specialist” scientists *understand* this cardinal point! And if they object with a “how do you know?”, I *will* suggest that they *forget* Plato’s *binding* principle-challenge that *everyone is free* to offer, *if he can*, a *more* reasonable understanding of things! This has been *another* source of confusion.

(c) For yet *another* thing, we *must* consider how people *divide* over this important issue: When the theory of evolution appeared, on the side of religious belief stood only the option of belief according to the Scriptural description of *special creation by specie*; while on the side of irreligious belief stood the *only* other option *then or since till now* thought possible, namely, that of “*creation*” *by pure chance*; “*chance*” being the *only* kind of “*creative*” agent that is possible to imagine at all in the absence of God! As a result, on the irreligious and *supposedly* “*scientific*” side, stood people who objected to the belief in God for whatever *other* reason, as did also otherwise *bona fide* reasonable people who thought opposition to the Biblical belief their “*only logical*” option, *without in the least comprehending the tremendous logical problems* this option introduces, problems revealed only when this option is examined closely! While on the religious and *supposedly* “*obscurantist*” side, there stood people believing themselves *bona fide* faithful Christians in thinking of the *traditional special creation by specie* as their only *con Deo* option without in the least compre-

hending the *grave compromises* this makes to their belief as Christians in an *All-wise* God; while with them *also* stood *all* remaining people, who though not *consciously* religious, nevertheless found it *both intellectually and morally abhorrent* to believe *in the possibility even of creation by pure chance!* This division of both issues *and* people has been yet *another* source of confusion.

§73. In the great general confusion resulting from these three sources, people other than degreed scientists and philosophers were and are more excused to take the specific stance they took and still take. *Supposedly* “disciplined” scientists and philosophers were and now are *far less* excused; while the most “disciplined” ones among them were and now certainly are excused *not at all!* Specifically the ones that became and despite the intervening advances continue to become advocates *without objective proof* of their position and *without considering the strongest possible opposition* against which alone they ought and now even more owe to make the best argument they could/can. Instead, while in the past they only presented *sophomore* arguments, today they seek to defend their position by *added on casuistry hidden elaborately, and connivance willfully superadded*, which is infinitely more detestable as it is done in the name of “reason” or “science”! It is in this category that particularly Richard Dawkins’ attack against Creation by Design belongs: it is still brought against the *traditional special creation by specie*; which remains the only opponent the evolutionists see, *pretending ignorance* of the wider issues of Creation that have gradually come to the fore during the last century and a half!

§74. What Dawkins overlooks, making it *particularly painful and sorrowful* to watch a *supposedly* disciplined scientist doing it, is *his intellectual dishonesty he himself exposes!* What he argues for in effect is the theory within the theory, of “punctuated equilibrium” within the *theoretical* scheme of evolution by natural selection. The first problem is that neither he nor any anyone else has managed to produce a *reasonable physical cause* for the *supposed* “fact” that evolution advances by locking in on the “*next higher*” organism it produces at a time through pure purposeless chance. The evolutionists *ignore* the cause! They begin in mid-air with the *process!* And with it, they attempt to produce the effect! The *only* evolutionary “process” or “mechanism” *all evolutionists accept without demur* is that of *blind and purposeless* mutation. Note

it: mutation is only a *process*, not the cause! Here immediately come the questions:

(a) What sort of process or mechanism may mutation be? Are not *all true processes and mechanisms created specifically for a clearly seen and pursued purpose*? In the present case, neither is the process/mechanism-producing agency stated, nor is a specific purpose recognized at all; instead, the process/mechanism *is categorically stated to be purposeless*! As an engineer respecting the *ageless process of engineering*, I protest vehemently this *irresponsible abuse of engineering language, practice and ethics* by non-engineers!

(b) Why should the *purposeless* "mechanism" of mutation lock the "next"-produced organism in on a *particular* structure, if there is no preferred direction and ordering of structures based on *Law*? Has *anyone ever* seen a bird giving birth to a fish and dropping it solely into the sea where alone it may survive? Has *anyone ever* seen a cat producing an egg? There are billions of birds in the air! Millions of cats well tendered as pets! How is it that *not a one ever of them* has done us this "favor"? Mere examples these two! There are millions of different species out there, billions of individuals and the evolutionists are diligently studying them in the wild, in zoos, in aquaria, in arboreta, in well protected man-made lush tropical gardens and jungles, in wild life sanctuaries of all sorts! Yet, *not a one such* observation!

(c) *Where is all the unimaginable teratogeny* that a *purposeless* process of procreation of stillborn and sickly and lame and *only very rarely* a healthy specimen of progeny ought constantly to produce; in which what we see to be "normal" ought to vanish as just another teratogenous form? Have the evolutionists no shame exhibiting themselves so proudly in their public demonstration of incapacity to learn from the *total absence* of what according to their *religion, not science, of purposelessness* ought to be the *normal and most plentiful course of events*?

(d) Faced with *that* absence, are they finally ready to admit that the process of evolution is *not* blind and purposeless? Then *somebody sees through it all and consciously purposes*! Will the evolutionists at last realize that it is far more likely to observe whole cities of perfect buildings standing in place, yet produced *purposelessly by inanimate nature*, than to have through the ages the *healthy* populations of animals we observe either living or as fossils?

(e) Are the evolutionists ready to admit a *preferred* direction and ordering of structures? *Preferred* implies him who prefers; *ordering* him who orders! In other words, *the* cause? Can they show us *who he* is, or will they continue so to abuse the language we all use and its meanings and implications?

(f) Are the evolutionists ready to reverse course and admit *no* preferring and *no* ordering? *Why*, then, is there *only* evolution and *no devolution*? If chance rules, in the regular course of events, evolution *and* devolution ought to have about equal chances!

(g) Will they still insist on "locking in" of the species through all their consecutive generations? What is *it* that locks a specie in on a structure? Need? Surely not! Pure chance *cannot* choose between life and the absence of it! The chanced first amoeba *surely could not tell what the next moment meant* to will to stay alive through it! The deaf, hearing *not* and having *no idea* of hearing, *have no need of hearing*! The need to hear is recognized *only* by those who once heard, and then finding that they no longer could, they decided they were better off when hearing than now when they are deaf. The need to hear is *appended* as a "need" to the hearing-not *only* by those who hear *already*! When nobody is made to hear, even this appending *cannot* be done! But there are dangers out there that the organism must defend itself against by developing the equipment of hearing? *How* does it know that hearing, *of which it has no sense yet*, will help? What *is* danger if I cannot sense it because I have no sensory equipment? If life is meaningless in a universe having no purpose, what good is it having either of them, and in them both the sense of danger?

(h) Will the evolutionists say that it is not the deaf organism but the *process* that has the need of hearing? *How does the process, having no purpose, know what is needed?*

(i) To see what this last question implies, just try to comprehend what each word requires in order for it to mean something specific and for the whole sentence something clearly sensible *not* in a uni-verse but in a heap of purposeless coexistence of wholly meaningless items! It (organism or process) does not know? Then *who* does? *No* locking in? *Why at all then* do *any* two of us look so much the same as to recognize *all humans* as a distinct specie?

(j) Will the evolutionists finally comprehend that in a blind and purposeless so-called "universe", *no kind* of obvious or hidden purposive item, instrument, mechanism or process are allowed

at all? That *any* motion in such a “system” *must of necessity be chaotic, not organizing, nor self-organizing*? That in such a “system”, not even “needs” exist, let alone *needs*? That “needs” said to exist in such a “system” are *only thought* by people such as themselves [do they know what the word *system* truly means?] comfortably ensconced in a *system* perfectly thought out, in which they act as freeloaders refusing to take up the full-blown intellectual, ethical and moral responsibilities of a rightful member?

(k) Do the evolutionists realize that in a “system” such as theirs “needs” *can be gotten and can be lost*, and there is *no* telling what *need* is! Before there can be *need*, there *must be purpose* to which *need* tunes, homing in to which, the *need* makes itself sensed by the *needy*? The evolutionists have *reversed* this natural order! They *assume* there are needy, even when there is no need felt because there is no conception of purpose! And then they insist that instruments develop helpful in “guiding” to *no purpose at all!*

(l) Will they, will we all, once for all realize that it has been, *it always is, scientifically irresponsible* to call a theory scientifically established when it *cannot* answer *fundamental* questions bearing *crucially* on its subject-matter? As it has been developed, the theory of evolution *is scientifically irresponsible!*

§75. Let us repeat some items in a somewhat different manner, if only to weigh the problem in all its weight:

(a) Do they not describe evolution as the *purposeless and unselfconscious* nature’s *undesigned* selection of individuals and species struggling for survival by way of *chanced* mutations? And do they not call the survivors the fittest, just for having survived? Shall we all finally realize that *every* selection is the *process* by which the processor (here, nature) *chooses based on some criteria*? Shall we all finally realize that criteria are established for the attainment of *some specific* objective? Shall we call survival as *the* objective? One *can* understand, say, Nirvana as *the* objective, for its being the *final* state to eternity! But survival is *only for a short* time, leading to *nothing*, according to evolutionists! *How* then can it be called *the* objective? *How* indeed do these “scientists” *understand* all this *so real* trouble of *this entire peregrination from nothing to nothing*? Shall we all thus finally *comprehend* that without objective there can be *no* criteria, and that with no criteria there can be *no* selection? Do we now finally thus *comprehend* that the theory of evolution asserts that nature has followed a sequence of events

that *cannot even get started if she truly is purposeless and unselfconscious?* And do we now finally *comprehend* that if we ever so slightly admit these two as characteristics of nature, we admit *her* as god, yet a god *far inferior* to that advocated by *any decent* religion, in *direct proportion of the inferiority we allow* of those two characteristics of nature relative to the perfection of God? For not giving all the *needed* attention to the *ontological* significance of the terms they use, the evolutionists in fact advocate belief in a *vastly inferior* god, and this in the name of "science"!

(b) Shall we all finally realize that even the selection of criteria *is* a process of *choosing*? [In our case, because we are *careless* thinkers, we avoid the endless regress into choosing criteria for choosing criteria ... for choosing *the* criteria for the attainment of *the specific* objective by starting *arbitrarily* from the *last* base, without giving any deeper thought to this matter. This is exactly the cause of most our failures: we do *not* think through the criteria, and those we pick do *not* lead to the desired objective!]:

(c) The theory of evolution as it got started became interested in the transformation of *species to new species*: *Only* later, did the evolutionists realize that the appearance of a new specie [morphogenesis] is the result of the appearance of a *new* kind of individuals [ontogenesis] in numbers large enough as to make the presence of the new specie noticeable for consisting of *this new kind* of individuals, *most curiously all appearing at essentially the same exact time, that certainly cannot constantly be a matter of chance!*

(d) Now first, mutation (i.e., an error in gene replication) proceeds according to theory by *chance and at a low rate* (typically one in a hundred million per base replication¹⁶) that either is least or optimum. The argument for the least rate is that the *vast majority of mutations is harmful*, and an individual with a high mutation rate will soon make its lineage extinct; whereas an individual with a low mutation rate will leave more, though less evolved offspring. The argument for the optimum rate is that it *somehow yet purposelessly balances* the effects of the vast number of harmful mutations by the advantages of the much smaller number of beneficial mutations that carry the evolutionary adaptation forward!

¹⁶ John Maynard Smith, *The Limitations of Evolutionary Theory*, THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF IGNORANCE, A Wallaby Book/Gulf & Western Corp. ISBN 0-671-79050-1, 1978, p. 235-42

Whereas also, if the rate of beneficial mutation is greater than optimum, the specie will evolve faster to another (or the *next?*) specie, thus also causing its own extinction; which suggests a “*purposeless*” yet *cautious* evolution! As in addition, the mutation rate *varies* with the case, the theory on the whole *cannot* say something meaningful and concrete and simply awaits developments. Rationally judged by concerned outsiders, a “purposeless balance” resembles strongly a forced marriage of mutually exclusive opposites; while to them, all this discussion regarding mutation rates smells heavily of the teleology the theory of evolution purports to deny! *Only the insiders*, long since carried away by the details of rates, and having lost both the sight and smell of the logical contradictions, seem unconcerned!

(e) Now second, the “struggle for survival” is possible by two options: either by the gradual disappearance of those individuals that cannot adapt to the challenges of the entire environment, in which case those that remain become gradually the majority *yet without any genetic change having occurred in them* (a case you may dismiss *only* if you assume *all* individuals to be absolutely identical as exact copies produced in a *faultless* production line, which *is definitely not* the case with natural populations); or by the vastly less likely appearance in a (small?) number of individuals of beneficial mutations, resulting in the domination of the individuals having them over the bulk of the population, that gradually disappears under what in the beginning at least will seem to be something like “interracial strife”, and only at the end will it appear as “general slaughter” by a superior specie. For purely *social* reasons, with the theory having appeared at a time of forceful spread of competing empires over the earth, its inventors and followers, being also members of the societies applying their power and spreading their domination, favored the latter option, socially seen as the “natural right of the stronger/superior race”, and they *neglected* what ought to have been a *serious* examination of the first option:

(f) Because rationally, the appearance in sufficient numbers such as to give notice of themselves as a distinct specie of individuals resulting from a *practically simultaneous chance occurrence* in them of vastly less likely identical beneficial mutations in comparison to the *already high probability of harmful* mutations truly stretches belief in sheer “good luck”! [In the spirit of all this dis-

cussion, this question, too, *must* be answered: Have gene mutations *truly been observed and isolated* and those that produce the evolutionary novelty and carry the evolution by natural selection forward *proven* to be beneficial, or are they simply an *elaborate mental construct, a mere hypothesis*, supporting *the larger hypothesis*, the theory of evolution by natural selection as it now stands, in the absence of an alternative thought acceptable to academia? The self-admitted “enough of a Popperian” J. M. Smith seems to admit as much, though he does not expect that he may have to stop being “an unrepentant neo-Darwinist” any time soon. Regarding an alternative thought, more later!]

(g) Certainly, if evolution occurred according to the first mode /option (that of the gradual natural elimination, *without competitive struggle among individuals*, of those members that due to weakness and sickness could not survive), we simply *cannot* expect the existence of so-called “missing links”, the process of evolution acting imperceptibly as sift separating from the bulk the always present more adaptable individuals. Certainly also, in that case, one *would expect the simultaneous presence over much longer periods of time of many more gradually distinct species only gradually, if absolutely necessary, separating geographically from each other* in the more remote past, and one *cannot* be certain whether the attribution of age to fossils discovered has not been influenced by the only active second mode of thinking having the species appearing consecutively in time and looking for the *always* “missing links”! For *culturally* inculcated reasons, the theory of evolution has *not* opened its objective lens as wide as it ought. Now third, the question arises, as to when nature decides to abort the development to maturity of an individual possessing a harmful mutation: The sooner she does so, the more *prescient* she appears (if indeed she does not *prove herself to be such!*), and so, inevitably, all the more to a *set objective* (purpose) does she indicate herself to be aiming at, i.e, contrary to the evolutionists’ belief that she is purposeless! The later she does so, the more the fossil record *must* be the record of *defects* and *all* conclusions based on paleontology *must* be correspondingly suspect:

(h) Geology and paleontology must either be hiding from us all those defects, or making it impossible for us to see the record as a record mostly of defects! After all, we all have seen some poor lame dog struggling along. A defect does not have to be so

visibly serious from birth. [And by the way, what sort of *blind purposeless* process produces as a matter of *practically faultless course* bipedal and tetrapedal animals *all* with *matching* limbs? "Punctuated equilibrium"? If blind mutations work entirely lawlessly, this sort of "equilibrium" *is yet another figment of some very wily imaginations!*] A defect may appear as generally sickly individuals, some making it only to, say, age five, some to fifteen, some to fifty; and some with three fingers on the one hand, some with seven on the other, which are *not* life-threatening defects! *Why* are all such absent from the living and fossil record? Seriously, a blind process if anything at all, ought to produce far far more Picassoesque copies than Giocondas! And Picasso was *not* blind, *nor* purposeless! *Where is all the litter of the failed "attempts"?* Relative to the *few* successes, the number of awful failures, of the monster forms *both living and dead*, a blind and purposeless process *of necessity must produce must be* in the zillions! In a blind and purposeless process, the fossil record *must of necessity be the record of failures, not of successes!* Is it then upon the record of *failures* that the theory of evolution has established its edifice by unrepentant paleo- and neo-Darwinists?

(i) And most certainly it *would* be beneficial to have yet another set of eyes in your back to watch it in a highly competitive so-called "society" in which "dog eats dog"! *How* indeed is it that, nature, allowing the struggle for survival and recognizing(?) the "need" of having eyes, certainly useful in answering that "need", so much so as to develop the whole wonderful mechanism of eyesight, has yet failed to make the next *tiny* step of duplicating the already developed two-eyed system at the back of our heads? Does *she*, too, "act in mysterious ways"? The more "mysterious" her ways, the more God-like (as the "theologians" think of God) must she be taken to be; in which case, the evolutionists simply replace one such "God" for another! The "*well-established*" theory of evolution [when closely examined by disinterested minds, used to examining things carefully rather than looking to please the professors in order to get a degree and a place in academia] is found to have more and far larger logic-threatening holes than Swiss cheese; whereas the Logos most certainly *cannot* be threatened!

(j) Shall we all finally realize that "struggle" *is also a process* requiring a *conscious* effort involving bodily, psychical *and* intellectual energy, and this makes the word *unsuitable for unconscious*

nature? That we transfer *our* way of reasoning to things, genes and their mutations, that *cannot* reason?

(k) Surely the evolutionists will *not* want to admit that the process of evolution they advocate is *not* universally applicable to nature! But that it certainly involves even the amoeba, from which at least all biology started. Recalling now also what we said in §74 g (p. 116), will they *explain* how the *universally purposeless* nature applied the process of evolution to produce the first single-cell organism having in it a *clear will* for survival, which we above showed to be a *purpose pursued*, or else evolution folds upon itself?

(l) The theory holds the mutations to be *mild and benign mistakes* that carry the process *only forward!* In a blind and purposeless process, *why or how* do the mutations carry the process *always forward?* Forward and backward? Why do the evolutionists *refuse* to produce the *complete* statistics of *successful and unsuccessful blind and purposeless "attempts"* (see below, §§80-2, p. 132-9)?

(m) Now first, would *you* call it an "attempt", if there were *no* prior knowledge of the *objective*, that one *reaches by attempting to reach it, knowing it is there?*

(n) To carry forward the process of evolution, *it is not enough* that an organism be just viable, *it must be contributive* to the process! On mutating, a *perfect* organism *can only result in a less perfect* organism! *How* then is the process carried from perfection to perfection *through imperfection?* And *where* are all those linking imperfections?

(o) Then again, a *less than perfect* and *not by its purpose spirit-ed* organism, mutating, *cannot be trusted* to carry the process to its "objective", that unless it is *objective*, the process would *never* be known as *evolution*, but rather as *total mess and chaos*, that *could never have brought us here whether as individuals or society capable of debating it!* A *less than perfect* mutant to see the process through? Would *you* mount an *untrained workhorse* to see you through the Olympic equestrian course? Are the evolutionists so blind that they do *not* see what happens around? Or is it that they do see, all right, but they do *not understand* what they see? Or rather, it is far more likely that they dutifully serve what we may call the religion of ultimate purposelessness, in a universe *they* choose to portray as having produced accidentally the intelligence we see, that in turn has as its only objective its *immoral* immediate material gain, however we otherwise timidly call it in progressively ever more meaningless language?

(p) There is simply *no end of reasonable questions, bearing upon the essence itself of ratiocination*, that the theory of evolution *fails to answer!* If faced with this large number of questions on the one side and the *deafening silence* on the other, our cynic remarks that there is no science here, but only a *lower form of religion dressed as "science"*, what will the evolutionists say to him? *What will it take for them to realize that even the term "evolution" is a misnomer for a blind and purposeless process?*

§76. Despite all the above, we cannot understand the problem posed by the theory of evolution until we understand the cultural milieu in which it appeared. Even our present culture, far from being a systematic whole, remains stubbornly an unorganized collection of disciplines having started independently of each other and coexisting not on an inner functioning network that unites them to a meaningful collaboration, but only for the (on occasion, just merely bearable) social interdependence of their carriers that are us. Our modern social troubles are due to our ossifying around our ideas that we accept as forevermore fixed and non-negotiable as already developed, for which we are prepared to rend to shreds even the society that holds us together. The ordinary man cannot perceive the gravity of the problem. The intellectual elites are exactly the ones that lead the rending. The universities are only institutions housing together disparate disciplinarians determined to remain ensconced in their separate ivory towers, feeding upon the rest of society, unconscious of the need that universities finally see all *knowledge as a uni-verse* rather than as a haphazard collection of strangely cohabiting ideas each seeking to form a closed independent association with its likes. The cultural milieu in the mid nineteenth century, having shed the remnants of medieval shackles, had embarked on a wide expedition to discover, describe and classify the secrets of the still widely unexplored expanses of the earth. Darwin's expedition to the Galapagos was one such. The discipline got its start, and only gradually did it begin to face its own internal difficulties, sticking stubbornly, however, to the no longer viable original line of thought that it considered non-negotiable. Evolutionists still try to explain what they consider to remain the core of the discipline, namely, the phylogenesis of the various species based on spurious chance accidents occurring during the development of organs on passing from one generation to the next. How the *stable* forms (morphogenesis) of both the species (as a *second* step) and the in-

dividuals (as the *necessary first* step leading up to the second) that make them up takes place as a result solely of accidents is still handled in an unconvincing way. Accidents and errors do *not* result in order. [Conscientious examiners do *not* grade examination papers solely on the correctness of the final answer, but on the *reasoning*; as, say, two errors *can* cancel each other out, but do not justify the correctness of the final answer!] The individuals within a specie exhibit sufficient order to vitiate completely the idea of accidents. Expressions such as "*only phenomenal order*" hiding the underlying accidents, and "*apparent, not real, purpose*" as a mere illusion in a world dominated by accidents simply *cannot* convince. The species show *sufficient* uniqueness to be recognized as *separate* species. *This is non-negotiable thematism* that, even if temporary in the long run of aeons, cannot but prove the workings of a scheme designed to bring them about even if for only some time. These can *only* be understood as *designed* way stations to a final destination: Evolution is progress *only if it is a progression toward something definite*. Absent that, the process would only be going haphazardly around, and this *would have become obvious*. It has *not*! Man stands out for having a unique intellectual capacity of very high order: We have spread our sight from the Democritean atom to the whole of the universe; from the first moment of the world ("Big Bang") to what we investigate must be fitting to be its termination; there is nothing material our tactile empiricism has ignored. We have gone beyond our tactile empiricism, and touched the ethereal worlds of Ideas, of Beauty, of Duty, of Justice, of Sanctity, of Absolute Holiness. Those who deny the existence of all these, have set as a program of their lives to investigate the "pleasures" of the "easy way" and to reach destinations that I better not mention! With all these within our reach, it seems that the process of evolution has indeed come to its end: there is nothing remaining to be done by some next more evolved and involved specie. Indeed, we seem to be hitting our heads on an invisible wall we have erected, that we may call *involution* as we have already begun to consume with "substances" our own intestines, and *revolution* as we have begun to demolish what still exists in us of the Spirit! Our professors lead us to purposelessness and meaninglessness! Indeed, only so far do they see with all their "science"! We may *not* be surprised at anything we see that occurs having such teachers as guides!

§77. The *Uni-verse* cries out to be understood. We have cut it to pieces: Here goes our geology, there our astronomy, this way the physics, that way the chemistry, inorganic and organic apart, there goes observational biology, that way genetics, all over behaviorism! Stubborn, our professors of evolution refuse to broaden the discipline and place the entire *Uni-verse* underneath. *Uni-verse means purpose under a unifying theme*: Physics has from the beginning worked under *Law*, not the one now taught, but still under *Law*. Under *that Law* have the elements been built and set in a row. As a result of *that Law* do the elements make up molecules. Under *that same Law* does carbon appear now as worthless graphite soft opaque and black, and then as priceless diamond hard diaphanous sparkling. Under *that same Law* here comes gaseous hydrogen, and with carbon united goes as methane. Under *that same Law* does the "inorganic" turn into "organic". Under *that same Law* does the "organic" form the "biological". *Without an all-unifying Law there is no Uni-verse!* Will the professors ever understand that, and begin to behave at last as indeed they must? Thank the Lord, I am not alone in calling for sanity! It is worth reading E. W. F. Tomlin¹⁷ who has seen it fit

"to examine the arguments of those who claim to advance a mechanistic interpretation of biological phenomena. We are concerned here with analysis not metaphysics. It will now be clearer why the succession of cultural evolution to organic evolution, upon which Huxley and also Waddington lay such stress is unintelligible without presupposing continuity between the two. If evolution becomes "interiorized" at the level of man, *this is because it was always in interior process*. Human culture was preceded by biological culture. It will not do to say with Dobzhansky that 'cultural evolution was added to biological evolution', and then to declare that 'evolution has no purpose; man must supply this for himself'. Man was not 'added' to the ape; he developed or evolved from that creature. This is another example of professed evolutionists refusing to adopt a truly evolutionary view. Granted, only man *behaves* in the explicit sense; but since such behavior or conscious activity, guided by thematism, entails the use of organic tools, these tools themselves must have been developed according to some form of thematism. They cannot have come into being by a series of mutations due to mechanical faults of copying; and the same applies to the brain and the nervous system. These organs are

¹⁷ E. W. F. Tomlin: *Fallacies of Evolutionary Theory*, THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF IGNORANCE ISBN 0-671-79050-1, 1978, p. 227-34.

the means whereby higher evolution is directed; to ascribe their development to the play of blind forces is to suspend rational judgment and to betray the cause of science. It is legitimate to go further and to call it with Karl Stern 'crazy'. Stern adds: 'I do not mean crazy in the sense of slangy invective but rather in the technical meaning of the psychotic. Indeed, such a view of the history of the world has much in common with certain aspects of schizophrenic thinking'.

Tomlin chooses to avoid direct reference to metaphysics, preferring his reader to concentrate on the analysis of factual evidence. But if the brain and the nervous system have come into being not by accident but "according to some form of thematism", one is indeed well advised to ask about the *source* of "thematism", that Tomlin earlier on the same page calls "another name for finality", in yet another effort to avoid the metaphysical. But examining Beethoven's *Ninth Symphony* as a sequence of sounds produced by physical instruments and calling the whole "thematic" or "finalistic" or "teleological" does *not* avoid the question of metaphysical, which in the particular case listens to the name of Beethoven. So, too, as the human brain *is* the final culmination of the thematic development of the Uni-verse, one is fully within his rational rights, especially in view of Tomlin's call to the evolutionists to include in their considerations the Uni-verse as a whole, to ask about the Author of *that entire* Theme that, starting with so many (an *exact* number!) of Democritean atoms spread out in the entire Uni-verse, ended up culminating in the formation of so many *functional* human brains which, we awful players so much abuse to produce instead of sense so much nonsense we call "science"! Alas, the Science and the Music of the Celestial Spheres are only for the ears of cognoscenti! Naturally, even the deaf, being persons, *must* be respected, despite/*not* their opinion regarding the Music they simply cannot hear! But again, it is true that the *true* Man is revealed by the perfection he *consciously* assigns to the God in Whom he says he believes, *and* the honors he accords to Him! This, too, *is* in the Scheme of Things!

§78. Now, *apply* the Principle of Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity to the theory of evolution, once as it stands now and then as it is proposed that it be broadened. That as it stands now it possesses no concrete physico-mathematical body does *not* make it immune to the test of this Principle! After all, even mathematics *is part of Logic*! On top of a long sheet of pa-

per leave some room for the heading. Below, draw a vertical line dividing the paper into two columns. On the left column write the list of all questions as the above in §§74-5 (p. 114-23). In the place of the heading write the *one self-consistent* mechanism, process or idea that, you think, resolves all the questions you have written already. In the second column and against each question in the first column, write down how the item at the top best answers the question. Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity *has the unique advantage that it answers all questions with absolute clarity and confidence!* Against *that* measure, now judge the results! If *all other* items, one at a time, that you try on the top fail, you are *not* an objective scientist if you do not then write on top the name of God! *He* is the *only carrier* of the Logic the evolutionary process [embedded within the whole universal process about which we have a great deal more to say] *needs* in order to succeed! But the evolutionists are trying to use the evolutionary process they propose as a *weapon against* God, as the substitute for and superior to Him, *who alone stands behind all processes in the Universe and alone assures* their success! Now, the boomerang called "evolution" the atheists thrust out returns home!

§79. (a) It brims significance that R. Dawkins, a polemical antitheist, ignoring considerations such as the above, proposed to argue for his doctrine by *supposedly* showing the world how the evolution of living species proceeds without design (i.e., without the need of a Designer God) to bring about variation and biological progress by using mutations (i.e., not just random but rather *spurious* errors in gene replication, as shall be shown below), in a book *purposefully* titled THE BLIND WATCHMAKER¹⁸, than in its latest reprinting was prefaced with four pages of warm comments of approving reviewers writing in world-leading newspapers. *Not narrowly but broadly* must the reader interpret the meaning of this title on a book with such content: A watchmaker may *not* be imagined as a mere assembler putting together the watch pieces *handed* to him, but as the *designer and craftsman* who (a) conceived the complete project in its full details, (b) proceeded to produce the pieces he needed, and (c) assembled them as a *working com-*

¹⁸ R. Dawkins: THE BLIND WATCHMAKER, Longman and Penguin Books, 1986, 1988, 1991, 2006, ISBN-13: 978-0-141-02616-9 and ISBN-10: 0-141-02616-2

plete jewel of superb craftsmanship! But as if all this were not demanding quite enough, the reader is called upon by Dawkins to imagine this *implied* watchmaker in addition/or instead as *totally mindless, blind and purposeless*! Now, Dawkins is *at least a teaching professor*, who on p. xviii of the 2006 version he states that "I may not always be right, but I care passionately about what is true and I never say anything that I do not believe to be right" On reading this statement, *every rational person* (but obviously, *not* the reviewers!) is tempted to ask how *this* professor would advise the Elections Committee of *his* university on the appointment to a permanent chair of a *blind, purposeless, and, so, ignorant of the purpose of his own appointment* person expected to teach evolution and biology! What this professor would *never* advise as the proper way to fill a single chair, he nevertheless teaches to have been the process the universe used to produce the *entire huge collection of masterpieces* called living organisms!

(b) Dawkins, confessing the overwhelmingly negligible probability of all this huge variety of life to have come about solely by chance, nevertheless (on p. 49) berates "experts in [other] fields" for failing to understand that "chance – 'single-step selection' – alone ... is a minor ingredient in the Darwinian recipe [because] the most important ingredient is cumulative selection which is quintessentially non-random", which makes the "belief that Darwinian selection is 'random' ...not merely false ... but the exact opposite of the truth". Now, "quintessential" does *not* only refer to the ancient philosophical conception of the "fifth essence" that added to air, water, earth and fire completes the ingredients making up the world of physical reality; but *it also has a still weightier, purely Platonic significance* in the strenuous effort of acquiring knowledge based on **names** (for representing things definite and concrete), **descriptions** (for the fact that with them we present the real objects in logos, and so we make *concrete sense* of them), **forms** (for confining within *definite spatial configurations and limits* the real objects having them), **wider concepts** (for alone encompassing *additional universal properties and characteristics* of the real objects, that *cannot* be seen from the *separate* consideration of names, descriptions, and forms), that all together lead to the **final fifth** and *only truly important acquisition* that is no other than the Ultimate Knowledge of the All-inclusive Reality. This being the *double* meaning of the term "quintessence", *brimming with the purposiveness of perfection*,

it is incomprehensible that it should be used by a modern professor in his effort to support the present-day message of general ultimate meaninglessness, to which these days so-called “intellectuals” desire to lead the world—unless they truly recognize absolutely no limits in their self-given license to prostitute *everything once held sacred and indeed holy!*

(c) To save his doctrine from the terrible clutches of the overwhelmingly negligible probability that the huge variety of life may have come about solely by chance, Dawkins attempts to build a case for what he calls “cumulative”, yet still insists to be *purposeless* selection, and he purports to show how this process *supposedly* works in reality, by means of a computer-produced verisimilitude of it. In his book he gives *only some, but none of the crucial* details bearing both on the reasonableness of his method of establishing the criteria by which the computer program recognizes “progress” that we must understand as proving his “argument”, and on the current state of the theory!

(i) That state, some about 150 years after the theory was first presented to the world and *cannot* since be said to have changed at all except for its *wordy* elaboration, has been given by Roy J. Britten (Senior Research Associate at the California Institute of Technology, Staff Member of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, and Member of the U. S. Academy of Sciences) in an article titled “The Sources of Variation in Evolution” published in 1977-8¹⁹ starting with: “A brief catalogue of ignorance or a list of questions about the mechanism of evolution makes a good starting point. Many of these questions may seem foolish or unanswerable when we understand the process of evolution. [Ergo, we still do *not* understand that process!] However, I feel they are appropriate from a molecular biologist’s point of view. The nature of living organisms is so intimately intertwined with their evolution that **most areas of biological ignorance should be listed but are not.** ... I use incautious and non-professional language **in order to raise questions which cannot yet be properly formulated**”. [Ergo, cautious professional language *cannot* even formulate questions on the precise degree of present ignorance of the matter! Bold characters were used here in order to draw *all* the reader’s attention.] He proceeds with “Population genetics explores the role of pop-

¹⁹ Roy J. Britten: *The Sources of Variation in Evolution* THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF IGNORANCE, ISBN 0-671-79050-1, 1978, p. 209-17.

ulations in evolution and the way in which natural evolution operates on individuals", which is yet another example of how from the *effect* (here, the population) we attempt to divine the "cause" we have hastened to label "evolution" that we *still* try to prove by *concluding preposterously* that it "must" act on the individuals, that *only if viable to maturity* form the population! All this while we keep on ignoring the *deep* cause acting on the "cause", since within the confines of evolutionary theory no effort is made to understand either the *working* molecular chemistry or the underlying physics of atoms, that through the precise electronic nature of *atomic* bonds *both within and between* the molecules dispose all these structures in three-dimensional space to form the *mostly flexible* living tissues!] Britten continues to say that "it [the theory] is a field with a large mathematical structure, many specific problems and questions but no overall solutions", and then that "[f]or myself the question of questions is what I term the *immediacy* of natural selection. Does it operate through the score of reproduction of adapted offspring that in turn reproduce?", thus questioning despite the theory's "large mathematical structure" (obviously totally unrelated to the *still unknown* precise underlying controlling physics of the atomic chemical bonds, or else we already would have had a full understanding of the overall process!) even the "way" by which Darwinism has always insisted that evolution proceeds! And then, he says "[w]e are nearly totally ignorant of the way 'external' events such as environment or population [remember here the earlier reference to population genetics!] affect evolution. Obviously, we are not much better off in regard to the 'internal' events. I divide internal and external domains arbitrarily at the skin of the animal. ... thinking of these domains separately has value. Most internal events are decided molecularly and the basis is DNA. [*Not* the original building blocks that are the atoms themselves.] There follows a brief review of the current *dogma*. [Emphasis added] The DNA of each cell of an individual is the same and carries the genome of the species. The sub-set of these genes that are expressed determines each cell type and state. For simplicity, I assume [another way of *avoiding to confess the also near total ignorance* of 'internal' events!] that the process by which these genes are expressed is understood. The DNA codes for a protein sequence. The sequence is transcribed into messenger RNA and the message is translated on ribosomes into the protein molecule. [Here the fact that the living organisms hydrolyze the proteins and incorporate directly the amino acids of which the proteins are composed to the

double helical structure of the DNA²⁰ seems to be forgotten] The amino acid sequence determines the three-dimensional structure of the protein with appropriate consideration of the influence of other molecules and structures in the cell. ... If all of the appropriate gene products are produced without error and in the right quantities the result is a cell, differentiated for its role. If all the appropriate cells are present in the right places we get a living organism with all of its complex structure and behavior. For the time being I am willing to by-pass the question of the validity of this model and ask if we can use it with appropriate subtlety to go after the mechanism of evolution". But what we truly lack is *not* the "appropriate subtlety" to use mere words, but the *precise knowledge of the natural mechanism that based all the way on underlying Law permits the quantum-mechanical solution of each cell type and state!* It is *not* science that based on "dogma" and a *wordy* model starts out from the *already advanced* state of the gene that may or may not fall in the right place at the right time! As *unquestionably*, underneath it all operates the Law that puts all atoms in place within the smaller molecules, it is *not* science to state that at that level physics and chemistry stops and chance now begins! Even if for a time, even if for just only once and then everything settles down again! This settling down means return under the operation of natural Law, *not* in obedience to human dogma! When sixes come up time after time after time ..., then the dice *are* fixed and this means *law*, the *law* of fixing, even as the fixing of dice goes against State Law! Let us all understand that where there is *Law* there is *no* chance! It is *not* science to excuse on chance our neglect or total ignorance of the Law! Britten concludes his article with: "In conclusion I wish to emphasize that while ingenious speculations can be made about the gene regulation system and its relationship to the source of variation in evolution our ignorance of the actual sources of variation is just as abysmal as our ignorance of the formal properties of the regulatory system that is evolving". Yet, in preparation for this conclusion, Britten does not hesitate also to state in an obvious effort to stay within the limits of "the current *dogma*" that "[w]e know that evolution [implied as dependent on the outcome of chance mutations!] works! However we know almost nothing of how it works ..."! [The reader both here

²⁰ THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF CHEMISTRY, 3rd Edition, C. A. Hampel & G. G. Hawley, Ed., Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1973, ISBN 0-442-23095-8, p. 65.

and in this entire work is requested to understand text set in size 9 as a direct quotation, and text set in size 10 as this author's commentary and discussion.]

(ii) As for his method, because Dawkins goes as far as stating (on p. 45) that "[i]t is natural to borrow such words as 'reproduce' and 'generation' which have associations with living things because living things are the main examples we know of things that participate in cumulative selection. They may in practice be the only things that do. But for the moment I don't want to beg that question by saying so outright", I can only say that Dawkins *deliberately* confuses the meaning of terms, equating a *real-life generation of progeny* to a *random try* of the computer program attempting to produce or "generate" a phrase *given already*, and he calls "generations" *not* what we normally understand, but what are *believed to be* the heritable *appearances of gene-mutations (believed to be spontaneous random changes/errors at single points in the chromosome)* produced in "copying" (in passing on) genes from parents to children; while genes [each believed to carry a unit heritable character; passed on to children, each believed to receive a set of genes from its parents that pairwise combined create *its* state] remain particular *still unidentified* states of complex three-dimensional organization of organic matter that the "current dogma" treats as passing on as *hypothetical unalterable* units, supposed to be arranged in linear fashion not only in the theory of chromosome structure, but in Dawkins' computer analog also, in which he represents them as letters forming words and then phrases! In his analog, aiming at demonstrating how cumulative selection "works", Dawkins simplifies matters still further, representing as single identical letters the state of both parent and progeny letter and phrase.

§80. (a) To understand Dawkins' method of "proof" of how "cumulative selection" *supposedly* "works", the reader must consult the table presented on p. 134, which is *not* how Dawkins explained the method in his own book. From Shakespeare's *Hamlet* he picked the phrase

METHINKS IT IS LIKE A WEASEL,

consisting of 28 letters and blank spaces, which a monkey typing endlessly away on a simplified typewriter having keys for the 26 capital letters and 1 blank space will on average get it right in only 1 out of $27^{28} = 1.20 \times 10^{40}$ tries. Dawkins claims that "cumulative selection" can accomplish this feat in only something like 41 to

64 “generations”! The program executed the First Run starting out with the chanced first phrase noted as Gen. 0, which, however, consists of only 27 letters and blank spaces (unless the blank in Place 28 is counted as correct). But as the odds of going from Gen. 0 to Gen. 1 are truly negligible, in view of the fact that in the latter only T is added in Place 04 and the blank on Place 28 is eliminated, while all characters in between are moved one place to the right, it is reasonable to conclude that a mistyping, gone through undetected, occurred in the process of generating Dawkins’ initial manuscript, and that the most favorable correct initial sequence is the one noted as Gen. 0(corr.) that moves over the M noted and all following letters and blank spaces one position to the right. Then, the “improvement” of going from Gen. 0(corr.) to Gen. 1 is due only to the substitution of T for the blank space in Place 04, and of S for K in Place 14. The Reader will also note that *all* characters that happen by *chance* to fall correctly in place, as it happened from the beginning with N in Place 06 and T in Place 11, are *never* subsequently allowed to suffer expulsion from that correct placement. *Obviously*, this is exactly what Dawkins calls “cumulative selection” but does *not* tell us how it can at all take place in a blind and purposeless process guided through by pure chance alone! While Dawkins spent time telling us about the time the program spent on producing the “feat” in 43 “generations”, which information is in effect useless, he *avoided* telling us the number of trials his monkey computer *happened* to need in order to produce the sequences reported as Gen, 1, 10, 20, etc. This reporting would have been most valuable in estimating the *real-life* generations that an organism would need in order even thus to obtain the 43 *thus implied* gene “generations” in which this cumulative “feat” was accomplished. This information is particularly valuable in face of the facts discussed in §140b (p. 282-3), according to which 12 separate flasks of bacterial colonies showed “surprising” *identical* development after more than 30000 real-life generations proving that this repeatability is *not* at all based on chance, and so, therefore, it is based *only on Law!*

(b) He also did *not* confess that feeding the computer with the aimed at phrase is *fully equivalent to setting an objective* even in an effort aimed at “proving” that this procedure represents a *said to be purposeless* “process”, that, lacking objective, *cannot even be called search!* One must wonder how the computer could possibly

+

+

	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
Aim:	M	E	T	H	I	N	K	S		I	T		I	S		L	I	K	E		A		W	E	A	S	E	L	
FIRST RUN																													
Gen 0:	W	D	L	M	N	L	T		D	T	J	B	K	W	I	R	Z	R	E	Z	L	M	Q	C	O		P		
Gen. 0 (corr.)	W	D	L		M	N	L	T		D	T	J	B	K	W	I	R	Z	R	E	Z	L	M	Q	C	O		P	
Gen. 1:	W	D	L	T	M	N	L	T		D	T	J	B	S	W	I	R	Z	R	E	Z	L	M	Q	C	O		P	
Gen. 10:	W	D	L	D	M	N	L	S		I	T	J	I	S	W	H	R	Z	R	E	Z		M	E	C	S		P	
Gen. 20:	M	E	L	D	I	N	L	S		I	T		I	S	W	P	R	K	E		Z		W	E	C	S	E	L	
Gen. 30:	M	E	T	H	I	N	K	S		I	T		I	S	W	L	I	K	E		B		W	E	C	S	E	L	
Gen. 40:	M	E	T	H	I	N	K	S		I	T		I	S		L	I	K	E		I		W	E	A	S	E	L	
Gen. 43:	M	E	T	H	I	N	K	S		I	T		I	S		L	I	K	E		A		W	E	A	S	E	L	

SECOND RUN																													
Gen. 0:	Y		Y	V	M	Q	K	Z	P	F	J	X	W	V	H	G	L	A	W	F	V	C	H	Q	X	Y	O	P	Y
Gen. 10:	Y		Y	V	M	Q	K	S	P	F	T	X	W	S	H	L	I	K	E	F	V		H	Q	Y	S	P	Y	
Gen. 20:	Y	E	T	H	I	N	K	S	P	I	T	X	I	S	H	L	I	K	E	F	A		W	Q	Y	S	E	Y	
Gen. 30:	M	E	T	H	I	N	K	S		I	T		I	S	S	L	I	K	E		A		W	E	F	S	E	Y	
Gen. 40:	M	E	T	H	I	N	K	S		I	T		I	S	B	L	I	K	E		A		W	E	A	S	E	S	
Gen. 50:	M	E	T	H	I	N	K	S		I	T		I	S	J	L	I	K	E		A		W	E	A	S	E	O	
Gen. 60:	M	E	T	H	I	N	K	S		I	T		I	S		L	I	K	E		A		W	E	A	S	E	P	
Gen. 64:	M	E	T	H	I	N	K	S		I	T		I	S		L	I	K	E		A		W	E	A	S	E	L	

FIG. 1

Arranging the letters and spaces in 28 fixed equal-width columns reveals how the computer program devised by R. Dawkins *was taught to hide the secret cooking*, masquerading under the term "generations", that in effect *protected* characters having once happened to fall in the right places from subsequent changes under the operation of pure chance, that may *not* be partial to *any* such occurrence, having *no predetermined fixed objective in its non-existent "mind"*!

It also reveals how easy it is for mistyping
(whether in writing the computer program or in preparing the book for printing remaining unknown) to interfere:
one in Gen. 0 of the first run, which transposed all characters from column 4 by one place toward the right;
and another in Gen. 0 of the second run, which in effect allowed 29 columns to appear in the beginning as present!

+

+

be programmed, if the aim-phrase or other information equivalent to it had never been fed into it; what then the significance of "generations" would have been; how many of them would have been needed; and how many trials the computer would have had to go through in order to produce the aimed at phrase, if it had remained only on paper!

(c) The picture of the Second Run was not much different, except for the fact that the phrase reported as originally produced contained 29 characters. The fact that Y in both places 26 and 29 moved respectively over to Places 25 and 28 through to "generation" 20 suggests that the typing of X in Place 25 was clearly spurious. The Second Run shows most clearly how the program locks in place the characters known to belong there! While the mistyping of the original nonsensical "phrases" shows how difficult it is to put nonsense in the right place, even when you know what its place is! We can only conclude that divining the correct phrase that remains sealed in Fort Knox is the closest we can come to writing correctly something completely unknown, as is indeed *everything* purposeless! This feat Dawkins *never* accomplished as he never also admitted that locking in place characters already known to belong there is fully equivalent to a *law*, that is completely forbidden to be thought of as legitimate in a purposeless universe! As for the Third Run reported to have reached the aimed at phrase in "Generation" 41 Dawkins produced no details.

(d) There is an additional consideration we need to bear in mind: Strictly speaking, a mutation must be conceived as representing the generation of a *new specie*, not the development of the same one. Otherwise, we need to have some fair idea about the number of mutations needed to bring about the appearance of a new specie. The theory of evolution does *not* seem to be fully if at all cognizant of this substantial distinction, and Dawkins' "generations" *cannot* be said to represent this or that in true life: forty three different species or forty three way stations, say, of monkey before evolving to homo. If 12 distinct sets of originally identical bacterial populations, have each gone through more than 30000 generations, yet show development substantially identical, we are very hard pressed to conclude that they all represent the *same exact specie developing but not differentiating to a new specie*; and, therefore, that they constitute a most remarkable case substantially *disproving* the theory! In the case of homo, 30000 generations represent at least some 700000 years of a *developing yet*

fixed specie! If all these generations represent what at least some evolutionists call “punctuated equilibrium states”, and we know only the first and the last of them, all in between states *cannot* exactly be called “missing links”, i.e., states carrying the process forward from one specie to the *chanced* next down the line! And, as a result, the geological time thought to be available for the sort of evolution propounded by atheist evolutionists may well not be long enough to accommodate all species representing the direct line! The things *are entirely different* if evolution is *not* chanced at all but *subject* to Law: then it proceeds when the conditions the Law allows are met! Which introduces the question of the origin of the Law!

§81. (a) The *claimed* “success” of Dawkins’ computer experiment *was unquestionably forced* by the way it was carried out:

— He *told* the computer from the beginning the number of letters and spaces, *thus drastically guiding* the computer to follow a *particular* mode of action: in real life, *the way Dawkins wants us to understand it, no particular mode of action is set*: in other words, Dawkins ought *not* to have told the computer how many members the sequences ought to have; he ought to have left it up to the computer *randomly to find that number too!*

— He *locked in* the “hits”, *ignoring and hiding from his reader* [I wonder: did he also hide it from his students?] the fact that in real life “locking in” is called *natural Law*; which introduces the *need to search for the Lawgiver*, or else the *need for a rational explanation* of how (must I say, *totally unguided?*) randomness establishes Law!

— He did *not* allow that the “hits”, too, just as *all parts of every* generated sentence be subject to variation given the real-life *randomness* of a *true chance* process [Chance *never* locks in a particular hit: if in a game of cards one could lock in for himself the aces in the way Dawkins locked in his “hits”, there would be *no poker!*]

— He did *not* allow for the real-life *hard fact* that the vast majority of mutations *is* indeed harmful, which in the computer simulation ought to be represented by a corresponding vast number of errors *exactly in the places where in Dawkins’ computer simulation the letters and spaces were locked in!*

— With all these reservations and objections, he proved *absolutely nothing of what he thought he proved!*: His simulation *was “doctored!”*: It could *not* but in time produce *any preordained* result!: And so, it proved just the reverse: that in nature, the *Law is the*

King! And Dawkins' method was by *no stretch of any rational imagination* a method for demonstrating the *random* establishment of a natural Law!

(b) Animals are chemically made up of hydrogen, carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, magnesium, phosphorus, sulfur, chlorine, calcium, iron, zinc, and other elements in smaller or trace amounts. For argument's sake, let us agree that the average molecular weight of these elements is 16. This means that a man weighing 75 kg. (165 lbs.) has in him about 2.8×10^{28} atoms. And *all* these are placed in three-dimensional space in their *proper distances and orientations* from each other. Compare *that* to 28 letters and spaces Dawkins used in his *doctored* simulation! Compare that to 830000 words and 6000000 letters and spaces [*my* rough estimate] making up Shakespeare's complete works! Will Dawkins tell us *how under no Law, no Design, just chance "mutations"* (broadened to cover up at least all of life-supporting chemistry) produce what to the rest of us seems to be *scheme, Design and Law, that do not just form but keep all that actual universe in place*, so that *he*, a *living* being can stand up and teach the world *his* doctrine? Some professors simply have no sense of shame! *They* (and not only biologists), maniacally "schizophrenic[ally] thinking", grease the *insane* slide to the abyss! Still worse: In the *one now universal (deliberately so-called) "lunar" park in which we all live*, all the slides on which today the human societies screaming "enjoy" themselves have professionally been placed in motion and use!

§82. We cannot continue rebutting every argument Dawkins has gone through: We would need to write a book much bigger than his. It suffices to note that his arguments quite simply do not go deep enough! When the physicists have gone down to what they call "Planck length" and "Planck time" (that in addition, in order to be meaningful, *must* be understood in the *complete* context of the expanding universe having had a *definite* beginning!), within which everything is claimed to be in constant flux, it is *from exactly there* that the argument against purpose must scientifically begin, and the odds be calculated, and *not* from stars and planets! On p. 141 Dawkins says: "To explain the origin of the DNA/protein machine by invoking a supernatural Designer is to explain precisely nothing, for it leaves unexplained the origin of the Designer. You have to say something like 'God was always there', and if you allow yourself that kind of lazy way out, you might as well just say

'DNA was always there', or 'Life was always there' and be done with it". *Not* quite, Professor! For, first, we *are* faced with the *factual* origin of the universe! So, life by way of the DNA/protein machine was *not* always there! Then, we have to calculate the odds *all the way from the Planck levels on up* for intelligence to develop even to this professor's level! Who does not understand that he simply may *not* ask questions pertinent for natural beings about beings himself calls supernatural, about which anterior lineage has *not* been found to be indispensable! As a result, his asking for an explanation of the origin of the supernatural Designer very much along natural lines is *logically illegitimate*! Then, if we agree that either the universe *without a Creator's prior action* suddenly showed up out of nowhere at the very first moment of the Big Bang and from the Planck levels of total anarchy, *as they too are subject to universal expansion*, proceeded fully on its own to develop such Universal Laws (*that clearly require a super-universal Intelligence to conceive the Whole over which they act*) as indeed we find, or that alternatively, all this came into being by supernatural fiat, it becomes crystal clear that we *must* make a choice as to which of the two is *both simpler and more logical*! Choosing the former requires *proving* the odds of its happening greater than those of the latter! OK, we don't know how to calculate the odds of the latter! But as regards those of the former, the professors claim to be expert. So clearly, it does *not* speak well of them that start from *arbitrary* odds involving only *unknown* numbers of planets, rather than the *entire* gamut just indicated! If, as Dawkins admits, the odds of haemoglobin (all four chains of it) coming about by a single step selection is 1 in $20^{146 \times 4}$, the odds of the universe coming about at a single moment, involving *necessarily* the *ultimate* single step selection of *everything needed* and *only thus* being fully equipped to develop in due time even the molecule of haemoglobin, quite clearly cannot but be very very very much smaller still! We all, Dawkins included, agree that life *cannot but precede* intelligence! As especially today there are many who "argue" for the existence of other forms of life, *why* must we confine ourselves to demanding that *all* those forms barring none "must" have a material basis very much such as ours? The "argument" that matter-based intelligence has always been there (and so, that "DNA was always there") collapses upon the realization that the material universe has *not*, in clear view of the Big Bang, always been there! It

thus becomes very much clearer that as the Universal Laws require an intelligence superior than themselves on the whole in order that they be conceived in their totality, and as life *must* precede intelligence, we may not but with Logic conclude that the supernatural Intelligence that conceived the Universal Laws *does* in fact require Life at *Its* own Level, *not at ours!* In other words, in the contest, between on the one hand, of the Big Bang and the odds as above indicated, and on the other, of Life, Intelligence and the Perfection of Laws from the beginning governing the world (and this in clear view of the fact that it took the universe some twelve billion years to develop professors of this level, being still nowhere close to coming up with the ultimate answer), the latter contestant wins hands down! In the very least (that is, *ignoring* the question of the appearance of the universe out of nowhere at all), the professors are honor bound to content with the odds of taming the Planck anarchy! As for the origin of the Designer, Dawkins, and not only he, truly needs a crash course in Aristotelian Logic that *forbids an infinite regress of intelligent causes of intelligent causes*, especially of *naturally* intelligible intelligent causes of supernatural Intelligent Causes! *One* supernatural Intelligent Cause *is all that is needed*, and *exactly There* does all this search Logically end! It follows that, *all those who truly argue for life may not but also argue for Life that has indeed the Intelligence to encompass the Whole!* It obviously takes much *wider* minds to consider the Whole and escape the parochial confines of this *limited* planet (with *its* unlimited blinding hateful passion against Life, Intelligence, Perfection and Holiness), to which only raw incorrigible peasants are professorially still allowed to confine themselves and thus limit the field of their intellectual vision to a horizon so far short of the Whole! All else is neither Science, nor Philosophy, nor Theology, but pure unadulterated nonsense, totally unbecoming of grownups and especially of professors building sand castles in the sun-bleached shores of the still unexplored ocean called the Whole! [As I am dealing with theories much in the order of their appearance, the Reader may find that, above, I use terms and ideas not yet presented. I request that he be patient till the end. Then having considered this whole, he may want to return to reconsider the parts. I know of no other way to make a *well argued and meaningful* presentation of the matter before us!]

16

THE ADVANCE OF ATHEISM BEYOND NINETEENTH CENTURY EVOLUTION

§83. When in about the middle of the nineteenth century the principle of conservation of energy was first proposed, there was significant opposition to it. Neither the engineering limitations of measurement nor the philosophical implications of the principle escaped the careful thinkers. Denying God by asserting the principle, on the *belief* that “science” and Laplacian determinism sufficed, seemed at the time (but only for a time) to guarantee the “triumph” of materialism. Matter as always from all eternity having been here [and we must not forget that the universe was then also believed to be infinite] could more easily be henceforth asserted. Neither science nor philosophy had yet advanced to the point of asking the *crucial detailed questions* about the significance of Law on the very constitution of matter: with the Law thought to be of the nature itself of matter, materialism could thus foolishly assert that matter stood alone. Even today, the full significance of Law has yet to sink in and be fully appreciated by philosophers, while the materialist scientists, who have had ample opportunity to dwell on it, *deliberately avoided and indeed still prevent* public discussion of the issue, that *cannot but only point to the basic weakness of materialism*: Its failure to face squarely the Question of Law in Nature. The essentially *parallel and only supposedly “independent”* (for being a *concurrent and no secret*) advent of the theory of evolution was, of course, a boon to the materialists. But the polemical atheists of the second half of the nineteenth century could still not sleep quiet: The unity of Nature that even

the materialists could not and still cannot ignore led to the realization that, if materialism were to be true, it ought to be true down to the core of matter, including the chemical and physical processes and the principles underlying all physical reality, and thus also underlying the domain of biological evolution. The principles of the conservation of mass and energy were not yet sufficient grounds, they recognized, for the secure triumph of materialism: Nothing had yet been found that established clearly the non-creation of the world, or prevented the institution of principles by a supernatural Creating Agency. On the other hand, the weaknesses of the theory of evolution were being made painfully obvious to the evolutionists, even as they publicly vehemently denied, as they still do, any weaknesses.

§84. All this, in the face of the *constant* Christian assertion that Christ *is* the Creator. The militant anti-Christ-ians had a personal score to settle against Him. If God, and Christ in particular, could be made redundant *and* appear to be foolish, so much the better, they reasoned. The depersonification of God *had already been started by Spinoza, and has continued by his disciples overt and covert!* A Personal God-Logos that at the same time is *inseparably* the Law-giving Father, the Law-executing Son, and the All-per-vading Spirit of Truth *guarantees* the role of Son-the-Creator (in modern parlance, the “all-inclusive executive authority”) in the World *He* created. It is for *this* reason that nothing chagrins more the anti-Christ-ian than Christ, to Whom, as Judge, we all *shall* give full account of our deeds. The polemical anti-Christ-ian can *only for a while* acquiesce his inner agony by depersonifying God and “successfully” attacking Christ, and he cannot sleep as long as he senses his attack to be weak. The severance of the connection of Law at the core of things with the Law-executing Creator to Whom it inescapably points had still to be made; and in a way that would just admit the barely “sufficient” amount of “law” that “scientifically” would invalidate and disgrace *both the Law and the Creator*, and thus all connection between them.

§85. The strengthening of the atheist argument appeared again as the “independent” theory of relativity. The supposedly impeccable “scientific” credentials were again denied, but the “success” of the theory, especially demonstrated later in the successful explosion of the atomic bomb, was much too “obvious” to be refuted. Still, one cannot fail to be struck by Einstein’s state-

ment referred to already (see §36 p.56). In addition to the remarks there made, the following also seem very pertinent:

(a) How does a bona fide first-class scientist as Einstein declare that he so very much prefers to satisfy the *feeling* of the *reader* that the path [*he, Einstein, chooses to follow*] is *psychologically* the natural one that he so categorically disavows as his purpose the all too clear obligation of such a scientist to present his theory in a simple and logically impeccable manner as regards *all*: its science, the substance and number of [*unstated*] *axioms* and the value of [*unstated*] underlying assumptions?

(b) What truly is the [*unstated*] "*psychologically natural path*" a servant of an *exact* science must feel himself obligated to follow in trying to fathom the depths of the structure of the *physical* Universe? [And indeed *how* does he go about choosing *this* psychologically *seeming* natural path, rather than *that*? When tomorrow his "psychology" changes, *which path will he then feel obligated to follow?*]

(c) *What* sort of reader did Einstein *truly* have in mind? If indeed we judge others by *our own* standards, then, Einstein tried to soothe *only his own psychological doubts and agonies, the only ones he knew so well*, and we know that *he confessed himself not a believer in a Personal God, and so not also in Christ!*

§86. Alas, the justification of *all* we presented above as the motive of atheistic science is supplied, as here proven, by these stark words of Einstein himself! Eventually, the "philosophy", that the so-called "uncomprehending masses" do in fact comprehend better than the modern professional philosophers who *lack* the courage to express themselves honestly and clearly, caught up with the "science": The principle that "*all is relative*" is the unavoidable philosophical lemma of the theory [the *principle*] of relativity, the full atheistic consequences of which we have begun to "enjoy", to our horror and despair, only gradually but ever more acceleratingly and unstopably already during the past one hundred years. The relativists, as it should have been expected, are vehement in their public denials of the connection between the "scientific" and the "philosophical" principles: They refuse to see that, if *all* physical ultimately refer to the "field", and if there be nothing other than what *they* call physical, then inexorably, *there are no absolutes and all is relative!* The more the "scientific" aspect of Nature is stressed [which the atheists foolishly think

works to their advantage if presented as identical with such pseudo-scientific theories], the more prominent the contradistinction between "science" and the *secure belief* [not religion] in a Logical God becomes. But when the morality included in the latter is seen as an impediment to the so-called "progress" [certainly toward the *always unstated* abyss!], all the more do these relativities (the "scientific" and the "philosophical") get confused! The many tales about Einstein, told by his admirers, have him on one occasion feeling sorry for the "good Lord", should He be shown to have failed to see the "logical inevitability" of *his* relativity as underlying truth, and to have constructed the world on some other principle; and on another denying the existence of any philosophical and theological implications *inexorably included* in his theory! The Lord certainly foresaw *all* that Einstein led to, *including the built-in profanities*; which is why He chose *otherwise* to construct the World! Einstein in *all* his "wisdom" *and* because of it, simply could not see beyond it! Eddington²¹ has without equivocation stigmatized the glaring fallacy of holding relativity innocent of profound religious implications. Have the admiring propagators themselves of these myths been so totally confused, or do they spread them *on purpose for all the evil they can produce* while drawing the admiration of the uncomprehending? For their other intelligence, we cannot but opt for their *conscious* intent! As for the real value of the admiration of the uncomprehending, how indeed can it be other than squarely nil? Still, the *monetary value for some* of the admiration of relativity as the new popular religion, by far the worst ever opium of the masses, is inestimable! Which is why some, and especially those in very high places, choose to play on both boards, *knowingly profaning* the Holy God!

§87. What if both myths *are* true? How can it then be evaded that the *seeming* "incomprehension" *and* deception *was* indeed the work of the master himself? The denial of the connection between the "scientific" and philosophical relativity principles is based on the *supposed* separateness of the spirit of "*all is relative*" from the "scientific" theory. The relativists attempt to persuade us that the latter could just as well have been called the "principle of invariance" for its incorporation of the principles of con-

²¹ A. S. Eddington: THE PHILOSOPHY OF PHYSICAL SCIENCE, Univ. of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1958, p. 7.

servation, the constancy of the velocity of light, and the proposal of the invariance of the so-called "interval" $ds = \sqrt{dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2 - c^2 dt^2}$. What they have failed to show is how they can make the claim seriously (a) when the special relativity theory, they themselves admit, is only an approximation and nowhere in the Universe an absolutely exact case of the general theory, in the framework of which even Einstein has admitted the non-invariance of the velocity of light, while totally failing to draw the proper conclusions from it, and (b) when nothing has been "explained" so much in all of science and nothing has remained so incomprehensible even by the relativists themselves for its being totally unexplainable, as has this infamous "interval". You *cannot* seriously claim as fundamental a theory of invariance when you do not know what it really is that you claim remains invariant, yet define it as above as the sum of elements such as x, y, z and t, that have *no absolute but only a relative* content! Moreover, between 1905 and 1916, eleven years passed of maturing thought. What was so powerful as to induce Einstein to call his own general theory a "general theory of relativity" rather than a "general theory of invariance"? If invariance truly were the basic characteristic of the theory, *why* did he not re-label his own theory, as he had every right to do so even as late as he lay on his deathbed? Thus, the denial of the *conscious* attempt to stress the *relativity of all things cannot* be upheld seriously! The so-called "invariance" was only the straw the atheists caught on to insure the success of the main objective, which from the beginning was and still remains the *undermining of the Absolute* by the relative. The cunning atheists are quite content to *confuse and rule, to limit if not altogether prevent* this sort of public discussion, and *not to seek openly public recognition for the patronymity of both relativity principles that are at base only one!* They enjoy more their "victory" and they insure it better by letting the tacit but publicly denied yet all the more *real* association of the "two" relativity principles do their dirty and thus far more effective work by operating freely in the darkness.

§88 By not discussing openly and thoroughly the whole issue of determinism vs. relativism, the atheists have succeeded in fooling a far wider following of fellow-travelers who have bought the theory of relativity without still realizing what in fact they have bought. Back in the pre-relativistic times, Laplacian determinism was recognized, even by the atheists, as a double-

+

+

edged sword with which they could cut as well as be cut. Under determinism, the World could far more easily be seen as the work of a Creator rather than as the outcome of a blind process of evolution based on chance. So, while the atheists publicly upheld Laplacian determinism as the pillar of materialism, privately they worked to subvert it themselves and, in keeping with the implications of chance masquerading as evolution, to cut off with it the *clear possibility* that Laplacian determinism could *still* point to Design.

+

+

17

THE SOLUTION OF THE MATTER AND ENERGY PROBLEMS

§89 Despite all remonstrations, materialism, the belief in matter alone, is the "philosophy" the world holds today supreme. Under *its* sway, matter is the subject of *all* our sciences, not just only the physical! Yet, our *scientific ideas* about matter *and* energy [and thus with them even the materialistic underpinnings of materialism] have *not*, because we have *not* dared to face them, been placed under the *full* power of the microscope of rational examination, that we so far have called "Logical and Mathematical Simplicity Principle" (or, L&MSP). The time now compels us to consider the hard facts:

(a) We cut up material bodies. We even smash atoms. How far can we continue the process of cutting up? It has been a direct finding of that process that, in order to proceed further we need to accelerate the colliding particles to very high velocities, but then we find a collection of particles having a total amount of matter greater than that contained in the particles we accelerated! What gives? The process of cutting up ought to refer only to the *reduction in size*, or so we thought. Now, given our limitations in optical analysis, instead of measuring geometrical size, we in effect *weigh* masses! Smashing atoms ought to result in smaller particles *continuing to have the total mass of the original particles, not more* as we indeed find! The suspicion is strong that if we could continue the process, even heavier particles would result! But instead of thinking rationally, some scientists have as a result spoken of "hidden" mass residing in the particles so far

recognized, passing gravitationally undetectable under normal conditions [while others simply take it as “mystery” and continue with their work]! But that *is contrary* to L&MSP, and *must* therefore be rejected. What is the alternative? That we finally face the *hard fact* that part of the energy we spend in accelerating the particles, the part that shows up as increased kinetic energy of the accelerated particles *attaches to, is absorbed in, and shows up in them as mass, for no magical or relativistic reason at all, but only because the energy is not massless, despite all current belief, for the reason that photons are indeed massive particles*²²! In other words, under L&MSP, the creation of the world involved only the creation of light in the form of the fundamental photons, that are no other than the Democritean atoms! It was with these considerations in mind that above we made all those remarks on pp. 34 (§22), 41

²² Consider a particle of mass m accelerated under the application of a force f , for a period of time dt , during which it travels a distance x , acquires velocity v , momentum p and energy ϵ . The following relationships hold:

$$f = dp/dt = d(mv)/dt, \quad (22/1)$$

$$d\epsilon = f dx = (dx/dt)d(mv) = v(dm) = v^2 dm + mvdv, \quad (22/2)$$

keeping open the question of possible variability of its mass m . But as we shall show later (§119a, p. 217), as a result *solely* of Newtonian gravitation under the *truly* constant “Newtonian gravitational constant” G and the *truly* constant *total* mass in the universe M , *despite current belief*, the velocity of light is *not* constant, *all* particles (except the Democritean atoms) do *not* keep their masses constant yet each has energy $\epsilon = mc^2$, but such that

$$d\epsilon = v^2 dm + mvdv = c^2 dm + 2mcdv. \quad (22/3)$$

Setting $v = \gamma c$ and $dv = c d\gamma + \gamma dc$, we obtain

$$d(\ln m) \equiv dm/m = \gamma d\gamma / (1 - \gamma^2) - [(2 - \gamma^2)/(1 - \gamma^2)] d(\ln c) \quad (22/4)$$

The first term on the right-hand side of this equation represents the effect upon the variation of mass due to *its* velocity v ; the second term represents the effect of the variation of the velocity of light; both during the time period considered. It is because we ignore the second term, believing the velocity of light to be constant, that on integrating we write

$$m = m_0 / (1 - \gamma^2)^{-1/2}; \quad (22/5)$$

which is thus shown to have absolutely nothing to do with the theory of relativity, but is solely due to the physical *hard fact* that the photons possess mass, and *every* mass is the grand sum of the masses of the photons of which it is composed, in full agreement with the L&MSP.

(F/n. 9), 49 (§32b), 77 (§47b), and 124 (§76) about the Democritean atoms and the substance of light; on pp. 20 (§10) and 103 (§65) about the tiny volume in which high energies are concentrated upon collision in supercolliders; and on pp. 93 (§58), 99 (§63), 154 (§93), 100 (F/n. 15) and 170 (§104b) about the confusion and irrationality of talking of the identity of matter and energy and the presence of gravitational field in the absence of matter.

(i) Solution of all these problems requires that we face the hard fact that the fundamental photons have *true, not "virtual"*, mass corresponding to their energy ($\epsilon_0 = m_0 c^2$), and that the grand sum of all their energies and masses produces the expression $E = Mc^2$! Accordingly, *no* theory is required to produce this simple equation; *it is necessitated only by the requirement that true mass correspond to energy as per the dimensional definition of energy, from the true elementary particle on up!* The increase of mass with velocity predicted by special relativity was first received with great skepticism. This was converted to shock, acceptance of, *belief in* the theory when particle accelerators "verified the predicted" effect. But *when mass is admitted to be delivered to particles on acceleration, according to the above specification, the mass of the accelerated particles comes out naturally exactly as "predicted" by special relativity, yet, without need of the theory! Automatically* as it now becomes obvious, the quandary of "over-massive particles hiding in the nucleons but not reporting in the ordinary course of events, except on smashing", *vanishes! All excess mass is seen for what it truly is: added on acceleration, not preexisting in there!* But what does this make of *all* our currently precious theories, and of our "best and brightest"?

(ii) Let us see: With the photon massive, we are talking of a *totally New Science!* The expansion or contraction of the universe would *not* remain, as it shockingly is, *totally silent* on the fate of *all* photons out there! Light, *every single fundamental photon, must be accounted for in any self-respecting theory of the universe!* Remember the general relativistic theories of the re-collapsing or recurring universe: Do they say *anything at all* (based on general relativity that brought them to the fore, or on anything else) about how *light* is to be retarded to a dead stop and re-accelerated backwards? *No!* Can they be serious? *No!* Remember all the (now seen to be only fatuous) talk about the "missing mass" out there! Remember the deflection of light and the retardation of signals pas-

sing close to massive bodies “predicted” by general relativity!: The massive photon, attracted *naturally* by massive bodies, follows *not* a straight but a *curved* path (upon which travel takes *longer*), *different* from that calculated on the basis of Newtonian mechanics: The deflection comes out *exactly* as observed and “predicted” by relativity! Remember that with a massive photon, *even the velocity of light suffers cosmological retardation!* Its velocity, therefore, *cannot* remain constant as current theory *requires!* In truth, it *is* amazing how *diligently* current theory *avoids* discussing how light and the whole universe escaped the original “singularity” (of *infinite* gravitational force) with a maximum velocity of expansion limited to the *present* (if constant) velocity of light! With the *present* velocity of light, the universe could *not* have come out of the initial singularity! On the other hand, inflationary theories *are* silly! Because the total velocity of separation of bodies *includes all* effects; and it is the *total* velocity of *bodies separating* that is limited by the velocity of light! A non-physical observer watching events then, as now, *would have to conclude* that the *total* velocity of separation could *not* have exceeded the velocity of light! But if you think that here we have a true quandary, please read on!

(iii) In (a) above we just touched on the problem of cutting up material bodies. That problem was first faced by Democritus who correctly decided that there *must* be a limit to that process. In modern language, this is simply expressed *and* proven by the expressions $(1/2)^\infty = 0$, *and* $\Sigma(1/2)^\infty = 0$. But today we find that light is behaving now as a particle and now again as a wave, while it has been proven that high frequency shorter wavelength light is more energetic than low frequency longer wavelength light. Which, under L&MSP, clearly compels us to conclude that the weakest possible light in the universe is that having the longest possible wavelength, that *cannot but equal* the diameter of the universe! Nor indeed can it be doubted that as the universe expands [for the proof of that, please wait until §119a, p. 217], the first light produced is that always henceforth present in the always advancing front of the expanding universe. The conclusion? That the Democritean atom, the fundamental photon, has a size *equal* to that of the entire universe! The universe expands as it dissolves to ever weaker light! In the beginning, at the moment of its creation, the entire universe was concentrated in a point of zero vo-

lume, its total mass *has since been constant* as the grand sum of all its photons, its energy was $E = Mc^2$, but light then had the shortest possible (i.e., *zero*) wavelength and the greatest possible (i.e., *infinite*) velocity $c = (4GMT^{-1}/3)^{1/3}$, where T is the age of the universe, in the beginning having the value of zero, the *only* value with which expansion could defeat the *also infinite* initial gravity of the universe concentrated in zero volume! While for these you must wait until later, you may, in the above expression for the velocity of light, try its present value $c = 2.99... \times 10^{10}$ cm/sec, together with the value of $G = 6.672 \times 10^{-8}$ g⁻¹cm³sec⁻² and $T = 3.786 \times 10^{17}$ sec (= 12 billion years), that give $M = 1.15 \times 10^{56}$ g, easily within one order of magnitude of the total mass of the universe. All these being fully compatible with Newton's law of gravitation! Now, you may reflect on whether or not that Law had at all been comprehended in *all* its universal significance, and whether some other theory or consideration of the universe produced anything as simple as all this and fully compatible with L&MSP! There is more to this story, of course: We have already referred to the mass of the fundamental photon being of the order of 1.947×10^{-65} , while the mass of the electron is 9.109×10^{-28} g, or some 4.68×10^{37} times larger. This means that the electron is made up of an equal number of Democritean atoms, obviously held together under a *universal* (in view of the L&MSP) quantum-mechanical Law (*certainly other* than the one now in fashion) that holds them together within the confines of the electron, the basic quantum of mass, energy *and* action being no other than the Democritean atom itself, *naturally embodying in itself all these three*. As action is the product (energy)×(time), it is obvious that it is proportional to $T^{1/3}$; the initial values of action for both the Democritean atom *and* the entire universe having been zero, and having since been increasing with the universal age. It is also entirely clear that it is the *present action of the Democritean atom* that is having the *present* value of the Heisenberg so-called "constant" h. If h were a true constant, it also is obvious that there ought to be, very early on, a period of time during which the *entire* universe would produce no action at all, its total action then being *less* than h, *though the universe did clearly produce action as it was already expanding and thus acting, even during that very early period!* An obvious contradiction, *not* allowed under L&MSP.

18

THE PROBLEMS SURROUNDING THE MICHELSON-MORLEY EXPERIMENT

§90 What problems? Is there a problem? But isn't there a *huge* problem? Nature and the L&MSP impose the *hard fact* that any one thing moving in space possesses an *objective total velocity vector* that though unknown to us *may not be ignored*, especially in an experiment such as this! This *hard fact* was *not* considered either by Michelson and Morley, or by FitzGerald, or by the relativists who searched for, found, and adopted such transformation of coordinates as to "justify" theoretically the *wrong*, in the absence of the *proper* consideration of this hard fact, FitzGerald contraction! So it has been that the Michelson-Morley experiment has [*wrongly!*] been taken to support the special relativity theory. All this is due to *overlooking the major triple blunder of tacitly equating as at all times correct the direction of the total velocity of the interferometer in space to the direction of its principal axis!* But this constitutes a *hidden* assumption, that only rarely, through serendipity if ever comes out true. The correct analysis *must* at all times involve the *projections* of the total velocity vector on the axes of the interferometer!

§91 Examined in greater detail, *three major mistakes, indeed blunders*, have been committed both in setting up the physico-mathematical foundation on which the experiment was conducted, and in the analysis of its findings!:First, *totally missed was the fact* that the interferometer, carried on a pool of mercury though seemingly two-dimensional, *in fact is only a two-dimensional ana-*

logue of a three-dimensional instrument continuously moving in space along a continuously variable direction with a continuously variable velocity, also due to the rotation of the earth and the placement of the instrument upon it! Its x and y axes in affect stand for any two of the three x,y and z axes in space. At any one instant, there is a total interferometer velocity vector forming respective angles α , β and γ with the x, y, and z angles of a three-dimensional instrument, of which only two are represented in the Michelson-Morley instrument. Only instantaneously may the continuous motion in space, along a continuously variable direction, with a continuously variable velocity be regarded as constant in space. Only the instantaneous total velocity multiplied by the instantaneous yet continuously variable cosine of its respective angle with each axis is projected on that each axis! Therefore, not the entire total velocity "is" in the direction of the main axis, of the instrument! Second, also totally missed was the fact that, the assumption that the entire velocity of the instrument is along the main axis is unreasonable for yet another reason: As the instrument turns freely on its bed, the total velocity is not carried along, in the arbitrary direction of the main axis! Third, also totally missed was the fact that as two or more instruments conducting measurements at different places on the globe generally have both their main axes and beds disposed at angles relative to each other, their operators may not therefore assume the total velocity to be in the direction of the main axes of all instruments at once! Of course, all these reservations are automatically lifted the moment the projected velocities are properly considered. But when this is done, the experiment proves the true physical contraction of all bodies: their arbitrary axes contract relative to their assumed constant lengths depending on the sines of the angles they form with the relatively continuously variable vector of the total motion! Thus the equal lengths L_0 of the axes of a perfect sphere at true absolute rest, when the sphere is set in motion in a particular direction with a total velocity v_{total} , become respectively

$$L_x = L_0(1 - \gamma^2)(1 - \gamma^2 \sin^2 \alpha)^{-1/2}, \quad (6a)$$

$$L_y = L_0(1 - \gamma^2)(1 - \gamma^2 \sin^2 \beta)^{-1/2}, \quad (6b)$$

$$L_z = L_0(1 - \gamma^2)(1 - \gamma^2 \sin^2 \gamma)^{-1/2}, \quad (6c)$$

where $\gamma = v_{\text{total}} / c$, which shows that only for $\alpha = 0^\circ$, $\beta = \gamma = 90^\circ$ is it true that only the principal axis contracts relative to the other two, as has been the conclusion known as the FitzGerald

contraction, based on the *faulty* Michelson and Morley analysis! Naturally, in a situation such as that of the Michelson and Morley experiment, the above differentiated lengths become the *instantaneous* lengths of the three axes. In other words, *had this correct analysis been carried out even as late as 1905, the theory of relativity would not have come into being; and even if it had, the experiment would already have shown its lie!*

§92 Thus at last correctly interpreted, the Michelson-Morley experiment, far from showing the legitimacy of any observer's freedom to set his own standards as supposedly co-equally correct as anyone else's, does in fact demonstrate the moment-by-moment recognition by *all* bodies in the physical world of their own orientation relative to their own instantaneous velocity vector, a recognition demonstrated by their *real* moment-by-moment contraction according to the above expressions, that alone produces the null result! But as the objective Nature is thus shown to be capable of this, *nothing in it can any longer be said to be fortuitous, chancy, relativistic or indeterminate*, and human atheistic "science" is once for all demonstrated to be no more than a poor reflection and a usurper of the role the *objective Natural Law* plays in the World.

[Much has been written about whether Einstein knew of the Michelson-Morley experiment when he wrote his 1905 paper. But in *that* paper²³ (reprinted after special arrangement with Einstein), *its author* referred to what *he called* "Lorentz transformations"! Since Lorentz *only* developed *his own* transformations (*not* those bearing his name, introduced by Einstein himself!) in his own effort to resolve the issues raised by the Michelson and Morley experiment, which experiment Einstein acknowledged though he did not mention it by name on the opening page 37 (loc. cit.), it is *impossible* that he did not *already* know of the problems associated with that experiment, in relation to which Lorentz developed *his* transformations! Einstein's own (*obviously historically subsequent!*) protestation of ignorance of Lorentz' efforts made in the footnote on p. 38 (inserted later? – one wonders!) of his same paper *cannot* be credited!]

²³ A. Einstein et al.: THE PRINCIPLE OF RELATIVITY 1923, 1952, ISBN: 486-60081-5, (Library of congress Catalog Card Number A32-9845), p. 46, F/note.

§93 Now, in view of the *correct* contraction equations given above, a body moving with the velocity of light in some arbitrary x-direction, *cannot but find its thickness in that direction reduced to zero*, while its size in the other two directions remains intact! A sphere moving as a whole in a particular direction with the velocity of light *cannot but become a disk of equal diameter but zero thickness*, disposed vertically about the axis of its motion! And the first spherical photon sent out the moment of creation *cannot but constitute the outermost zero-thickness skin* of the expanding universe! In view of the *true* contraction shown above, how can indeed be expected that, if a body should retard after traveling at near-luminal velocities, it shall be reconstituted to its original size and internal constitution? The effects of strain most visibly suffered by soft biological bodies (and thus *invisibly even by all hard* bodies) under high-speed (gravitationally produced) stress *cannot* be ignored; they are too well known! About this, relativity theory, *simply believing in its own illusion produced by wrongfully produced equations, has absolutely nothing to say: Without ever producing even the slightest factual evidence*, it asserts that nothing substantial ever happens to bodies accelerating to (near) luminal speeds and then retarding to regular life, *except* that they return younger! [Promises, promises! *Fatuous* psychology working hard, on the belief it can defeat the *hard facts!*] One leaves his twin brother behind, embarks on a high speed trip and returns younger! But another wonders: Won't the universal ages at the moments of separation and reunion and thus also the difference between them be *identical for both brothers*? One can now appreciate the *levity* of the relativistic treatment of "gravitational fields in the absence of matter and energy", and of the myths produced by "scientists" for a hundred years already!

§94 There is one more related problem that must here be mentioned. Unquestionably, light *is* part of the natural world, and as such *is subject to all the laws ruling the world, as well as to the laws specifically applicable to it*. It follows that if for the velocities of two other bodies it is legitimate to write such sums as $(v_a \pm v_b)$, under the universality of Laws and the L&MSP, it is legitimate to write them even when $v_a = c$ also, *as was in fact done* by Michelson and Morley, who proceeded to conduct their experiment and produce its findings on the basis of just *such* sums, against which *nobody* has since ever complained! Though the velocity of light in

space is subject to the laws applying to it, sums such as $(c \pm v_s)$, where v_s is the velocity of its source, or of some other body do *not* become meaningless. If that were the case, the Michelson-Morley experiment ought never to have been conducted, as nothing other than a null result could possibly be expected! If I, traveling with speed $c/2$ send forward light, the difference in our velocities truly is $c/2$ and *not* c , as relativity theory states: The velocity of light in space remains c , but this does not affect my own speed that also remains at $c/2$. The reason is that *the universe as a whole constitutes a universal reference frame, and all velocities ultimately refer only to it, regardless of the opinions (and the frames of reference) of observers in it.* It is *not* relative to any observer that light obeys the *universal Law* establishing (regulating) its velocity. If the velocity of light were constant relative to all observers, independent of the velocity of its source, *and* without reference to the one-only absolute universe-frame, as per current belief, the sums $(c \pm v)$ as used by Michelson and Morley *would be illegitimate!* But then, relativity itself *would* remove the carpet upon which it flies! The use of the Michelson-Morley experiment in support of relativity *is a tacit admission of the existence of the universe-frame.* The theory *cannot* thus deny that upon which it has built itself! But making this admission *is equivalent to writing its own obituary!* All the rest are at best mere illusions, at worst fatuous self-delusions!

§95 It is incredible that with so many problems relating to our most famous theories still outstanding, our “best and brightest” *continue to build on them rather than reexamining their premises ab initio!* Continue, that is, *even after 1985, when all these issues were presented to them in full, and they decided in full knowledge of the facts to suppress the findings and pretend that nothing had changed!* It does *not* require much expertise to understand what the Michelson-Morley experiment says about ordinary bodies, *truly and instantaneously* contracting as they turn relative to their direction of total motion! But when one considers that they *all* are made of *fundamental* photons, their behavior can *no longer* surprise! So, this discussion finally demonstrates what so far has remained a carefully guarded secret, namely that *relativity, built on the blunders committed in the execution and interpretation of the Michelson-Morley experiment, was not both philosophically and theologically innocent* when introduced and accepted, despite the vehement denials of the atheists. If it were, and if the atheists as scientists were

+

+

men of honor, they should have no difficulty discussing dispassionately these and *all* related issues; instead they attempt to bury them, thus themselves demonstrating their own dishonesty. It should, therefore, come as no surprise that in this Age of the Great Deception, even, *and principally*, professors would *not* hesitate, *nor* be shamed, to teach as truths what they now *know*, *at least for twenty years already*, to be absolute falsehoods!

+

+

19

THE PROBLEMS OF NEWTON'S LAW AND THE SEPARATION OF BODIES

§96 According to Einstein, what caused him to develop general relativity was the “inaccuracy” of Newton’s law. But does it not strike as most odd that *we have been much too quick* to dismiss Newton’s law as “highly accurate but not exactly accurate”, when *we have not spent all necessary effort* in determining the *causes* of its *purported* inaccuracy? Let’s review the situation: If we look *carefully* at what we call “laws of nature”, *we will be struck by the fact that, among them all, Newton’s is the only one that is free of obvious assumptions!* Mass, separation, force are *all objective* physical quantities! *Nothing* more seems to be involved in Newton’s Law! The so-called gravitational constant *is nothing more but a proportionality constant*, the introduction and use of which involved *no ad hoc* assumptions! [Compared to this Law, *all other so-called laws are contingent on difficult and not well understood concepts and unverified assumptions*, such as the *pure claim* that the velocity of light is constant, or the *equally pure claim* that the photon is massless. The latter of these claims has already been shown above, on material *already before us* at the time of the Michelson-Morley experiment (yet, material *then and now* misunderstood), to have been *entirely baseless!*] We have *verified evidence*, indeed *unshakable proof*, that the solar system is held together by gravitation *as defined* by Newton’s Law! Kepler’s Laws relate *inextricably* to Newton’s Law! On account of these *sufficient* hard facts, *we ought to have redoubled our efforts* to discover the *purported* failure of Newton’s law to

account for the precession of planetary orbits! Which, however, we did *not* do, either before 1916, or after Einstein *added at least five more to his other assumptions in his effort to "streamline" his general relativity to Newton's Law, in order that he may then come back to claim the latter as a case of the former to a "first approximation"*! Moreover, after the discovery of universal expansion, leading *directly to the initial singularity and its infinite field of gravitation, we have every reason to think that by no finite initial velocity could the universe have been set upon its subsequent expansion! Thus, the fact that the universe is still as observed and has not already scattered to infinity cannot have been due to some cause other than gravitation delaying its expansion right from the start! This, in face of the fact that Hawking and Company admit the breakdown of relativity during the earliest period in the life of the universe, during which Newton's Law does not break down, as it already allows for the infinite force of gravity at zero separation!* Which all is all the more sufficient reason for us to *redouble* our effort to understand all that lies hidden in Newton's Law! Which *unquestionably is indeed plenty!*

§97 First off, we see at once that what we call Mathematical and Logical Consistency *could not have failed to leave out of consideration something as universal as Newton's physical-natural Law [physical, as part of physics, the science; natural, as part of Nature, the Greek physis; on account of which, the hyphenated term is naturally given in Greek by the sufficient term physical]!* When from a tiny bit of tissue, as we now find, we can reconstruct a whole living organism, surely from a Law within the Consistent Mathematical and Logical System, we ought to be able to learn *plenty!* And what we learn right off is that even this old as the universe Law *has* been misunderstood for three-hundred years already! Whereas we have a *good* intuitive feeling of what a *physical* force is (as we all have felt *physical* forces), and what a *physical* mass is (as we all have held *physical* masses in our hands), and we *know* that there are *objective* quantities out there corresponding to forces and masses, the intuitive feeling we have of *physical* separations *does not automatically lead to being a Law of nature that the separation used in Newton's Law must be measured along a Euclidean straight line!* In other words, *what the exact physical separation of bodies as used in Newton's Law is can only be defined by another physical Law, and we may not assume without testing that*

that Law dictates the Euclidean straight-line separation! *What separation that other Law dictates is a matter for a separate detailed investigation!* We have been wrong for three hundred years, and we still are, to subsume without testing Euclidean straight-line distances operating under Newton's Law! For that matter, in a dynamic system in continuous motion, and the universe is the ultimate such system, *how is that Law to define distance, statically or dynamically?* A static definition *could* require that at a *frozen* moment, *perhaps*, the best option is of the *frozen* Euclidean straight-line distance. At the *next frozen* moment the *then frozen* Euclidean straight-line distance, and so on. But *how do we know what those frozen distances are when we may only judge distances by light, i.e., massive photons traveling in real time, and along curved paths due to gravity?* Let me try to be as precise as I can: In a dynamic system, the frozen distance is a *constantly fleeting conception*, requiring for its complete grasping *not only* the distance itself, *constantly, cosmologically, in real time, developing* between the two bodies, but *also* the *constantly, cosmologically, in real time, developing* path along which *we observe what we take to be* that distance, along which the photon travels under its *constantly, cosmologically, in real time developing* velocity! A dynamic definition *could* require that at a *frozen* moment, *perhaps*, the best option is of the distance *along the actual physical path a photon would travel under the field of gravity of the entire frozen rest of the universe* (i.e., of the universe minus that photon) applying to *each* point along that path! A variation, *perhaps already involved automatically in this definition*, is the requirement that the light path between two bodies be the *least* path traveled in the *least* time! Perhaps, other static or dynamic definitions may be imagined. What we call Mathematical and Logical Consistency *cannot* have failed, among *all* the various options open in this regard, to pick *the one most parsimonious of means* (including the ideas of *least* path, time, energy, action) and *most economical relative to the overall objective*; without which considerations, the term "Consistency" totally *loses* its meaning! There is *no* question that, between *any two* points, light travels *in the particular path that is the most "economical" relative to something!* In other words, there is *no* question that the Mathematical and Logical Consistency *is already at work having resolved all the issues involved!* The problem is we do *not* know *which that something is* and *how* Mathematical and Logical Consistency *has gone*

about resolving the issues involved! Besides, there is yet another issue to be decided: Traditionally, we write Newton's Law as

$$F = Gm_1m_2/r^2. \quad (7)$$

But in the face of the universality of this Law, "Consistency" requires that *both* views of the universe, i.e, *as seen about each* of the two mutually attracting masses be considered. E. g., a test particle moving from the Sun to the Earth, and another moving *at the same time* in the opposite direction will *not* follow the same path, as the universe is *not* arranged exactly the same as regards *both* bodies acting as gravitational centers on all other masses! This means that the *correct* writing of the Law should be

$$F = G(m_1/r_1)(m_2/r_2). \quad (8)$$

How *naïve, if not irresponsible* in light of this discussion, a *not too austere* critic might regard the current theories is seen by the *fact that nowhere in them are these issues at all hinted at!* That general relativity *ignores* them *does not make them unimportant, only it much too crude!* Now, we all can have a better measure of how *complete* the abandon is with which our "best and brightest" keep on erecting their impressive-looking mathematical edifices—on *unsecured* ground! [See also F/notes: 15, p. 100; 22, p.147; and 25, p. 165.]

§98 How then is the problem of planetary orbital precession resolved? A planetary Keplerian orbit remains fixed in space *only* as long as the separation entering Newton's law is *exactly the least and constant distance of the Euclidean straight line!* Any longer distance entering Newton's law will *automatically* cause planetary precession! *Unquestionably*, the universal expansion itself, *applying to planetary orbits also, causes them to be not closed but expanding ellipses, precessing forward as they are spiraling outward!* In light of this discussion, *if all ordinary effects on a planetary orbit are properly accounted for*, but the orbital precession is *not* thereby fully accounted for, then there can be *no* question that the separation used in Newton's Law *must* include the *total acting* effect of the universal expansion; and *if the orbital precession is still not accounted for fully*, there then shall be no avoiding the *acting hard fact* of the path of separation *being longer* than the Euclidean straight line path! A least test particle traveling from one celestial body to another *cannot but feel the effect of the entire rest of the universe, meaning the effects as they reach it of all other celestial bodies from the minutest to the largest as they are distributed in space around the traveling test particle!* *Unquestionably*, the *path of separation* as deter-

mined by its own *independent defining Law*, that *alone* is used in *Nature's* Newton's Law remains to be determined! *It is naïve to believe that general relativity automatically accounts correctly for planetary precession, when it has ignored and not addressed in an explicit and compelling way all these issues, that under no circumstances can be made to go away!* [In his 1916 general relativity paper (*loc. cit.* p. 164), Einstein referred to two earlier (and may we judge independent of general relativistic considerations?) papers by himself of 1915, and by K. Schwarzschild of 1916, bearing on planetary precession. Having not seen those papers, I cannot comment on the assumptions made in them. But this *is* clear: When in the late twenties, faced with Hubble's *proof* of universal expansion against which he had till then fought so strenuously, he finally admitted "the greatest blunder of his life", it must be regarded as *an extraordinarily serendipitous pure coincidence* that as early as 1915 he had been able to account *correctly* for the precession, i.e., *without, at least*, considering the effect of universal expansion—to say nothing about the accuracy of Le Verrier's calculations of residual Mercurial precession in the mid nineteenth century!]

20

THE
FAULTY LOGIC
OF
GENERAL RELATIVITY

§99. Our entire discussion so far demonstrates, if anything, how *intimately intertwined* philosophy, religion and science truly are, and why it *is* a fundamental mistake to believe we can do correct science in the absence of a *correct* general consideration of *all* philosophical and “religious” matters also, relating *directly* to the physical world. It was *not* a result of loose concentration that every now and then we allowed ourselves to veer off to matters considered foreign to the subject of some particular main discussion, but for the *fact* that we never let go out of our attention that matters traditionally appearing under *phenomenally foreign* headings were *not* in fact foreign. Nothing brings that into yet sharper focus than a so-called “scientific” theory that calls itself “General Theory of Relativity”, that purports to unite everything under the consideration of a *single indivisible field* (of which all things we see are mere local concentrations); of which theory the disciples, subsequently faced with a *philosophically opposite* theory, that of “quanta” (namely, quantities *distinct ontologically from each other* yet said to be making up all we see), have embarked, so far without success, on an effort to develop a *truly* “General Theory of Everything”. These latter people, presently headed by Stephen Hawking, make no bones about their religious beliefs, regarding themselves atheists, yet without realizing that in exactly this their effort they do *not* in fact eliminate religious considerations, but *only substitute those of the past with the one they hope they will one*

day invent. [Nor is the blame wholly theirs: Just imagine the world still holding the once current “scientific” beliefs of the Chaldeans, or of Claudius Ptolemy! We *are* lucky that science *has* advanced. That traditional religion, blindly if not calculatingly, claims for itself to be Revelation is *only partly* correct! *All its overstructure is man’s invention!* And *we are unlucky* that religion, self-shielded behind what *she* calls Revelation, *has not* advanced, *has not* seen it fit to improve, as science has done with hers, *her* overstructure that continues to be *man’s invention, and so ever more continues to be a profanity!*] I use the “invent” in full consciousness of what they are doing [and those others *have* done]: The developing of a theory is a process of *invention, not* of discovery! You discover what though unbeknownst to us yet *already existed.* You invent what has *never* existed before. The effort of these people is therefore to *invent, not* discover, a theory. As a theory is a *complex construct living in at least one mind,* these people deny that there is or ever has been a mind that has taken in its purview everything there is. They thus attempt to establish *themselves* not just as mere inventors but as in effect *Gods after the fact,* inventors of a so-called “Theory of Everything”, after all that exists has already been in existence *and* declared by these same people as meaningless! So, these people are *not* thus acting as cats, chasing gracefully as cats only can their tails, visibly attempting to catch them as it were by surprise, but *are in fact the tails* attempting to arrest the heads that always go in front! This is *not* comical! It is the natural development of man’s *mad* effort to substitute himself as God ruling over what *he* calls a meaningless world; an effort that proves how much these people truly hunger for the existence of *the* Person they deny, Whom, faced by their own denial of Him, they are forced to attempt to replace by themselves! Would you call it “crazy” or “insane”? This is exactly what Karl Stern had in mind, as we have already referred (§77, p. 126). Yet, it is no less a *religion,* unconscious though it is of itself being one such, in the pangs of being born, even as it is going to be born still! We therefore *shall* be remiss if we here fail to examine in at least some depth the theory that was the mother of all such ostensibly “scientific” efforts to resolve the “mysteries” of the world that were not.

§100. As it occurs in all similar cases, when the theory of relativity was first introduced, it caused opposition. But the objections, logical and philosophical as well as scientific could not be

better than the understanding of the basic issues involved. As that understanding was, at best, incomplete, the opposition *almost had* to fail. It is important that relativity "succeeded" first in its general form, and only later, with the artificial disintegration of the atom, in its special form. It "succeeded" first with Eddington's measurements during the 1919 solar eclipse. It was only much later, as D. W. Sciama²⁴ revealed, that those measurements *were indeed dubious*. The members of the expedition *already knew* what measurements would prove the theory and were biased in their favor! The measurements that would not *were practically as many!* Later, when this was learned, the belief in the correctness of the theory was already established, albeit on those favored *yet dubious* measurements! The later "more accurate" measurements made by people already convinced cannot be regarded, for that very reason, as being above suspicion. Only persons inexperienced of the inner workings of "science" have never seen data suppressed or beautified, or records altered in order to suit better the preconceptions, positions, or interests of the "bosses"! Or how troublesome the latter regard "unsuitable" data and the people producing them!

§101. How did general relativity succeed? As A. Lynch has shown, by cunningly imitating Nature where it can be checked against her, and by "predicting" *essentially everything* where it cannot! "The "verifications" of general relativity are *not* beyond question. Even its handling of the precession of the perihelia has *totally* ignored the effects of the planets (*and*, of course, the problems discussed in the previous chapter of the present work. The theory wondrously predicts the correct result of precession *without any mention* of the planets! The classically (i.e., according to Newtonian mechanics) "unexplained" residue of precession is *net* of the effects of the planets; i.e., determined *after* those effects have been calculated and subtracted. But those effects were calculated on the basis of *Newton's* law as it was *then* "understood" that it ought to apply. If those calculations as *then* carried out were incorrect by reason of *improper consideration of all matters concerned, yet without the law of gravity itself being at all wrong*, then the residue *would not* be free of error! General relativity can only

²⁴ D. W. Sciama: THE PHYSICAL FOUNDATIONS OF GENERAL RELATIVITY, Doubleday & Co, 1969, 67-70.

justify its prediction of the residue by *assuming, not proving* that the residue so calculated is free of error! But this *inevitably though tacitly thus also assumes correct the whole of "Newtonian" mechanics as classically understood and applied to those calculations!!!* In other words, relativity tacitly uses the *assumed* correctness of Newtonian gravitation in order, later, in the end, to *deny* the truthfulness of Newton's law!!! Again, Sciama has all but openly admitted the total uselessness of the so-called "soft" theories, (including those based on differential calculus) that *do not make unique predictions* as indeed do the "hard" theories (including those based on *integral* calculus—and we must never forget that the Universe is the *integral par excellence* of physical Reality!) on which they can stand or fall²⁵. Relativity is just such a *soft* theory, as Sciama, a relativist, all but openly admits but fails to show the courage to reject it for that sufficient reason, ostensibly for its being "the best theo-

²⁵ What I here insist that must be understood is that in the classical treatment of Newton's Law, each pair of masses is treated as if present in a *two-body universe* consisting of *only those two* masses. As the three-body problem is *still only approximately* solved, one *cannot even imagine* the complexity of the *exact* solution of motion in our universe! This and the unaccounted for precessional residue is *not* due to the inexactitude of Newton's Law per se, but to *our ignorance of the exact lengths of the two distinct separations* [that must be considered in Newton's law, as discussed on p. 157-61] of the masses acting upon each other, which are being *assumed correct* when joined and measured along the *Euclidean straight line* joining the two (acting as point) masses. Which is correct *only in a two-body universe* consisting of *only those two* masses. The presence of (*all*) other masses in the universe, *cannot fail to make itself noted by affecting the course, i.e., the precise geometry of the line, along which the separation of the two masses considered must be measured, under all considerations discussed in the previous chapter!*: Consider a point test mass of infinitesimal magnitude (in fact, a Democritean atom sent from the one mass to the other): In a two-body universe, the (now *added*) test mass can *only* move along the Euclidean straight line! In the *real* universe, the test mass can *only* move as the *entire field of gravitation applies to each point of its actual, yet unknown to us, trajectory!* This is the subject of an *entirely other Law, the Law of Separations, that correctly ties up the entire universe together, a Law gone till now unnoticed within Newton's Law!* The latter Law remains *absolutely intact!* What has been faulty is *our neglect* of these matters! Classical mechanics *did not notice the presence of this other Law acting within Newton's Law!* General relativity, lost in its own differential considerations, failed to see the Universe as an *operating integral* quantity!

ry we have got"! How it is the best when it is so soft, he of course does not say! A soft theory is "best" either because it predicts *everything*, depending on how *we* adjust it to suit us, or simply because *we want to call it best* regardless!

§102. Every relativist knows that the strength of relativity as a scientific theory lies on its ability to handle concisely the general problem of the transformation of coordinates. But physically, this does *not* suffice! If pre-Copernicanism was objectionable for its placing the Earth at the center of the world, how can it fail to be infinitely more objectionable that, as relativity asserts, *every* observer regardless of his position *truly is* at the center of the world, *solely because he thinks or imagines he sees the world around him as if he were at its center* while in fact he has no idea whatever of how the world truly looks when seen from its center? It is as though you ostensibly solved the problem of Rome as the seat of world empire by calling every point of it "Rome"! If Rome were once right, that right is *not* thus spread around! And if it were wrong, you only make matters worse by spreading *that* wrong around! Nor do you eliminate the problem of a wrongful claim to a right by permitting that very same wrongful right to an infinite number of claimants, and this while you also, with the very same breath, assert the non-existence of that right!: For this is exactly what general relativity does: it *both* asserts that every observer is at the center of the world, *and* denies the existence of a(ny) center! This in fact is the psychological satisfaction Einstein has invented and offered to *everyone*! But only *fools* can be thus satisfied! Relativity is nothing less than a return to pre-Copernicanism for all *and* the denial of it! All dressed up in the awe-inspiring relativistic formalism! If the world has a center, an absolute scientist (i.e., one who respects his science absolutely) is honor-bound to try to discover it and show it to us all. If the world is finite, *it ipso facto does have a center*! If the world does not have a center, *every observer must be denied the right to claim centrality for himself*, appearances notwithstanding! If the universe is infinite, *it does not have a center anywhere, let alone an infinity of centers*, even though it may look alike in that case from every position! Looks and Reality are *not* the same, and if a "scientific" theory cannot, or refuses to, distinguish between the two, it simply confuses Reality and illusion, and is thus not scientific in the least despite its impressive-looking structure. What makes a theory scientific is *not* that it was con-

structed by a scientist, for even such a one can still tell us beautiful-looking tales, but its ability to relate *directly* to the underlying Reality and make it stand out apart from illusions and appearances. A relativist (and as such, by definition, *no absolute* scientist) feels no such compunctions; he spends his time manipulating infinitesimals leading to no integral picture! It is *not* immaterial that exactly in relation to these matters, Einstein, till the day he died some almost forty years after his invention of the general theory, had no idea based on it or any other so-called "scientific" (of the accepted sort) evidence as to whether the world was finite or infinite! Nor has anyone else either, after fifty more years, based on all the currently accepted "science"! And this is a very sorry hard fact indeed!!! Unless the syllogisms made so far and specifically those in this section *are demonstrated* to be in gross error (and everyone is welcome to present one's arguments, following and *all* subsequent presentation remaining to be here presented!), the general theory of relativity introduces the *insane* problem of splitting the L&MSP apart, separating Logic from Mathematics (that is *if* you accept the theory as a legitimate part of it!), and of confusing the *Clear Simplicity of Absolute Congruence of Reasoning* with so-called "findings" of *unspecified psychological desires* (only as above beginning to be made at all understood) given a differential mathematical dress! Those unwilling to give up this over-all Principle, *without which we definitely belong in an insane asylum, must stand up and declare all* relativity a theory suitable only for its inmates!

§103. As Einstein showed with his box and rope thought experiment, an accelerated system cannot be told apart from a system at rest, *if* one restricts his measurements within the box. But why so much fear of the *outside* world, so much claustrophilia, so much peasantry, regionalism, so much psychological attachment to the *closed* system, the caste, the ghetto? Because *only in such a place* does one feel psychologically secure with the immediately familiar, toward which alone he feels relative, while he has since childhood been taught to avoid considering and relating to the Whole, and to the Absolute, and *cannot or will not for the sake of freedom* reject this mentality even when he becomes a "scientist"! Einstein did not confess this openly but only semantically, in the quotation we already have given (pp. 50 and 56)! But as everyone who has studied relativity at some depth [and so too *all* rela-

tivists] knows that, transformations such as that conducted in the above thought experiment (in reality, the *feeling* that it cannot be told apart from a system at rest!), can only be conducted in the *single* direction in which the system moves; that *there is no way by which an entire spherically symmetrical gravitational field can be transformed away by any transformation of coordinates!* So, despite its name, which it thus misappropriates, general relativity *already fails this first test of true generality, and only falsely claims* to be a substitute for, and a correct theory that includes, gravitation! Whereas Newtonian gravitation is a *true spherically symmetrical, global, Universal* phenomenon, “general” relativity continues to be a *miserably local* one that at best is correct in a *single* direction! So, the relativists choose to stick to their theory, *not* for its veracity, but only because it is a *cunning* “scientific” [for it lets them do *tricky and not above suspicion* mathematical manipulations of symbols] and so, in reality, is *only a pseudo-scientific* instrument that permits them to uphold, in the eyes of the uninitiated, the philosophically and psychologically convenient, for all who fear the Absolute, principle of relativity! Those who object to this complete travesty of Logic, the relativists impudently do not hesitate to call second-rate brains, thus cowering into submission *those not confident enough both in themselves and in Logic*, and preventing them from standing up to this grossly unsubstantiated charge! To pass off as a first-rate brain today, you only need to memorize the general relativistic formalism, learn its tricks and be ready to charge those opposed with “inability” to understand! But look:

§104. (a) Faithful from the beginning to his program to set down a scheme to expel and replace the Personal God even of his Jewish tradition, and realizing that holding such a Principle as that of faith in the Logical and Mathematical Simplicity present behind even the hard facts of nature *is a purely mental process referring to the Presence of another, the Ultimate Mental Process, neither of which can hang up in mid air let alone in the complete vacuum*, Einstein had to, and did, choose: (i) the explicit abandonment of that principle and the attachment to the psychological factor as we already have twice discussed (pp. 50, 56); and (b) to turn inside, to his own mental capacities. This however required some mental juggling: as the unavoidable world process sets the appearance of humans to follow that of matter, the knowledge that mental processes do *not* exist in inanimate nature, *nor* hang up in

mid air, let alone in the complete vacuum but *solely in minds* was nevertheless not enough to keep him from believing them as having come into being *out of nowhere at all!* But he conceived this nowhere at all as having an *innate twist*, as being the *complete vacuum possessing a gravitational field, i.e., gravitational energy* even before there appeared in it ordinary matter, which for all we know causes the appearance of the gravitational field! But whereas we understand energy as the product of matter and the square of the velocity with which it moves, namely, $(\text{mass}) \times (\text{velocity})^2 = (\text{mass}) \times (\text{distance})^2 \times (\text{time})^{-2}$, or as the product of a force acting on a mass and the distance it covers while under the influence of that force, namely, $(\text{force}) \times (\text{distance}) = (\text{mass}) \times (\text{acceleration}) \times (\text{distance}) = (\text{mass}) \times (\text{distance}) \times (\text{time})^{-2} \times (\text{distance}) = (\text{mass}) \times (\text{distance})^2 \times (\text{time})^{-2}$, that is, whereas we understand energy in terms of those other *real* quantities, when Einstein reversed that order and set the existence of the gravitational field, that is, energy *prior* to the existence of those others, he did *not*, as he ought, feel it incumbent upon himself to give the world the definition of those others in terms of the vacuum and the energy it contained as gravitational field! In Logic, definitions proceed in the *exact strict sequence* from cause to effect, and *never* are the anterior defined in terms of the posterior! It follows that in Logic, even our *posterior* mind may *never* be used as a determining cause of events prior to its being! Einstein and the relativists have *never* discussed this reversal of physical and Logical order! Instead, and fully in the spirit of the wide discussion about fields during the nineteenth century, and at least being right in regarding the gravitational field as the most important of all fields, he could not but *invent* the existence of *yet another field* (which he called “gravitational”, though he conceived it *distinct* from the one already then known, the one due to *ordinary matter*) *already acting in space completely empty of all matter and all energy resulting from it!* Up until then, it was thought that fields were *particular* products of *real and particular* material entities. His *invention* was the *inversion* of that *real* relationship: His *new* “gravitational” field, he called upon us all to believe, was the progenitor of *all* that later followed, by *him* said to act very much, even if not quite completely, in the fashion of what later followed! *Thus* was God up on high replaced—by Einstein’s “gravitational” field as *ostensible* natural “fact”, and *his* mind setting the world rules! The “details” of inexorable

Logic and the Complete Logos notwithstanding!

(b) How did Einstein manage to do this? By *avoiding to draw direct attention* to the assumptions he made, referring to them variously; which makes it almost *impossible* to tell them apart and evaluate them with all proper consideration! So, in his Section 14, he says: “[w]e make a distinction hereafter between ‘gravitational field’ and ‘matter’ in this way, that we denote everything but the gravitational field matter. Our use of the word therefore includes not only matter in the ordinary sense, but the electromagnetic field as well. Our next task is to find the field equations of gravitation [which he regards as possessing *energy of its own in addition to that due to what he calls ‘ponderable’ matter*] in the absence of matter...” But this is nothing less than a *fundamental infuriatingly licentious assumption!* Physically, *only matter* possesses energy, and *only matter* produces a gravitational field! This is the *common* experience of *all* scientists and engineers. Now, Einstein tells us that, “something else” *also* produces a gravitational field and possesses energy, and that is nothing other than the “field” itself! God to exist on His own—that Einstein rejects, as do *all* atheists. But what *cannot*, even by his own definition, exist physically—that, Einstein and the relativists state, both produces a *physical gravitational effect* as well as possesses physical energy *identical and additional* to those possessed/produced by “ponderable” matter! The belief in the existence of God—ah, that is “religion”! The belief in the existence of this “field”—ah, this now is “science”! As K. Popper has shown, theories are only as good as their ancillary assumptions are scarce. In the case of general relativity as gravitation, *all* assumptions made, stated *and* unstated, *must* come out right, or else, the entire theory fails! Assuming the probability of each assumption made to be an “impartial” (but in reality *very favorable* to the theory) $1/2$, the probability of only all five aforementioned assumptions being correct simultaneously is $(1/2)^5 = 1/32$. And it is infuriatingly preposterous to state that it is as likely as not that gravity is produced by matter as by nothing material at all! If it truly were based on such probabilities, science would already have been proven a pitiful farce, producing *only tears, not laughter!* So what is the *real* probability of Einsteinian gravitation being correct, remembering that it already *has* failed the global test, because in Einstein’s own words “the gravitational field generated by a material point in its environment certainly cannot be ‘transformed away’ by any choice of the system of

coordinates" [loc. cit. §14, p. 144]? When pressed the "experts" choose to remain silent, or they would have to close shop! All this is more to the point of tractability of the theory in meeting, as itself a "logical" construct, the demands of Logic.

§105. (a) It is thus essential that we see in some detail how he proceeded to accomplish all this and to present his vision of the world. Because it also reveals how his mind worked: His 1916 paper carried the title FOUNDATION OF THE GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY, and was divided in chapters and sections as follows:

- A. Fundamental Considerations of the Postulate of Relativity.
 1. Observations on the special theory of relativity.
 2. The need for an extension of the postulate of relativity.
 3. The space-time continuum. Requirement of general covariance for the equations expressing general laws of nature.
 4. The relation of the four coordinates to measurement in space and time.
- B. Mathematical aids to the formulation of generally covariant equations.
 5. Contravariant and covariant four-vectors.
 6. Tensors of second and higher ranks.
 7. Multiplication of tensors.
 8. Some aspects of the fundamental tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$.
 9. Equation of the geodetic line. The motion of a particle.
 10. The formation of tensors by differentiation.
 11. Some cases of special importance.
 12. The Riemann-Christoffel tensor.
- C. Theory of the gravitational field.
 13. Equations of motion of a material point in the gravitational field. Expressions for the field components of gravitation.
 14. The field equations of gravitation in the absence of matter.
 15. The Hamiltonian function for the gravitational field. Laws of momentum and energy.
 16. The general form of the field equations of gravitation.
 17. The laws of conservation in the general case.
 18. The laws of momentum and energy for matter, as a consequence of the field equations.
- D. Material phenomena.
 19. Euler's equation for a frictionless adiabatic fluid.
 20. Maxwell's electromagnetic equations for free space.
- E.
 21. Newton's theory as a first approximation.
 22. Behavior of rods and clocks in the static gravitational field. Bending of light rays. Motion of the perihelion of a planetary orbit.

In this forbidding structure, the unavoidable sequence of mental processes we discussed in the previous paragraph that led to its building hide in the opening statements of Section 4 [there the *substitution of psychological demands* made by the traumas collected in the process of human and Jewish history for the Logicality and Simplicity of Absolute Reason *acting as cause aiming at producing a certain desired effect*—to understand this fully just *compare and add* the meanings of the term “cause” in expressions like “what was the cause of this accident?” and “man acting for a cause”] and of Section 14 [there the *carefully camouflaged* replacement of the traditional God by the *invented* all-generating gravitational field of totally empty space, subject to the postulates discussed earlier in Sections 1 and 2 of relativity and frames of reference/products of the human mind guided *not by its best vision* of Absolute Reason but by what *it* thinks “must be” the laws of nature that establish *co-equally all as anywhere resident emperors* of “Rome” (recall F/n. 15 on p. 100 and §102 on p. 166) and the requirement of general covariance, discussed in Einstein’s Section 3].

(b) Considering Einstein’s postulate of special relativity and the “need” for extending it, we must bear in mind the definition of the word “postulate” (according to my dictionary: something regarded as a prerequisite and a basic principle—obviously in pursuit of an object—namely here, the establishment of Einstein’s vision of the world! The entire mathematical structure of the general relativity paper had just that in mind!

(c) Einstein’s requirement of general covariance is that “[t]he general laws of nature ... be expressed by equations which hold good for all systems of coordinates, that is, are co-variant with respect to any substitution whatever, (generally co-variant)” (emphasis in the original, loc. cit. p. 117). But as we saw above, the view of things occurring in a box pulled by a rope *cannot* be made fully compatible with the general view of the world, because an entire spherically symmetrical gravitational field *cannot* be transformed away! As a result, the requirement of general covariance *denies* the possibility that the universe establishes a general spherically symmetrical gravitational field. But even if this be true for the whole (about which matter patience is required in view of what is to follow, Ch. 22), there *are* places in it where a spherically symmetrical gravitational field *does in fact hold locally*! As a result, in such places, as the requirement of general covariance *cannot* apply, neither can the

whole of general relativity! [It is surprising, therefore, that localities, such as the *believed to exist* black holes (that are nothing if not areas of extremely strong local spherically symmetrical gravitational fields) are attempted to be understood in terms of general relativity!] So, as *there at least exist* "islands" in the universe where the general theory of relativity *cannot* rule, at the very best, the *so-called general relativity* can only proceed by making such *generally unverifiable simultaneous stringent assumptions* that make the theory *generally unverifiable as practically at all operable, regardless of what is still being believed!* [The supposed verification of the special theory regarding the dependence of mass of a body upon its velocity has already been shown above (F/n. 22, p. 147) to be due to the *fact* that photons *are* massive, for which reason *also, the path of light is bent* ²⁶, while the precession of the planetary perihelia depends on matters that relativity theory never considered (see discussion in §101. p. 164)] And there *are* places, such as ours, that *are far better understood by much simpler theories!* All this does *not* make the general theory of relativity generally operable! General operability means that a *single version of the theory (with the identical same assumptions, if some such must be made) apply to all cases barring none!* The non-transformability of a spherically symmetrical gravitational field stands against general covariance, without which general relativity simply cannot make sense of itself! As a result, the moment it is shown that the entire universe creates a spherically symmetrical gravitational field shall be also the moment in which the theory of general relativity shall have been shown to be false!

(d) In Section 9 of his 1916 paper, Einstein defines the geodesic line in four-dimensional space such that, independently of the coordinate system in which it is stated, the length $\int ds$ between two points on it is "stationary" and its variation is $\delta \int ds = 0$. By this definition, he in effect states that in *this* universe, distances between *fixed* material points remain *static and unalterable*. It is the *old* vision of the universe consisting mainly of fixed stars. Ignoring (or only *truly* forgetting?, at any rate *not* canceling!) this part, in his Appendix IV of the Fifteenth Edition of June 9th, 1952 to

²⁶ G. P. Stavropoulos: PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI, Athens 1986, ISBN: 960-85044-0-6 (Library of Congress Catalog N° 87-670006), p. 352.

his book RELATIVITY of December 1916²⁷, he states that “[his] original considerations on the subject were based on two hypotheses: (1) there exists an average density of matter in the whole of space which is everywhere the same and different from zero (2) the magnitude (“radius”) of space is independent of time. Both these hypotheses proved to be consistent, according to the general theory of relativity, but only after a hypothetical term was added to the field equations, a term which was not required by the theory as such nor did it seem natural from a theoretical point of view (cosmological term of the field equations). Hypothesis (2) appeared unavoidable to me at the time, since I thought that one would get into bottomless speculations if one departed from it. However, already in the ‘twenties, the Russian mathematician Friedman showed that a different hypothesis was natural from a theoretical point of view. He realized that it was possible to preserve hypothesis (1) without introducing the less natural cosmological term into the field equations of gravitation, if one was ready to drop hypothesis (2). Namely, the original field equations admit a solution in which the “world radius” depends on time (expanding space). In that sense one can say, according to Friedman, that the theory demands an expansion of space....” Physicists still debate the question of whether or not the addition of cosmological constant (Einstein’s confessed “greatest mistake of his life” was proper. This however *is* clear: There absolutely were no cosmological considerations included in the 1916 paper! Those were the subject of the 1917 paper! So, Einstein’s above statement that the two “hypotheses proved to be consistent, according to the general theory of relativity, but only after a hypothetical term was added to the field equations” cannot apply to the 1916 paper. The two hypotheses go *inseparably together* in the considerations of the geodesic line. His term “stationary” regarding the length of the segment fd_s does *not* permit universal expansion. Without the second hypothesis, retention of only the first goes *against* the Hubble findings, as “an average density of matter in the whole of space which is everywhere the same”, i.e., a *constant* density of matter in the whole of an expanding space requires that *all* elements $d\tau$ of three-dimensional space expand at the same rate, whereas Hubble discovered that the rate of expansion *increases* with the distance from the observer, which means that the density at greater distances *decreases*, unless one is prepared to accept the *addition of new matter* to the universe in proportion to the distance from the observ-

²⁷ A. Einstein: RELATIVITY, Crown Publishers, Inc., New York, ISBN: 0-517- 025302, 1961, p. 133.

er; a *practically impossible* situation if the observer is anywhere in the universe, manageable only if the addition of mass is proportional to the distance from the center of a *spherical* universe, and in *both* cases a situation contrary to the principle of conservation of mass! In other words, the original 1916 paper as it stands (*scripta manent!*) does *not* permit universal expansion, *all* later statements notwithstanding! Moreover, in the above quotation from the appendix to his 1916 book, it is clear that Einstein limits himself to saying that it is according to *Friedman* "that the theory demands an expansion of space", thus *avoiding* to express an *immediate direct* opinion of his own! For that the reader must confine himself to the closing statement of that appendix: "I further want to remark that the theory of expanding space, together with the empirical data of astronomy, permit no decision to be reached about the finite or infinite character of (three-dimensional) space, while the original 'static' hypothesis of space yielded the closure (finiteness) of space". The Hubble findings are no longer doubted: No one ever was able to propose a persuasive explanation of the observed redshifts other than universal expansion. The so-called "closure" of space can *only* refer to its *ordinary* three-dimensional character: no one ever can claim that time does not keep on flowing, which means that for the four-dimensional space to be constant, the integral $\int ds$ [where $ds^2 = dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2 + dt^2$] may only remain constant as time increases, namely as the universe grows older, at the expense of its *three other* dimensions, which *would* involve the *exact reversal* of the Hubble findings!

(e) There are more points on which one is well justified to remain reserved in view of the general theory: E.g., in Section 19 of his original paper, Einstein discusses the matter of the "complete solution of the problem of motion", in relation to the numbers of functions and equations required for it. He admits to there being only seven independent equations available on the basis of the theory, when ten or eleven are needed, but he attributes this lack of *mathematical* definition to *our* freedom of choosing the three (or four, if time is included) functions of space "at will"! Here, there definitely appears confusion: (i) the how many equations physical matters truly demand for their complete definition, (ii) the how many equations the theory truly supplies, (iii) the whether or not *we* may add *whatever additional equations we think* adequate, and (iv) the whether or not motion in space is fully control-

led by nature, or remains at all undetermined and haphazard, and so, *beyond* understanding, all these *are completely separate* matters needing *separate and strictly Logical* consideration! As the motion of bodies in space *is definitely not undetermined nor undeterminable* (or else, *astronomy would be impossible!*), the absence of mathematical definition *cannot* be attributed to the freedom of the student as a “good reason for it”, but solely to the *theoretical apparatus* available to him! Einstein supplies *no suggestions* [he simply *cannot* do so, or else he *would* have given the *needed* missing equations as a part of his theory!] as to how best to proceed adding three (or four) equations to the only seven his theory puts forward, in order to get over the conundrum!

(f) The untitled chapter E, dealing mainly with the extraction of Newton’s Law of gravitation out of the general relativistic formalism and secondarily with practically verifiable predictions of the theory, is where things seem to have gotten completely out of hand. In our Section §36iii p. 58, we have already referred to Section 21 of Einstein’s 1916 general relativity paper, for his use in it of *at least five additional* assumptions²⁸, by which, added to the formalism he had already developed, he extracted the gravitational potential developed at a distance r from a body [having volume T (over which the integral applies) and mass density ρ in the infinitesimal cubicle $d\tau = (dx)(dy)(dz)$ within T] as given by

$$-(\kappa/8\pi)\int(\rho/r)d\tau, \quad (9)$$

which he then proceeded to compare with

$$-(K/c^2)\int(\rho/r)d\tau, \quad (10)$$

which he said to be the gravitational potential according to “Newton’s theory, with the unit of time we have chosen”. This unit, in Section 4, was characterized as “appropriate” and said that it “is to be chosen so that the velocity of light *in vacuo* as measured in the ‘local’ system of coordinates is to be equal to unity”. He nowhere indicated how this operation ought to be conducted, or what, e.g., our local system must be in order that, in it, the velocity of light be equal to unity, when in the reference system we normally use the gravitational potential given by Newton’s theory is

$$-K\int(\rho/r)d\tau, \quad (11)$$

K being no other than Newton’s G . But at best, this is only an *unexplained relativistic reinterpretation* of Newton’s gravitation! Not

²⁸ Discussed in detail by G.P.Stavropoulos in REALITY, TRUTH, FAITH AND REASON, Athens 1995, ISBN: 960-85044-1-4, p. 433-9.

only did the velocity of light never play a part in classical gravitation, but it was also simply unknown in Newton's time! Accordingly, the reader is left with no option but to conclude that, in the "local system" suggested "to be chosen", the velocity of light c is the *dimensionless numerical unity*! This impression is reinforced further at the end of Section 21, where Einstein comparing the above two expressions for the potential and using *only the numerical values* of K and c in the cgs system, obtains, the value of κ as

$$\kappa = (8\pi K)/c^2 = 1.87 \times 10^{-27}. \quad (12)$$

Accordingly, one, and specifically an engineer taught in his very first engineering lesson *never* to forget checking his equations for dimensional correctness, is very hard put to imagine what the appropriate local coordinate system must be that *converts physical quantities* such as K and c , having respectively the physical dimensions of $[M^{-1}L^3T^{-2}]$ and $[LT^{-1}]$, and the quotient K/c^2 having dimensions $[M^{-1}L]$ to dimensionless numbers! This κ was first encountered in Einstein's Section 15 "for reasons that [would] be made apparent later" and also used *without* explanation in his Section 17 as a part of Poisson's equation, which he wrote as $\nabla^2\phi = -4\pi\kappa\rho$, where ρ denoted the density of matter, here written as $\hat{\rho}$. Obviously, what Einstein wanted to "be made apparent later" was the above value of κ , by which Newton's law is claimed to be a part of relativity theory to "a first approximation", though the utility of κ is neither obvious, nor at all shown by Einstein! Since Newton's theory sets $\phi = -G\mu/r$, where μ denotes the attracting mass and r the distance at which the gravitational potential due to it is measured, an equation, corresponding to Poisson's own, must on the left-hand side have the term

$$\nabla^2(-G\mu/r) = -G\mu\nabla^2(1/r) \quad (13)$$

where μ and r must have their corresponding significance, and its right-hand side a term that truly is proper to stand there. In the above Poisson equation, Einstein's hypothesis (1) of a *uniform* mass distribution [see subsection e above, top of p. 164] is present in the form of the *constant* mass density ρ . Under this hypothesis, a spherical shell (concentric with the sphere R containing the mass μ) of infinitesimal thickness dr at a distance $r = \rho R$ [permissible values of the dimensionless ρ between 0 and 1] from the center contains mass

$$d\mu = (4\pi r^2 dr)\hat{\rho} = 4\pi\hat{\rho}r^2 dr, \quad (14)$$

which upon integration from 0 to 1 gives the total mass

$$\mu = 4\pi R^3 \hat{\rho} / 3 \quad \therefore \quad \mu / R^3 = 4\pi \hat{\rho} / 3. \quad (15)$$

Setting the distance r at which the potential is measured equal to R , the above second differential becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^2(-G\mu/r) &= -G\mu \nabla^2(1/r) = \\ &= -G\mu \partial^2(1/r) / \partial r^2 = -2G\mu r^{-3} = -(8/3)\pi G \hat{\rho}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Only in *this* form does the equation become dimensionally correct, as both its sides acquire the dimensionality of $|T^{-2}|$. So, e.g., with $G = 6.6725985 \times 10^{-8}$ cgs, the Earth having: mass: $m = 5.9599575 \times 10^{27}$ g; mean radius: $r_E = 6.370949 \times 10^8$ cm; mean acceleration of gravity at surface: $g = Gm/r_E^2 = 979.783$ cm/sec², mean density: $\hat{\rho} = 5.50227$ g/cm³, gravitational potential at surface: $\phi_E = GM/r_E = -6.2421475 \times 10^{11}$ cm²/sec², also has

$$\nabla^2 \phi_E = -(8/3)\pi G \hat{\rho} = -3.0757835 \times 10^{-6} \text{ sec}^{-2}. \quad (16a)$$

[These may be compared with the corresponding values for the universe presented in §119a, p. 217]

§106. The fundamental point of how the theory of relativity translates into Natural Law nobody has ever discussed! It is one thing *just to say* that “gravitation is geometry”, even when nothing can be geometrized because there is as yet no *geometrizable* “ponderable” matter, and energy depending on it. It is totally another to demonstrate that an *axiomatic system of purely human thought* truly was an *acting* feature of Nature, even before there was any nature as the one we know, characterized by the “ponderable” matter we all know! If a ball is set to move in a frictionless elliptical groove, it will do so with *constant tangential* velocity²⁹ on the *sufficient* principle of conservation of momentum, even as that is a *vector*, *not* according to Kepler’s second law, for there is nothing in either focus that forces it to move as that law requires! So, that “gravitation is geometry”, or its opposite, that “geometry is gravitation”, *is already* a baseless and conscious lie!

§107. In his Section 22, Einstein discusses the behavior of rods and clocks, the bending of light-rays and the motion of the perihelia of planets. This discussion inevitably involves the use of the term “rigid rod”, a concept already present in the special theory of relativity, but *never really clarified*. If the “rigid rod” is made of *ordinary* matter, its length is *naturally* affected by the

²⁹ G.P.Stavropoulos: REALITY, TRUTH, FAITH AND REASON, Athens 1995, ISBN: 960-85044-1-4, pp. 595-9.

gravitational field; the effect is *real*, it has *nothing* to do with the properties of space *per se*, but it also eliminates the concept of *rigidity* as a property that leaves the length unalterable by any real effect whatever! If the rod is made of some *extraordinary* substance, left unalterable by any real effect whatever and so not subject to the effects of the gravitational field, *surreptitiously* called “matter” and left to be understood as ordinary matter, then we are left with a *mere concept surreptitiously called “rigid rod”* substituting for the real thing, the “physical properties” of which and the absence of effects of the gravitational field upon which, *can only be told but never physically verified!* “[E]xamin[ing] the influence exerted by the field of the mass M upon the metrical properties of space” using such ill-defined “rigid rods” is thus subject to the vagueness of their definition. So, *how indeed* are we to understand the statement that “[t]he measuring rod thus *appears* [emphasis added] to be a little shortened in relation to the system of coordinates by the presence of the gravitational field, if the rod is laid along a radius”? *Is the theory describing mere appearances or reality itself?* If I adopt another system of coordinates but leave the physical system as it was, will I get another *mere appearance* of the unaltered physical reality, or will the latter change too? Or will it license me to say that the world *is as it appears from that system of reference?* *How my choice of coordinate system affects the reality out there and not only my own description of it, that is to say, the illusion I scribble on paper of the unaltered physical facts?* Likewise, a clock is a mechanism *subject to all the vicissitudes befalling the materials of which it is made*; so too, its rate *cannot be even if at all* a pure property of “spacetime” in the vicinity of mass M. And what must I conclude about the curvature of a ray of light? Is it due to my choice of coordinates, or to the shortening of the rods I use in “measuring” (actually, *estimating*) the *real* distances out there? Is it only an illusion, or a *real* physical fact? If it is *such* a fact, *how* can it be affected by *my* choice of rods and clocks, that I do not even lay in the space in between but only keep in mind or paper? If such a fact, all my relativistic considerations are for nought: the phenomenon has *only* to do with the *direct* effect upon the photon of the *real* gravitational field, *that acts only on real masses, and never on massless quantities!* Indeed, *even under Newtonian gravitation, when the photon is treated correctly as a massive body, it is found to bend as observed!*³⁰

³⁰ See again F/note 26, p. 173, above.

§108. (a) General relativity has never explained how, i.e., by what physical (meaning, *objective in Nature out there*) agents the velocity of light is kept generally constant! The theory of special relativity accepted that constancy as a *mere hypothesis*. The general theory tacitly turned that hypothesis into a Law of Nature, except where extreme “curvature” of spacetime is said to demand otherwise! Both theories consider the photons massless! Relativity theory *is concerned with the picture of the world as seen from specified coordinate systems*. Spacetime, it states, *affects only the velocity of bodies and photons as seen from such systems, not themselves* as such. How the “Law” [whatever it regards as “Law”] obtains in Nature has *never* been the subject even of philosophical, let alone scientific investigation!: The hard fact remains that the constancy of the velocity of light was fundamental in building up the special relativity, without which the general relativity could not be constructed. When the general theory was done, it denied the principle upon which its own foundation was built! That is gratitude!: You establish the solidity of the ground upon which you build the foundation upon which you build a tall tower; when all is done, you proceed to claim that the solidity of the ground upon which you built was never there, but your client whose money you spent on the project must continue to regard the tower safe! As an engineer, I have *no* license even to dream of such things! Obviously, some physicists and *all* relativists feel licensed to claim that Reality consists of just such a dream! With the theories now believed sacrosanct, all discussion bearing upon their foundation is considered scientific taboo! The excuse is *very thin* that special relativity is an *approximate* theory, good only for areas away from heavy bodies. We do *not* live in such an area: The entire universe is *too* small even for the special relativity to be “approximately” correct *anywhere* in it! [Indeed, *who* sets the standards of approximation? What do they think that “approximately” means when it comes to building the World? Do they take the World to be an oriental bazaar, where qualities and prices are “approximately” set? When Newton’s Law is believed *approximate*, *what* is the value of a theory that produces a result approximate to something approximate? What we need is the *truth* about the world, and only *after that is at hand* may we judge how approximate to it was some particular theory!] Newton’s Law has *no* distance limit beyond which it becomes inapplicable! General relati-

vity has never produced the *general* Law for the motion of light far or near heavy bodies, all the way to the limits of the Universe! The whole issue is cunningly masked behind the transformation of coordinates and the “perceived” (*perhaps insinuated as only illusionary*) red-shift. It is claimed that things do not really change for the bodies themselves that happen to fall into a “black hole”, even as they appear (hence the illusion!) reddened or retarded, or accelerated, or even as they vanish for somebody standing safely away. What is astounding is that general relativity attempts to “resolve” the *scientific* issue of light so that it satisfy *its own* “special” and “general” view of the world, without ever addressing the issue of the *real* effect of the entire universe on light, on *every single photon* in it! If one star, or galaxy, or black hole, affects the light so much as to make it the subject of so much *apparent* “scientific” discussion, it is *ignoble* to ignore the examination of the effect of the whole Universe upon *every* photon in it! The haughty professors, again, choose to remain silent, thinking that in their so doing their proverbial imperial nakedness will not be noticed!

(b) Nor can it surprise us that since Einstein’s work of 1917, Friedman’s work of 1922 and Hubble’s work during most of the 1920s, nobody seems willing to confess clearly that the theory of relativity *cannot* be a theory of the universe! The assumptions of Einstein we discussed in §105d (p. 173) and his incorporation in 1917 of the cosmological constant to the original field equations were *not* a spurious choice of a scientist but had an unconfessed singular purpose: Having rejected a Personal God as the Ultimate Absolute Reference, Einstein felt obliged to ensure that the *physical universe* remained forever static as *that* Ultimate Absolute Reference! *Undoubtedly*, this was for him a *most important quasi-theological* matter! His belief at the time was that under his original equations, gravitation *would* eventually bring about a collapse of the universe. He thus introduced the cosmological constant, representing a *repulsive* force between masses at great distances, exactly in order to avoid collapse and ensure staticity. Friedman’s considerations showed that Einstein’s first hypothesis (“an average density of matter in the whole of space ... everywhere the same and different from zero”) could be preserved even after rejecting Einstein’s second hypothesis (of “the magnitude (‘radius’) of space [being] independent of time”. Einstein’s subsequent statement (see above, p. 165) that, in light of Friedman’s work, “the original field

equations admit a solution in which the 'world radius' depends on time (expanding space). [and i]n that sense one can say, according to Friedman, that the theory demands an expansion of space..." *runs directly contrary* to Einstein's own earlier understanding of his own theory that (without the cosmological constant and the second hypothesis ensuring a static universe) the universe would collapse! Faced with Friedman's and Hubble's works, Einstein forgot his own estimation of his own theory and his earlier fear based on that estimation and adopted Friedman's later *opposite expansionary* proposition, thus claiming *guarded* patronymity even for that, but did *not* bother to state the cost at which the average density of matter would stay constant in an expanding universe, *nor* how the theory accounted for it! The original field equations under gravitation *must* bring about collapse. Einstein's original fear was *not* unfounded. Constant density of matter in an expanding universe *can only be brought about by the addition of new mass*, but that does *not* by itself eliminate the danger of collapse unless there is some independent agency counteracting the *increased gravitation due to the addition of new mass*. More mass in a bigger universe does *not* eliminate the problem of collapse. This is the main reason for which the relativists have taken a second look at Einstein's "blunder" and have *ceased* to consider it a "blunder" at all, notwithstanding the Hubble findings, which they attempt to attribute to expanding space, forgetting that, unless distances and velocities *are measured across all kinds of space with standard measures, they must close shop!* Originally, Einstein obviously feared the collapse of his quasi-God; later, he and his followers did/do not seem to mind their quasi-God growing bigger—at least he retains the dubious "dignity" of constant density! Their inability to account for what they consider "missing" mass remains intact! But such are the vagaries of the respected "scientific" theories nowadays!

(c) Having not seen Friedman's work, I cannot comment on it. Based on Einstein's own guarded statement that "the original field equations admit a solution in which the 'world radius' depends on time (expanding space). [and i]n that sense one can say, according to Friedman, that the theory demands an expansion of space...", however, I and we all *must be skeptical* about his so very much having missed this "demand" (if it truly existed in his original field equations) at least until 1922, that in 1917 he found *he had to add* the

“cosmological constant” term. With that constant gone under expansion of “space-time”, a *constant everywhere* (and *of course non-zero*, or else we would *not* be here talking!) density of matter [in Einstein’s own *confused* and confusing expression “an average density of matter in the whole of space which is everywhere the same and different from zero”, for if the density is the same everywhere in the whole of space, the “average” *is definitely wrong as indicative of variation* that alone legitimizes the term; and if the “average” is insisted upon as legitimately used, *then clearly the density cannot be the same everywhere!*] becomes possible only if *new matter is added* to that present already! Otherwise, i.e., without addition of new matter, and without the matter already present being infinite, it is impossible that an average density of matter can be kept constant for very long! Einstein did *not* discuss this matter! So, even the extent to which even Einstein comprehended the *full* consequences of his entire theory *must* remain questionable! Otherwise, his claim that “Hubble’s discovery can, therefore, be considered to some extent as a confirmation of the theory”³¹ *cannot be less than an effort to appropriate the Hubble findings as yet another “prediction”!* Passing between authors introducing slight changes in the assumptions and minute unevaluated alterations to the original equations, the general theory of relativity is made the father of nearly every subsequent finding! Yet, it remains a *hard fact* of Nature that both gravitation *and* universal expansion are *too* fundamental to the structure of the universe to be claimed for itself by any theory that did *not* incorporate them both in itself *clearly, unequivocally consciously and correctly from the beginning*, but only attempts to appropriate them either by means of such manipulations or through pure serendipity! Putting it only a bit more austere than Sciamia, a theory that “predicts” *everything is not good for anything!* Specifically as applies to relativity, this is by *no means too harsh* a judgment: Universal expansion is a *fundamental* characteristic of the universe. As such, *it can only depend on an unequivocal universal measure of time, having absolutely nothing to do with arbitrary measures, frames of reference and observers who relative to each other cannot even decide which of the two moves or stays put!* This being its game, its spirit and its field, relativity theory

³¹ A. Einstein: RELATIVITY, Crown Publishers, Inc., New York, ISBN: 0-517- 025302, 1961, p. 134.

may claim *absolutely no rightful part of universal expansion!*

(d) The Hubble's findings depend on the Doppler shift, as classically understood. *Never before* was the Doppler shift associated with an expansion of "spacetime", *but only with the relative velocity* between observer and observed acting in the classically understood ordinary three-dimensional space and time. The Doppler shift is and has always been understood *fully* in the *ordinary* sense. The appropriation of Hubble's findings by relativity, therefore, involved a *physically unsupported and thus impermissible re-interpretation* of the Doppler shift. Such is the only way in which claims in support of relativity can and have been made on phenomena entirely foreign to its spirit! It is important to remember Einstein's oblique and even more confusing (when viewed from its practical consequences) defense of his original position (already mentioned in §105d, p.173, above) who found it necessary "to remark that [the general relativistic Friedmanian] theory of expanding space, together with the empirical data of astronomy permit no decision to be reached about the finite or infinite character of (three-dimensional) space, while the original 'static' hypothesis of space yielded the closure (finiteness) of space". Only thus can the relativists claim at once the validity of the concepts of general relativity, of the curvature of spacetime, and of the expansion of the latter! But from Einstein's statement just quoted, it is clear that the inability to reach a decision follows *only* from the status accorded to the theory as co-equal (note that "together") to "the empirical data of astronomy"! It is unbelievable that a theory can make such a claim for itself, even as it seeks confirmation in experience! For if one considers the Hubble findings without the blinkers set by relativity, one is less than one half-step away from declaring *unequivocally* that those findings and the *instantaneous* conservation of linear momentum [truly conserved in *instantaneous* transfers of momentum, though *not* over time due to the cosmological *decrease* of velocity, see below] suffice to set *all events in the Universe in absolute spatial and temporal order*, while the denial of these both is the founding argument of relativity!: And this because, the Hubble findings and the just stated cosmological conservation of momentum *suffice to establish as an incontrovertible absolute hard fact* that the Universe *has indeed an immobile absolute center*: at the point where expansion began, where/when all momentum vectors then summed up to zero, as they still and always do! This point

suffices as the center of a preferred (Cartesian or polar) system of reference, in which all events are fully spatially ordered!!! The moment of the Big Bang at that exact point establishes the moment of zero time as the absolute temporal origin of the World, sufficient to put all events in absolute temporal order!!! Thus the Hubble findings discriminate unequivocally between universal expansion as an absolute fact of the objective Universe out there, on the one hand, and the purely subjective relativistic concoctions of "observers", all bent on establishing themselves as co-equally legitimate centers of the world in a logically impermissible attempt to return to an even worse pre-Copernicanism for all, on the other! In other words, the theory of relativity has already been refuted by Hubble's work, and no longer has any validity!!! Its original claims of spatial and temporal indeterminacy are thus summarily debunked. But atheistic "science", preferring to serve the interests on which it feeds rather than the Truth that inspires, refuses not only since Hubble, but even since 1986 to discuss the entire issue and acknowledge its complete resolution.

(e) Putting it all most succinctly, the *unquestionable* psychological problem of Einstein and all his followers, which he never resolved, as neither will they, was the *living* presence in the conscience of society around him/them of the *Personal God*, in Whom despite their personal faults the vast majority of the people believed and continue to believe. *Him* did he, as they too, try to supplant by his *pure invention* of the "field", of which *he* is honored as the *father* by all like-minded people, ignoramuses and fools! How "successful" this effort has been, this exposition has already begun to show: and the following *shall* put the *unbreakable* nails and seals in its coffin!

+

+

21

THE
TRAVESTY
OF
SPECIAL RELATIVITY

§109. As regards Einstein's special theory of relativity, its much desired conclusion, namely, the relativity of measurements in space and time can more easily be seen to have been in the sights of "scientists" *even before* the tools were invented that "justified" it. The conclusion was desired *not* for its scientific value, as none such was at all visible before the theory was invented, but for its *philosophical* significance in subverting determinism. Only later were the means sought that could allow the desired conclusion "legitimately" to be drawn. True, classical determinism had made some use of ill-advised assumptions and principles, only gradually understood and removed, as they were discovered to be contrary to the hard facts and to cast doubt on the value of measurements regarded as absolute though referred to arbitrary coordinate systems. But that such findings can neither invalidate the basic correctness of *objective* determinism, nor permit stating that there is no naturally preferred system of reference is beyond the vision of atheists: they, in typically arrogant fashion, thought it opportune to attribute the human failure to see the incontrovertible Reality of things firstly to Nature; and secondly, if it were to be shown that Nature still needed an Author, to God as *His* own defect! Only thus can the gloss be explained that was right from the start put over some very thorny issues by none oth-

+

+

er than Einstein himself. Later, as P. K. Feyerabend³² has aptly remarked (and F. L. Hill had before him observed), physicists were satisfied to regard the “theory of relativity [as] consist[ing] of the formal Lorentz transformations and the mass-energy equivalence”, and to ignore the very legitimacy of the physical and Logical basis of, and the steps that led to, those two. Today, so scared have the “scientists” become of the issue of the legitimacy of the bases of relativity, that the editors have long surpassed the bounds of civility, and even those of the *Physical Review* have reduced themselves to using *thin and transparent ruses* to avoid expressing a *reasoned* rejecting opinion on papers reviewing that entire issue (see §112c, p. 194)!!!

§110. (a) As everyone who studied the basics of relativity theory knows, what since 1905 are called “Lorentz transformations” are *Einstein’s and not Lorentz’s*, whose transformations *were not at all equivalent* to those used by Einstein! One *cannot* avoid concluding that Lorentz’s name was used *cunningly*, seemingly in order to honor, *in reality in order to obtain the approval of the older man*; so that by thus broadening the patronage, to obtain an aura of legitimacy that the theory would *not* have had right from the start! Einstein was the first to show that the mislabeled transformations transform the two equations

$$x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = c^2 t^2 (= r^2) \quad (17a)$$

$$\xi^2 + \eta^2 + \zeta^2 = c^2 \tau^2 (= \rho^2) \quad (17b)$$

uniformly to each other. True, the relativity of measurements of position and time follow from the “Lorentz’s transformations”, but are these transformations truly legitimate? Careful thought reveals that they are *not*: Consider the above equations separately from each other. Each expresses the distances r and ρ , traveled by light as measured in two coordinate systems K and K' having arbitrary respective origins O and O' , and arbitrary respective measures of space (x, y, z) and (ξ, η, ζ) and of time t and τ , under the *assumption* that the velocity of light c remains constant regardless of the system in which it is measured. Consider also that (a) system K' is traveling relative to K with velocity v as measured from K , (b) the two origins O and O' coincide at the *reset* time indications $t = \tau = 0$, (c) the distance from O the origin O' travels in

³² READINGS IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE, B. A. Bailey, Ed.; Prentice Hall, 1970, pp. 319-342..

time t is $x = vt$, and (d) that a flash of light is emitted spherically at the moment the two origins O and O' coincide. It *cannot* fail to be obvious that the flash of light *is unique*, though measured in K and K' as the above equations indicate. Let us now recall first—what we truly mean by an orthogonal and a polar coordinate system and then the physical phenomenon of light emission.

(b) The geometrical space of nature is three-dimensional. In it, motion can be analyzed in up to three axes, each disposed orthogonally to the plane of the other two. Two such directions are possible per axis, all directions being three. Velocities are vectors. A vector is an arrow characterized by its direction and a scalar that is the dimensionless ratio of the size of the vector over the size of the unit vector placed parallel to the vector in question. Every velocity vector in three-dimensional space can be analyzed to its three component vectors, each disposed parallel to the directions of the x , y , and z axes. Under uniform rectilinear motion, the product (velocity) \times (time) referred to a *particular* moving body is the distance traveled by it in the *particular* direction of the velocity. So, $r = ct$ is the distance traveled by light in the *particular* direction the light was cast. When light is cast spherically around its origin the equation $r = ct$ represents the *entire* spherical front reached by it in time t . In rectangular coordinates, the point light has reached in the direction of a *particular ray*, is represented by $x = (ct)\cos\alpha$, $y = (ct)\cos\beta$ and $z = (ct)\cos\gamma$, which are the projections of the distance r on the main axes and α , β and γ the angles formed by the *particular ray* with the positive directions of the axes, being there always true that the sum $\cos^2\alpha + \cos^2\beta + \cos^2\gamma = 1$.

(c) Now as to the physical phenomenon of light emission: Since the velocity of light is [*said to be*—so here stated in order to draw attention to all pertinent matters that shall be discussed later] independent of the velocity of its source, there can be no question that, at least in empty space, light emitted spherically forms an *expanding front remaining perfectly spherical and centered at the true point of its emission*. Even though we may “lose” or come to doubt the coordinates of this center, *it certainly is by no means lost, or in any physical doubt*. It can be regained *exactly* from the geometry of the spherical front, *in exactly the same manner* in which the center of a circle can be recovered from its periphery in plane geometry. *This is basic*. B. Russell, a confirmed atheist

and avid supporter of relativity has recognized the existence in nature of “hard facts”, that is, phenomena the physical nature of which *cannot* be doubted and is *not* subject to arbitrary human linguistic manipulation. Light and a spherical light front *are* such phenomena. The independence of the velocity of light from the velocity of its source [despite the remark in brackets at the top of this paragraph] is another such hard fact. Taken together, these hard facts guarantee the *equally hard fact* that [at least in empty space] the expanding spherical light front does *not* translate in space as a whole as a body translates as a whole along a trajectory, *nor* does it deform. This is *absolutely identical* to saying that its center, the point of its emission remains *absolutely motionless* in space! An “observer”, with the lantern (that for an *instant* just flashed the light) in hand, may remain at that center; or he may move about. However, his state of motion *may no longer be doubted*: It is unquestionably determined by the advancing light front: *Only if he remains at the center of the light front may he claim to remain absolutely motionless, since only that point is the true, and truly motionless, point of emission.* If he has moved relative to the light front (which is another way of saying relative to the *absolute* point of its emission), he then *has definitely moved!* So, *only if he remains at the true point of origin* may he use either of the two equations 17 given above in §110a, p. 187! A second observer has the same rights as the first *only if he remains truly coincidental with him.* The two equations are equivalent *only if the two origins O and O' remain truly coincident and at the point of emission*, the only difference between them being in the size of the units of length and time used, that are then very simply related. When O' moves relative to O, at the very best, *only one* of the two equations is correct. If neither observer has remained at the center of the light front, *neither of these two equations expresses a hard physical fact!* The true light origin, call it if you will O_o, is *not* physically the same as either O or O', when either or both of these move!

§111. (a) Einstein and the relativists following him have completely ignored all these indubitable hard natural facts. Instead, they all have regarded as true that every observer casting a light may claim for himself to remain at the origin of the light front he once in his past cast, regardless of his own state of motion, *as if he carried along with him the entire light front still expanding out there, and as if it formed a solid non-transformable body with him!* Einstein

succeeded in “showing” that the equations 17 (given in §110a) transform identically to each other under *his* “Lorentz transformations”, that he set as:

$$\xi = \beta(x - vt), \quad \eta = y, \quad \zeta = z, \quad \beta = (1 - v^2/c^2)^{-1/2}. \quad (18)$$

$$\tau = \beta(t - vx/c^2) = t(1 - v^2/c^2)^{1/2}.$$

In writing these, he ignored two additional points: First, that, when you set $\eta = y$, and $\zeta = z$, *unless you explicitly say and act ever sensibly otherwise*, you *tacitly also assume* the component unitary vectors in those four directions to be of *equal length*, and *not merely pairwise parallel in direction*; in which case, *you may not fail* to set $\xi = x$ also, both as regards the third orthogonal direction and the lengths of the respective two unitary vectors, thus setting them equal in size to those other four; for unless you do this there is no telling what the equations represent! And second, that, you do *not* ever mix the coordinates of the light front and those of other points in any frame, which points you also regard to be in motion relative to you! In view of the equalities $\eta = y$, and $\zeta = z$, as set by the “Lorentz transformations”, Einstein was able to concentrate on the remaining transformations, in view of which he in effect was able to write:

$$\begin{aligned} \xi^2 - c^2\tau^2 &= \\ &= \beta^2(x - vt)^2 - c^2\beta^2(t - vx/c^2)^2 \\ &= \beta^2[(x - vt)^2 - c^2(t - vx/c^2)^2] \\ &= \beta^2\{(x - vt)^2 - c^2[(c^2t - vx)/c^2]^2\} \\ &= \beta^2[(x - vt)^2 - (c^2t - vx)^2/c^2] \\ &= (\beta^2/c^2)[c^2(x - vt)^2 - (c^2t - vx)^2] \\ &= [1/(c^2 - \beta^2)][c(x - vt) + (c^2t - vx)][c(x - vt) - (c^2t - vx)] \\ &= [1/(c^2 - \beta^2)][cx - cvt + c^2t - vx][cx - cvt - c^2t + vx] \\ &= [1/(c^2 - \beta^2)][x(c - v) + ct(c - v)][x(c + v) - ct(c + v)] \\ &= [1/(c^2 - \beta^2)][(c - v)(x + ct)][(c + v)(x - ct)] \\ &= [1/(c^2 - \beta^2)][(c^2 - \beta^2)(x^2 - c^2t^2)] \\ &= x^2 - c^2t^2, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

and *only thus* to claim that the two equations of §110a transform to each other. However here, it is necessary to enquire as to the nature of the x appearing in $(x - vt)$ and $(t - vx/c^2)$ above. There can be no question that the x in the first parenthesis is the x -coordinate of the light front; so that the first parenthesis ought more carefully to have been written as $(x_{\text{lf}} - vt)$; for if that x were the x -coordinate of the origin O' as seen from the origin O , the first par-

enthesi ought to have been written more carefully as $(x_{O'} - vt)$ and it *would* immediately be seen to be equal to zero. As for the x appearing in the second parenthesis, Einstein himself admits³³ that “the quantities x , t and τ ... refer to the position of the [moving] clock [at O' as seen from O , for which] we have, evidently, $x = vt$ ”. But if, *as he ought*, had written $(t - vx_{O'}/c^2)$, the above transformation *would have stopped at the its seventh step as the eighth could not possibly be written*, as clearly seen below:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \xi^2 - c^2\tau^2 &= \\
 &= \beta^2(x_{if} - vt)^2 - c^2\beta^2(t - vx_{O'}/c^2)^2 \\
 &= \beta^2[(x_{if} - vt)^2 - c^2(t - vx_{O'}/c^2)^2] \\
 &= \beta^2\{(x_{if} - vt)^2 - c^2[(c^2t - vx_{O'})/c^2]^2\} \\
 &= \beta^2[(x_{if} - vt)^2 - (c^2t - vx_{O'})^2/c^2] \\
 &= (\beta^2/c^2)[c^2(x_{if} - vt)^2 - (c^2t - vx_{O'})^2] \\
 &= [1/(c^2 - \beta^2)][c((x_{if} - vt) + (c^2t - vx_{O'}))][c(x_{if} - vt) - (c^2t - vx_{O'})] \\
 &= [1/(c^2 - \beta^2)][cx_{if} - cvt + c^2t - vx_{O'}][cx_{if} - cvt - c^2t + vx_{O'}], \quad (20)
 \end{aligned}$$

This use of the x *was*, therefore, a *conscious and deliberate* act! It also was the *true* “greatest blunder of his life”!: For it *partly replaced* the x in the equation expressing the light front by the x -coordinate of the origin O' as measured in K relative to the origin O . Only by means of this *illegitimate* partial substitution was he able to present the “Lorentz transformations” as a mathematical (i.e., *also logical*) set of equations that allowed the special relativistic conclusions, starting with the transformation to each other of equations 17, proceeding with the relativistic “explanation” of the Fitzgerald contraction [*otherwise correctly explained*, see above §91, p. 151-3] proposed to resolve the null result of the Michelson-Morley experiment, and advancing to the dilation (the *still only claimed* slower flowing) of time with velocity and to the idea of *physically free* travel up and down through the fourth dimension, all of which are based on the above value of β ; not to forget and all the “scientific” and fanciful literature, “star trek” art, and vacuous related talk! Asking forgivingly, mildly, tolerantly, wonderingly whether the above act of Einstein was inadvertent or deliberate will *not* do! The lure of the explanation of the Michelson-Morley experiment was much too tempting in those days, but no

³³ Einstein et al.: THE PRINCIPLE OF RELATIVITY, Dover Publications, Inc. 1923, 1952, ISBN: 486-60081-5, (Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: A32-9845), p. 49.

one was willing to re-examine the *Logic* of the experiment. Unquestionably, the "Lorentz transformations" represent the slickest ever "scientific" slight of hand, or more figuratively, nothing less than the grandest ever hat trick performed in the circuses of the world! As two wrongs do not ever make a right, and careful professors, acting correctly, do *not* give passing marks to students committing such errors, one *must* wonder as to how they nevertheless accepted such an "error?" as "scientific" Holy Writ!

(b) It follows that, Einstein's claim that the two equations of §110a together express the constancy of the velocity of light and its independence from the velocity of its source, understood without regard to the positions and states of motion of the sources O and O', that coincided but for a moment *was flatly false!* Since the two equations may *not* be written together as a system except for the trivial case of coincidence of O, and O' at O_o, the conclusion that the "Lorentz transformations" transform these two equations to each other *continuously* regardless of the relative to each other state of motion of the two origins O and O' *is illegitimate!* The *instantaneous* equivalence of the two equations does *not* make the two equations continuously equivalent to each other simply because the moments of emission are separated by an instant! As every light source moves in space, its continuous emission *does not result in one advancing light front;* but in a series *distinct* fronts, each distinguished from the immediately previous one by the ds difference in the path of motion of its source and the dt difference of emission in the scale of time. To every instantaneous flash of light there corresponds *its own distinct advancing light front.* We may *not* confuse, as we do as cinema viewers, the fast presentation of *distinct* consecutive events/pictures as a continuous one-only event. These distinctions *are incontrovertible!*

(c) Einstein's *cardinal error* was in confusing the issue of independence of the velocity of light from the velocity of its source with (i) the *totally distinct* issue of whether or not the two light sources remain truly at the center of the advancing light front (generally, they are *not!*); and (ii) the issue of whether or not each light source may regard itself as always remaining at the center of one advancing front or *successively* at the centers of a whole series of *distinct* advancing fronts (of which two options, *only the latter is the correct one physically!*).

(d) *Only for the true instant of emission is the light source at the*

true point of center of the light front emitted at that moment! When the source, shining continually, moves in space, *it does not carry the same light front along with it, but is instantaneously at the center of the particular light front being emitted at that same moment!* The centers of instantaneous emissions form the locus of motion of the continually emitting light source. The source retains its own velocity in space, but that *may never be associated with the velocity of light as was confusedly attempted to be regarded as true through the use of the "Lorentz transformations".* Two consecutive light emissions separated by an instant, form two *distinct* light fronts. These will arrive at a fixed distant point after traveling *different* distances (the second obviously traveling a *shorter* distance if the receiving point is in the direction of instantaneous motion of the light source), while the interval of their arrival will equal that of their emission *only if the velocity of light be truly constant!*

(e) Finally left without the barbarians called "Lorentz transformations", now *proven* to have been derived from this confusion, we see that there is *no physical* relativity, at least such as advanced by Einstein! The "constancy" of the velocity of light, its independence from the velocity of its source, and the various "successes" of his theory, to the extent that they approximate or seem to be true physical facts, *must be derived directly* from the Natural evidence, and *not from any theory based on faulty "logic"!*

§112. (a) On account of this manipulation of the "Lorentz transformations" by Einstein, forests have been cut and untold tons of ink poured in the effort to "explain" what an observer speeding away from his point of origin sees at "his" clock and an *identical* clock left there. As the point of origin O is regarded motionless, the traveler considers himself occupying the moving origin O', to which there corresponds the time τ , reduced relative to t by the factor $(1 - v^2/c^2)^{1/2}$, i.e., getting ever younger than his twin brother at O, as he speeds ever faster away from him. Eventually, when $v = c$, relativity says, $\tau = 0$, or in layman's terms, immortality shall have been gained. So, when he returns, those left at home shall have grown old but he shall have remained young! Not just the age old dream of immortality, but of eternal youth! That is exactly how tricksters attract the gullible—through *consciously false* promising, that is *never* confessed!: Because, relativity cuts both ways, or else it is *not* relativity: We all, sitting in a

car of the tramway, depending on how we concentrate our field of vision, can see either ourselves or another car going the opposite way as moving or standing: If this happened in deep space, *nothing* could prevent the twin at O to regard *himself* as traveling ever faster and remaining ever younger! So, upon reunion, what shall we conclude? The relativists avoid all pricks threatening to blow up their balloon this way: They simply never answer "inferior" minds! Again, suppose the traveler to be none other than a photon emitted at the exact moment of Creation. At the present universal age T, it of course is *at the very front of the expanding universe!* Will it be right to conclude that the universe has not aged at all, or just only its front? If not, how is it *not still* at the point of Creation? If *your* wristwatch has *not* stopped and you are supposed to be in motion, is it not by the *sufficient* fact that it still shows $\tau = 0$, that you *with full confidence* state that you have not moved at all? Is it not with *complete* Reason that *the photon at the universal front has no option other than concluding that it truly is as old as the Universe itself?* Where indeed then is this supposedly famous "relativity" of time?

(b) Looked at from another perspective, what Einstein did was exactly equivalent to the following: On a straight stretch of highway, say 60+ miles long, you travel at a steady 60 mph and for just a moment, at a point A, you flash your headlights. After one hour you arrive at point B, 60 miles ahead. Not for a moment would you think that you arrived at the light front of the flash you emitted at point A! It is just as (il)legitimate to equate 60 miles to one light-hour! But this is *exactly* what Einstein did! In the equations of §110a, the x expresses the general x-coordinate of the light front. In the "Lorentz transformations", Einstein equated that general x now to the light front and now to the x-coordinate of x_0 !

(c) How can you avoid expressing an opinion on this matter if you do not want to admit the obvious, that is brighter than the Sun, and you do not want the public to be told about it? Only by means of a ruse! This is what the *PHYSICAL REVIEW* reduced itself to in 1987: A paper of mine "*On the Relativity of Clocks*", discussing succinctly the problem of mixed x-s present in the "Lorentz transformations", received at the *PHYSICAL REVIEW* on April 10, 1987 got the Code Number SD3605D. Inquiring, on May 29, 1987, I telephoned the Journal and spoke to Mrs. Plonski. She told me

that “the *PHYSICAL REVIEW* was not a suitable vehicle for my paper as they no longer published papers on Relativity, and as a result they did not even send the [my] paper for review”! In disbelief, I asked her to suggest some other “suitable” journal. She *declined* to do so! I requested that all she told me kindly be put in writing. On June 1, 1987, Dr. D. Nordstrom (Editor, *PHYSICAL REVIEW D*), sent me a letter stating: “We regret to inform you that your manuscript entitled ‘On the relativity of clocks’ is not considered suitable for publication in the Physical Review”. The reader will notice the shift of “suitable” from the journal to the paper. Speaking of Relativity in action! I *cannot* honestly take as true Mrs. Plonski’s oral statement, as that would mean that the *PHYSICAL REVIEW* no longer takes seriously its own name! Nor can I consider it possible that either she or some other single individual at *PHYSICAL REVIEW* would undertake the responsibility of not sending up to the Review Committee *every* submission! I *cannot but conclude* that she uttered the first excuse she could think of! If the *PHYSICAL REVIEW* acted as Mrs. Plonski stated, one is fully justified to wonder as to the exact meaning of the word *REVIEW* in the title of this most highly esteemed bona fide scientific journal!: If after only seventy to eighty years a “scientific” theory is so well “established” as to need no reviewing, how did we dare review Ptolemy’s theory after *fourteen* centuries? Wasn’t that theory *at least equally well* “established” during all that period? Without Copernicus, there would have been no Newton, whose theory *was* reviewed after it also was well “established” for more than two hundred years before we arrived at relativity! What I mean is that without those earlier reviews, *there would today be no relativists around!* Therefore, will the kind gentlemen at *PHYSICAL REVIEW* be kind enough to tell the world on what grand projects they think they would be spending their precious time today, had they somehow been born *in the absence* of those earlier reviews of science? Einstein, by the *conscious* decision to write x for the *correct* x_G , performed a *now all too evident deception*, by which he “produced” the relativity of time fully in “a cat from a hat” fashion; *not* merely to the great amazement of the world, but *also* to the satisfaction of formal “Science”! And the rest, as they say, is history!

(d) So here is some more of it: In February 1988 I appealed to Dr.s Penzias and Hohenberg of the AT&T Bell Labs to whom I sent a copy of my book *PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI* and of the

aforementioned paper, requesting that *in the interests of Science upon their honor* either produce refutation of my findings, or failing that, undertake all proper steps. On June 24, 1988, having in the meantime received no proper response as per request from the aforementioned gentlemen, I sent a letter to Dr. S. Hawking at the University of Cambridge, England, informing him of the above, along with a copy of my book. Even he did not answer! In the Fall of 1987, I hand-delivered a copy of my book mentioned above to the proper office of the New York Public Library. Some months passed. I telephoned and was told that there had ensued a serious debate in the Library, splitting the Acquisitions Committee as to whether or not they should keep the book, **offered as a gift!** More months passed. Eventually, Mrs. Juanita S. Doares (Associate Director, Collection Management and Development), sent me the following letter dated April 27, 1988: "Thank you for your offer of *Principia Physica Universi*. We are, however, returning the book to you under separate cover. It is the requirement of the Science and Technology Research Center's collection policy to add only those books to the collection whose scientific merit we could reasonably be expected to evaluate. Since we are not scientists, we have to rely on reviews in scientific literature, and we could locate no review of your book in the scientific literature that we regularly consult to build our collections. We regret any disappointment and hope that you understand our position. Thank you for considering us."

(e) The Reader can now assess how the scientific establishment works: The *PHYSICAL REVIEW* does *not* act as a *Review* of established knowledge, but rather as a *Preview* of knowledge yet eventually to come [yet, solely in further support of established dogma, the cynic will be tempted to conclude!] at it is there that researchers race to get proof of their priority over new submissions and findings. The top brass of Science *refuses* to acknowledge work *they* have not ordered! An independent worker producing knowledge upsetting established dogma is *not* answered, even when he appeals to their scientific and personal honor! The Libraries are forbidden to keep books, even offered as free gifts, that do not obtain the imprimatur from on high. The public has *no* right to be informed of the Truth³⁴ on matters of the very

³⁴ The distinguished astronomer Professor Fred Hoyle on p. 416 of his *Astronomy and Cosmology, A MODERN COURSE*, [W. H. Freeman and

greatest importance in the Universe! “Democracy”, however, “works”! Long live the slaves—on whose flesh “WE” feast!

(f) Faced with this situation, I did not fail to do my duty as a citizen of the World: On April 21, 1987, I sent an 8-page, about 3900-word Press Release/Public Announcement to all corners of Science-related News Media. The response was meagre to say the least. Science editors too, as all News editors, are well taught what to inform the world about! News that upset the standing

Co, San Francisco (Library of Congress Cat. No: QB 43.2.H69—520—74-28441), ISBN: 0-7167-0351-3] states: “We now know that the difference between a heliocentric theory and a geocentric theory is one of relative motion only, and that such a difference has no physical significance. but such an understanding had to wait Einstein’s theory of gravitation in order to be fully clarified”! The good professor seems to forget that the difference between the two theories is *not* due to the perception of “relative motion only”, as that is understood in relativity theory, but to the *revolution of the Earth about its axis* [that, in addition, is *inclined* relative to the plane of revolution about the Sun], *which is a totally other matter*. If the Earth, as does the Moon to it, presented always the same face to the Sun, both things on Earth and our perception of the universe, *if we could still exist under such a condition, would have developed totally differently!* Besides, there is indeed a huge energy difference between a heliocentric and geocentric system that Einstein’s theory *completely ignores*: Whereas the potential energy of the Sun-Earth system, being the product of (force)×(distance), remains the same, regardless of which is taken to be the attracting mass at the center, the kinetic difference is vast: Seen from the Earth, the Sun performs one revolution per *day*: seen from the Sun, the Earth performs one revolution per *year*: So, the respective kinetic energies stand in the ratio of 4.44×10^{10} ; about which, relativity theory is totally mute, and the professor does *not* inform his students in his relativity advertising textbook! Is this a matter of “relative motion only”. and is it really true that “such a difference has no physical significance”? And *what* indeed “had to wait Einstein’s theory of gravitation in order to be fully clarified”? That the above ratio is insignificant? Or “clarified” was only the way to *hide* the Truth? Can it be that the possession of one dollar and the possession of 44.4 billion dollars is only a matter of “relativity”? Why doesn’t the noted astronomer first ask the multibillionaire whether he would be willing to exchange places with a pauper before delivering his lecture on “relativity”? In his novel *The Black Cloud*, the professor mentions the *occasional* reception of messages about *proof* of the existence of a (*the*) Superior Intelligence; that are, however, never verified! After comprehending the way of the professors, one understands who truly are that *maniacally suppress* the messages, drowning them in *their* relativistic noise!

world-order are *not* allowed to get through, on pains of immediate dismissal. That, however, does not mean that my findings were not leaked through to all people of high science. I, too, had seen to it, by contacting them directly, across America, Europe, Asia. In 1995 I finished writing two more books, the 745-page "*REALITY, TRUTH, FAITH AND REASON*" (Athens, ISBN: 960-85044-1-4) and the 150-page "*CONTRA PHILISTINES AND SYCOPHANTS, OR FALSCHERGÖTTERBESCHÄMUNG*" (Athens ISBN: 960-850441-2-2). Again I sought reputable publishers. I found none. I delivered copies of these two books to a professor, who visiting me some years later announced that he had an interesting book to show me. I awaited his arrival with anticipation. He produced the second of the above two books! At my exclamation of surprise he answered "of course, and a *very* interesting book, too! But you know, George, even professors have second mortgages on their homes! Why don't you start by sending a paper on your re-analysis of the Michelson-Morley experiment to *NATURE*?" I replied that I was not about to start that game again. He assured me that it was his belief that this time it would be published. Without, out of tact, pressing him to produce reasons for that belief of his, I replied that talking about the *intelligent* structure of the Universe *cannot* reasonably be made without all due reference to the Intelligence that produced it, and that I would *not* be side-tracked to abandoning *direct* reference to Him; that all I had to say had essentially been said, and it was the responsibility of the world scientists either to refute the arguments, analysis, contents, and conclusions of my first book, or to admit them in public! Some years later, he sent me a copy of the article by Steven Weinberg in the *NEW YORK REVIEW* (see F/note 2, p. 15, above), in which the author admits to "even when physicists will have gone as far as they can go, when we have a final theory, we will not have a completely satisfying picture of the world, because we will still be left with the question 'why?' ... Quantum mechanics is the one part of our present physics that is likely to survive intact in any future theory, but there is nothing logically inevitable about quantum mechanics; I can imagine a universe governed by Newtonian mechanics instead. So there seems to be an irreducible mystery that science will not eliminate", and later to "... although I really don't believe in a cosmic designer, the reason that I am taking the trouble to argue about it is that on balance the moral influence of religion has been awful". There are many ways to say a thing you want said. So, the latter quotation is a *clear* confession of an *atheist* stating his *unbe-*

lief in God. A God who is not *the* Designer, quite simply is not *the* God. If you believe that the Universe has come about without Design, you simply do *not* believe in *the* God! When even Nobel laureates speak as Steven Weinberg, the responsibility is not entirely theirs, even as you reasonably expect particularly of them to be leading the world in the most pregnant thinking, and not merely to hold a prize for achievement in a *narrow* field of endeavor: Religion has been around far far longer than Nobel laureates, and it has been formed gradually by people as ignorant of the great questions as their fellow men. From their sayings and examples you, we all, Nobel laureates too, may only extract and keep what passes the *most austere critical judgment, nothing* more (or else we too fall victim to thus perpetuated past ignorance)! *All* the rest, even when taught as if from on high, is nothing more than *human* talk. Alas, when it comes to religion, even the Nobel laureates speak practically as do all ignoramuses! They have *not* stopped to see, which is *their* responsibility, where Reality *obliges Science and Religion to come together!* We all speak from the surplus of our inner selves. The first answer *we must* give is *where our own intelligence came from*, for if on the whole the World is senseless, to be consistent with this sort of “philosophy”, we owe it to ourselves to admit that we first, *if* we retain some shreds of honor, *must* shut up, for the sufficient reason of thus preventing the latest crop of nonsense, that *we* produce by talking, to pile upon that already produced! Therefore, that Nobel laureates continue to research and to talk is a tacit admission that the world they accuse as nonsensical in fact belies exactly that their statement! With this first lesson firm in their minds, the Nobel laureates owe it to themselves to submit *all* their statements to the Lydian touchstone of *objectivity*, which requires as prime admission that hypotheses set down as first principles are *not* objective natural hard facts, but themselves subject to the *most austere critical examination*. What do we use as standards? *Objective hard natural facts!* *No one* can deny that Newtonian gravity *is* such a fact, for the *sufficient* reason that *no one* has produced an alternative natural frame of reference in which Newtonian gravity is unknown! **Newton’s Law is a hard natural fact, not a theory!**³⁵ **As such it**

³⁵ We *must* once for all understand that the modern use of the Greek term “theory” differs drastically from its genuine meaning: It de-

deserves far more attention than *all* theories combined! The Nobel laureates of physics, have tacitly decided to reverse this natural order, and to believe even Newtonian gravity as inferior to man-made theories! Had they not done so, they would

rives from “θέαν ὁρῶ”, meaning “I look at a view (= *examine* what I see)”. If we then desire to *understand* what we see, we must examine *minutely* what we see, and restrict ourselves to a *meaningful* presentation of our findings, according to how well tied together what we see, namely, the *hard natural facts*, are. Therefore, θεωρία = theory ought only to mean the “*meaningful* presentation of our findings according to how well tied together the *hard natural facts truly are*” We, before exhausting our minutest examinations, *constructed narrow aprioristic statements*

(such as the principle of conservation of mass; the principle of conservation of energy; the *mere hypothesis, elevated to the status of stiff Law*, of the constancy of the velocity of light; the idea of the *uniform everywhere* mass density of the Universe, to the extent that we reject horrified the *possible need for a different* mass distribution; the idea that light is on the one hand energy, but on the other is massless, forgetting that we comprehend and define energy in terms of mass, length and time, and therefore energy divorced from mass is totally meaningless!; the idea that the *perfect* void possesses gravitational energy!; the idea that the *found expanding* universe may perhaps re-collapse, without giving a single thought to how the light, begun to be sent out from the first instant of expansion, is going to be recalled when the universe re-collapses, to the extent that renowned astronomers are horrified at the demand that *light finally be given all honors that it deserves*, pitifully degrading the present status of what they have the temerity to call “Science” by asking me how I dare to speak of such things and call to account the so-called “experts” *none* of whom has had the *moral and intellectual courage* to ask for the license and intellectually obligatory Law by which such propositions as *they* put forward and adopt must be revered by all as the absolute criteria by which Nature must be judged!; the idea of a unified four-dimensional spacetime, or an even-more-dimensional “space”, forgetting that the simplest “two-dimensional” x-t diagrams exist *only on paper* as a vehicle may *only* travel along the x- axis while the time may *only* be measured along the t- axis, *and there is nothing natural that can step off these two axes*, to find itself on some point of the paper off the x- and t- axes, which *are not at all like the real* two-dimensional x- and y- axes that leave free a walker to go *anywhere* on the *real* two-dimensional plane; and so on!),

put them together as we willed, thus constructing “theories”, which we subsequently determined to test for veracity in Nature, and then had the temerity to insist saying that it is *Nature that obeys or does not* this or that “theory”! People who do not understand why the backdrop of the night sky is black, mere specks of some seventy kilograms of *weak* flesh,

have stood up and taken the challenge of re-examining the full consequences of Newton's Law, as I proposed they do. Where I am shown *hard-factually* wrong, I *shall* stand corrected. Where such showing is not produced, what I [*not* the "I" of an egoist, but that of a *witness!*] have stated stands: Even if contrary to all theories put together! Because theories are just theories, *not* objective hard natural facts! It is impossible that between 1986 when I presented the analysis of Newton's Law and 1999 when Weinberg published his article in the *NEW YORK REVIEW*, nothing reached him as a result of my strenuous efforts and challenges brought to the attention of the world academic community. Not a mere scientific needle falls down, the noise of which these people fail to hear! Therefore, that Weinberg does not include the relativity theory in those that are likely to survive intact, but can imagine instead a universe governed by Newtonian mechanics, as per the first quotation mentioned above, is coming as close as I have ever seen a Nobel laureate admit, without stating it openly, that my analysis of Newton's Law stands! But then, as all Laws do, so also Newton's Law poses most starkly the question of *its* Lawgiver. Weinberg does *not* discuss how in a senseless universe Newton's Law along with *all* its consequences got established! This does *not* pass the criterion of the *most austere critical judgment!* The Nobel laureate showed himself shorter than expectations! An *unneeded* personal self-sacrifice upon the altar of Atheism, the current, cruelest, insatiable of flesh, souls and spirits of *all* his faithful, and most ungrateful God of those calling themselves "WE"! It is said that peoples deserve their governments. I ask *all* the Nobel Laureates: Do they judge themselves to be deserving the "God" *they* worship?

§113. All this brings us, alas, back for yet another look at it to the question surrounding Einstein's two blunders, the first being the belief that an observer in motion may continue to consider himself as the central source of the *same one* light front expanding about him, and the second that he mixed the x_{if} and $x_{O'}$ as a single x , that permitted the relativity theory to advance: If the

have the temerity to order a universe some fifty orders of magnitude larger how to behave in order to please their psychological insecurities! This is *not* mere temerity, it is what the Greeks called *ἀττην*, namely, infatuation caused by delusion produced in the effort to forget the guilty rashness!

first can at all be forgiven (which in itself *is a questionable proposition!*) was the second a conscious, and if so was it a *deliberate* deception, or was it only an ordinary (though in view of its consequences a *thoroughly extraordinary*) blunder? Which of the two questions, these *only two* options, is the less devastating to the father of relativity? As I have already indicated, I prefer to choose the second, modified only in order to make it *less* devastating to him: Such was Einstein's own desire to produce the "result" of the relativity of time that he committed the blunder in honest innocence [to the extent, of course, that atheism can at all be called innocent while it *refuses* to calculate anywhere near the *exact* probability of the world being scientifically investigable in the absence of the Creating Logos]³⁶! Although he used the equations of §110 (p. 187) to produce the "Lorentz" transformations, his mind was already transfixed on the idea that "all" (at least, the physical "all") is relative. So, he did not watch out to ensure that his use of (x, t) and (ξ, τ) was indeed legitimate throughout. What is surprising is that he did not realize it for another almost fifty years! So committed, we (being merciful) *must* conclude, was his transfixion on relativity, as indeed is of all his followers. But at least since 1987 the atheists no longer have *any* excuse. If in 1905, Einstein's paper met with total incomprehension and its publication was permitted despite the two blunders [for in the opposite case, we can only have the greatest intellectual conspiracy in the history of humanity committed in full earnest right from the start by the editors colluding with the author!], and, unbelievably, between 1905 and 1987 nobody caught them, in 1987, upon the previous incomprehension was compounded the *additional great burden of naked conscious and deliberate deception!!!* So, now, since 1987 *by the latest*, we live in the Shameful Age of Deception, pure and simple! If in 1987 I was wrong in explaining the above, it should have been very easy for the "experts" at *PHYSICAL REVIEW*, and all those others to whom I since wrote, to point it out. *They did not!* They *all* refused publication, using ruses and silence! "Scientific" atheism is a far more squarely dishonest proposition, for the weight of "Science" it purports to carry, than is all the

³⁶ See my pertinent discussions in *ΘΕΟΥ ΘΕΣΙΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΠΟΔΕΙΞΙΣ*, Athens 2004, ISBN: 960-85044-3-0, and *ΛΟΓΩ ΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΙΣ ΑΙΩΣΙΝ ΑΝΑΦΟΡΑ*, ATHENS 2006, ISBN: 978-960-85044-5-5.

rest of atheism put together! And it must at all costs protect the sources of its "legitimacy", or it is doomed to die in the din of loud and cruel laughter!!!

§114. (a) In the olden times, Judaism was the only monotheistic religion; from it did Christianity and Mohammedanism spring. Israel was a nickname given to Jacob for wrestling/contending during a whole pitch-black night with somebody, whose face he never saw, taken to be none other than God! According to legend, there was no clear winner! An episode highly symbolic of the only worthy struggle a man can have during his entire life (in the legend likened to a pitch-black night) ending uncertainly. There are two kinds of contention: that of a Greco-Roman style, in which two *friends* contend in an honest effort to declare the best, yet *without bitterness or animosity*, and that in which the battle is for absolute supremacy of the one and the total destruction of the other. It is therefore with deep sorrow that one finds that it is exactly from within the Judaic tradition that the greatest polemical atheists have appeared, *without respectful consideration of that uncertain outcome*: these people have already decided, *before the night is over*, what the outcome is! Deep in the root of Einstein's psychological anxieties, the matter was about and against *the Personal God*, to Whom alone the final accounting is due! Compared to these people, the atheists from the Christian or Mohammedan camp are all light-weight, vacillating between the one extreme and the other, without solid reasons and determination guiding their entire lives! Lukewarm "Faith"; and an equally disgusting "Atheism"! Of which, the second alone in the Age of Deception wins; while the first, "tolerantly", *idiotically* only smiles!

(b). When people dedicate their lives to the study of the physical world, *only rarely* do they make a respectful allowance for the *possibility* that the world *is* a work of God, in which case, all they may say about it does, in fact, refer solely to Him! Instead, they rush, rather than examining the *plentiful* objective evidence the world itself offers, to produce "theories" within which they attempt to straight-jacket the world, and through it God Himself! The wise man starts from the *evidence*: Does he find some sense in it, some law casting its light on it all? He investigates further, building on *that* law, on the *wise* belief on the one hand that laws are *never* products of chance, and on the other that God, should He exist, would *not* throw laws around mindless of the outcome,

for if His laws collide, they would produce a God-given lawful anarchy, which is worse than total lawlessness!: Total lawlessness implies the God's nonexistence. The declaration of a God-given lawful anarchy only profanes Him! [With this in mind, do the indescribable lawgivers in these latter days, *with* the judges *and* all who vote them in office, comprehend at all the terrain in which *we all* conduct our "regular" business?]

(c). Einstein was not the first one to ignore these precepts. Formally, the spark was given with Newton's discovery of the Law of Gravitation. But his great contributions spanned many fields, which was probably the main reason he did not dig in further to see what was laid down *with* the Law of Gravitation. He *also* declared his faith in God—at least in the way the "good manners" of that era allowed. To those who came after him passing through the era of enlightenment, even that was too much! The days of *demanding* learning in physics, mathematics, and the properties and behavior of materials, as these are inevitably involved in building great technical works, was still in the future. Only when technical mathematics of great complexity was put down on paper did it occur to engineers to safeguard their statements by means of what they call "dimensional analysis": When an equation involves complicated left and right hands, it is imperative to ensure that you do not equate apples to maples! Non-engineers do not feel the same compunction: In that category fall all those advocating the "mass is energy" principle, including Einstein, Russell and all the rest. The "proof" of the principle given by Russell is a case in point: By *merely calling* (but *not*, as an engineer would, specifying it *completely*) the velocity of light the "natural unit" of velocity, he wrote $c = 1$, as if it were ever permissible to equate a physical quantity having the dimensions of $(\text{length}) \times (\text{time})^{-1}$ to the *dimensionless mere arithmetical* unit, by which "mathematical" method, he wrote $E = mc^2 = m$; thus ignoring the *inescapable hard physical fact* [a category of things of which he was so fond!] that, dimensionally, $|E| = |ML^2T^{-2}|$!

(d). This was not all of it. All the talk about "ether" and the *supposed* resolution of the matter provided by the Michelson-Morley experiment was, as we already have seen in Ch. 18, a *badly stated and "resolved" riddle!* It was not realized that although the interferometer was constructed as a two-dimensional (in the x-y plane) instrument, as it was carried around on the surface of the

revolving globe it became *in fact a three-dimensional* (in the x-y-z space) instrument! Nor was it realized that the direction of the *total* motion in space of the instrument *had* to be involved *right from the start*. Nor was it realized that the mathematical analysis of the measurement *necessarily* based on the quantities $(c + v)$ and $(c - v)$, where v is the velocity relative to the ether of the instrument, and so also of the light source carried on it and of the mirrors *acting as secondary-reflecting light sources*, may *not* later be used as “proof” of an “explaining” theory that considers the light source as always at the center of an advancing light front on account of the fact that “the velocity of light is independent of its source” and accordingly such sums and differences are nonsensical! If so, the velocity c rather than the sums $(c \pm v)$ ought to have been used in the mathematical analysis *right from the start*; but then, neither the Michelson analysis of the experiment could be used, nor interference could be expected to be observed, as in fact it was not! But then also, the so-called FitzGerald contraction, *inescapably* involving that v , would be impossible to be written down, and Einstein *could not have sought nor found* such coordinate transformations that would fit that contraction! If v , as per special relativity theory, is immaterial in phenomena involving the motion of light, not only is its use within the theory proper *improper* as contradictory to its spirit, but it may not even be used as a prop of any theory that rejects it! In the *pure surrealist fashion* of the time, these *Obidian Metamorphoses* of the *Tales of Hoffmann* had the velocity of the interferometer relative to the *supposed but proven non-existent ether* turned into the velocity of *any two material* observers relative to each other, that was both involved and then removed from the scene, as the scenariographer thought the story should develop! None of all these has for one hundred years worried the Science “experts” one bit! The *fact* is that the sums $(c \pm v)$ retain their *full* meaning on account of the *facts* that (i) ordinary bodies *are* composed of light; (ii) the velocity of *free* light relative to them involves *exactly* those sums; (iii) the velocity of *free* light in space is constant everywhere in the expanding universe *only in fixed time*, due to the *particular distribution* of total matter in it seeing to that effect; (iv) the velocity of *free* light in space, *thus* being constant everywhere in the expanding universe in fixed time, *varies universally only with respect to its age*, and (v) the *fact* that the *seeming ordinary* matter *also* partakes in the ex-

pansion with topical velocity $v = (r/R)c$, where r is the topical distance from the immobile center of the universe; in *full* accord with the Hubble finding, that is due to *this* particular structure of the universe! As all the “experts” together started considering the universe with the blinders of their arbitrary hypotheses rather than a *close* examination of Newton’s Law, they naturally could *not* conceive of the universe as an *organized* whole; *nor* would they, unwilling, as they are sworn to be, to confess the *unavoidable* presence of the Organizer! As none of all these comes out of their theories, the “experts” prefer to stick to their *barren* theories, pretending ignorance of the *complete* operation of Newton’s Law, *that exposes all their theories as totally useless!!!* When the astronomers refuse to accept the *hard* fact that the universe *always* extends to the *ever advancing front of the first light thrown out of the central point at which Creation took place*, a front that naturally no physical observer can possibly ever see; and when they also refuse to consider that *ordinary “astronomical” matter truly exists beyond the outer limit of every conceivable astronomical observation* [on account of the *hard* fact that the age of the universe sets a limit to *all* we see, as the first part of the universal age was “spent” while *every* (and so also the farthest) observable body traveled to the site at which it is *now* observed, and the second part of the universal age was “spent” while *light* from the site of *every* body observed reaches us *here and now*]; this *entirely new* body of ideas cannot but leave them totally speechless. One may *not* thus be surprised to see it written [as Prof. Edward Harrison of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst wrote to me on Sept. 15, 1988] that, “[u]nfortunately, to make an impact, a scientist nowadays must offer modest contributions and not revolutionary ideas”!!! With eyes shut for the fear of the *full* impact of light, it is natural that all minds, too, fed by such eyes, shall be shut tight in the face of Light, and only in the Darkness will they accept to conduct all their “regular” business! In the Age of Darkness you may only expect an *Unbrave New World!* *This* World does now its future write and seal! The rest *cannot* but silence be!

22

THE TRUE
SIGNIFICANCE
OF
NEWTON'S LAW

§115. (a) In my efforts to bring about an *honest* dialogue with the “scientific” authorities on the *real* issues that truly matter, I have found that we truly talk past each other: Suppose the art experts talking about *Mona Lisa*, developing theories about its merits and demerits, such as: is it a piece of art consciously conceived and executed, or is it a piece of chance that somehow came into being curiously, solely in order only to befuddle us? And suppose that they came to support the second position. Are the “non-experts”, the millions that go to the museums to admire the work when exhibited, truly to believe the “experts”? We all, expert and non-expert have heard of somebody called Da Vinci and his “alleged” association with *Mona Lisa*. Are the “non-experts” obliged to adopt the “expert” position that the allegations are all “old women’s tales”? We all have seen lesser artists trying to produce lesser works. Are we to dismiss the possibility that *Mona Lisa* was truly produced by a greater artist? What finally is the real significance of *Mona Lisa* as a *piece of chance* that the “experts” feel justified to spend their entire *comfortable* lives, ultimately at the expense of the “non-experts”, and to press upon the society at large the belief that *Mona Lisa* is a purposeless piece of chance—or a piece that has always been there, unworthy of further investigation, except as the “experts” decide and the “non-experts” are called to foot the bill of the investigation? Here comes a “conscientious objector” who challenges this system of *ulti-*

mately blind faith in barren theorizing, which is what this whole debate about *Mona Lisa* truly is, and suggests that, instead, we take a real close view of the work, and find out what *it* truly says about itself. Ordinary conscientious objectors are, society has decided, to be respected for their differing positions, *if proven* to be honest, even though their objections ultimately expose to opprobrium only themselves and affect only minimally the rest of society. This one is different, no less honest (he has put some at least thirty three years of his life so far to what he says), *he insists and begs that the issue be given the fullest possible examination it deserves for the sufficient singular reason that it affects not only his own soul but the soul of everyone!* Why is he not listened to? Are all those souls less worthy of real attention, than the single soul of an ordinary solitary objector whose view is protected? What *must* the legal experts decide? Surely, this *could, if not would*, bring about a *real* revolution in thought; but if this should come about, will it be for the better or the worst, and whose? Mustn't the legal experts decide that too, even on automatically understood long-established democratic tradition, if no written law yet exists for the lack of sufficient wisdom on the part of the lawgivers? In a democratic world, citizens are protected against the abuses of petty criminals. *Who ultimately guards us all against the far more weighty abuses of the guards?* Is it really the foundation of our society so shaky that it may not even be touched for its betterment, or only the high chairs and the balance of those sitting upon them, for the sake of which, as Prof. Edward Harris put it, "[u]nfortunately, to make an impact, a scientist nowadays must offer modest contributions and not revolutionary ideas"?

(b) Let me exhaust all allowances in favor of my opponents. Let's accept the view, as I have some clear indications from my private correspondence with some of them and as I have already suggested above, that we use the same terms but do not apply to them the same meaning: When a mathematician expresses a *y*-variable in terms of a series of x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots -variables, he *may*, staying fully legal within the mathematical domain of thought, conceive of all those variables in a *pseudo*-geometrical sense, thinking them all as each perpendicular to all others at once, and call them all "dimensions" of the *same* kind. Mathematical physicists have adopted this mathematical mode of thought, but have *forgotten* that the fourth "dimension" already, called "time" is of a

totally other kind, as no one can walk as he pleases on, say, the (x_1, t) plane, but solely along its axes, with the added constraint that he may only "walk" along the t -axis unidirectionally and at a prefixed rate called aging! All theories notwithstanding! And we know and therefore, we *may not*, as physicists, condone the belief in the existence within Natural Physics of additional "dimensions" and treat them all, except the three *true* Euclidean geometrical dimensions, as if they were just such! This is the understanding of "dimensions" as used by mathematicians and mathematical physicists and the objections to them, that *may not* be ignored when using them. The use of the term in engineering is different: All three Euclidean dimensions are summed up to one called "length", another is matter and it is called "mass", another is ordinary unidirectional time and it is called simply "time"; others are force, electrical charge, temperature, pressure, etc. Of all these, *only three are taken to be the fundamental ones*: mass, length and time, in engineering dimensional analysis represented respectively by M, L, and T. All other ones, to the extent possible are referred back to them. E.g., as energy is the product of (mass) \times (length) $^2\times$ (time) $^{-2}$, its dimensions are $|E| = |ML^2T^{-2}|$. The reason for this engineering practice is obvious: That *never dissimilar things be equated!*: that the left and right sides of equations *always have the same dimensionality*. Whereas for a mathematician dimensionless are only the arithmetical zero and the geometrical point of zero size, for an engineer dimensionless also are *all* numbers, because they have *no physical but only mental* existence: The cgs and the British system differ only in the sizes of the units they use, related by numerical dimensionless ratios, because the physical quantity they both measure, be it mass, or length or time *is* the same. But energy as shown above, is *not* the same as mass, and for this reason *it is a blunder* to equate mass to energy, as the relativists, Einstein, Russell and all the rest do! As also, *it is a blunder*, committed even by Einstein in his 1916 paper, to equate the ratio G/c^2 to a pure number and ignore the *hard fact* that, dimensionally, G and c^2 are *not* equivalent, in which case alone (that is, *if* they were) would it be correct to equate the G/c^2 [Einstein used K for G] ratio to a dimensionless number, as we already have mentioned (p. 177).

(c) With these facts in mind, the ways a mathematician, a physicist and an engineer view the world *are fundamentally different*. And *the strictest is the engineer's!* He alone goes to prison

for a failure of his constructions. Those others can get away scot free with a dry “sorry, mea culpa”! Those others, can speak of the Universe as a “mystery”, can imagine theories about it, speculate endlessly about it. A self-respecting engineer may *not!*: Because, *the Universe is already found to function under an inviolable, unquestionable Law*, ignoring which can bring about disaster and death! An engineer knows that *particularly natural laws are not mysteries, theories or speculations, but things deserving to be absolutely respected; or else, disaster shall for sure ensue; he also knows that something governed by a universal law may not contain additional laws in conflict with it; or else, that something is not stable, it is not even constructible!* Sufficiently by the fact that the Universe is the longest natural “thing” under Law, it is *only natural* that it be subjected to an *engineering* examination to see how it is constructed, how it develops, how the Law came about, what its purpose is, who its master-builder is. who its master-owner is! For an engineer, these are *not* empty questions, but *the* matters of real physical substance! Theoreticians, astronomers, professors of physics and theologians are chagrined that here comes an engineer who dares enter and examine what they so far have regarded “their” domain that *they* have agreed to split into a physical and a theological part and each be happy in his own piece of land. No more!: An engineer *is duty bound* to look at the whole: *Physics and Theology combined*. After all, were it not for Nature, that *is* the cause both of us and the Science of Physics, there would not even be any talk about Theology either! We are *both matter and Spirit*, and are by our very nature bound to pay due honor to *both, as each deserves!* *Neither* physicists *nor* Theologians have so far had the *courage and honesty needed* to do that. The time has come for an engineer to apply his tools of trade, offer the world his view of things and only afterwards to be judged about the success of his undertaking. After all, it was not for nothing that what is before us all was called *Universe*. Let us therefore take a *good truly universal* look at it! Even if only as much as the name-givers were wrong, that too is a matter for determination, no longer for speculation! Regardless of the chagrin of parties used to the old modes of thinking!

§116. Structural engineering refers to both statics and dynamics. These are the main examinable features of the Universe too. And this *cannot* be just fortuitous! The old view was that the Uni-

verse was totally static. Then, it was found that, being subject to Newton's Law, it must also gravitate upon itself, towards what *must* be its center. Then, it was found that it also expands! At once: a static structure, gravitating and swelling up! Seemingly conflicting views of the world. What gives? How do the seemingly conflicting Laws of Newton and Hubble come together? There is more: In ancient times Democritus spoke of the atom, the *least possible unsplitable block* of matter. When modern chemistry was in its infancy, the Democritean atom was taken to be the chemical atom, later found to be not at all unsplitable. Atomic fission, however, caused us to forget the Democritean atom, to forget, that is, that *ultimate simplicity in Nature demands just that one only kind of atom, out of which all other particles and atoms are built*, [as a result of which, we now swim in a veritable soup of so-called fundamental particles which we only observe but cannot disentangle let alone explain at all]. Just as it demands a principle of least action, that was first discovered but dimly explained by Leibnitz, re-discovered by Maupertuis who saw much deeper into it, but whose arrogance was ridiculed by Voltaire, while both were in the Court of Frederick the Great. The mathematical features of the principle caused the "experts" to neglect its physical significance; until the *actual physical unit of least action* was re-discovered by Planck; who, however, did *not* associate it with the principle, labeled it h , and rather unwillingly made it the starting point of modern quantum theory, which is nothing if not called upon to study the physics of the ultimate least quanta, or Democritean atoms, though yet not recognized as such! The modern failure (or else *willful self-deception*) of scientists to see things clearly has been such as to associate the *physical* least action unit with the so-called "uncertainty principle", which under this *misnomer* hides the *hard fact* that the h is involved in *all* problems even of chemical kinetics, as well as the photoelectric phenomenon, that have *absolutely nothing* to do with any uncertainty, and *everything* to do with the *physical need for the presence of the least amount of action* [action being the product of (energy) \times (time) = (momentum) \times (length)] or *exact multiples of it necessary for any* natural process to proceed; which makes obvious the close relationship of the Democritean atom and the least action that is required for it to partake in any kind of reaction. Unquestionably, the *Universe* is the place where the least and the most come together under a *uni-*

fied least set of non-conflicting Laws that overlook nothing, entangle nothing, keep everything clear and unconfused. How all this takes place will be the subject of this and the next chapter.

§117. (a) Regarding the claim of a still remaining inaccuracy of Newton's Law showing up especially in the issue of planetary orbital precession, this *is* clear: Even if the Law is "highly accurate but not exactly accurate", as it is said, because it is a Law of *clearly universal* applicability, *all* universal issues *can* be examined through it in a *corresponding* "highly accurate if not exactly accurate" manner, leaving it for later to see what inaccuracies [*if* there still be any left in light of the remarks already made above regarding the proper internal structure of the Law and its dependence on the Law of separations acting mutually between any two gravitating bodies] this examination will reveal—*if*, that is, despite it all, Newton's Law truly turn out not to be the real thing!

(b) Given the dimensions of force, mass and length, which we find to satisfy *every* aspect of mechanics and dynamics, and which we therefore may never ignore, we *cannot* but accept it as a hard physical fact that Newton's Law recognizes the physical dimensions of the gravitational constant to be *no* other than (mass density)⁻¹×(time)⁻². It is clear already that this conclusion *is totally free* of all considerations relating to the exact magnitude of separation, as here involved are *only the integral corresponding universal quantities*. It follows that, *equally clear of such considerations and all other possible objections shall also be all conclusions based on this universally solid stepping stone*, on which it is written that

$$G = a / (d \times t^2), \quad (21)$$

where *a* is a yet to be determined clearly numerical physically dimensionless constant [I still feel forced to use all these defining adjectives, that by now ought to be automatically understood, in view of the reservations expressed from certain quarters still having, or *merely pretending to be having* difficulties accepting this *so far unused* analytical tool] which makes it *incontrovertible* that *just as G is a universal constant, so too necessarily is the right-hand side of this equation!* But first, *what* sort of universal constant truly is G? Only as it relates to the two-body gravitational interactions, even those involving as one body *just one* fundamental photon and as the other body the *rest of the universe*, or *also* as it relates to the *one undivided Uni-verse in the fullest possible sense?* How important

this question is becomes clear the moment we realize that since G already applies to the interactions, *if another*, call it G', of the *same* physical dimensionality but different numerical value applied to the entire universe, to avoid serious trouble, the Mathematical and Logical Consistency *would require that an additional Law should exist determining* which of the two values applied in each particular case! This *is* incontrovertible, unless Simplicity orders that the two G-s be not only dimensionally but also numerically identical; which makes them not two, but just only one! If Simplicity do not so order, this shall become obvious at once through some inconsistency the moment we try to apply the already known value of G to the whole Universe! [Keeping in mind specifically the arguments just presented, and preparing the way for what follows, it is of the utmost importance to remember Plato's *always standing* challenge: "Let anyone find fault in and improve upon what we here present, and the *friendly* wreath of victory shall be his"! Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity *are unforgiving mistresses that never miss a step!* Commit one mistake and a *myriad other ones* follow! Overlook an *important* detail, and wherever the road takes you, whatever you believe about your findings, it shall *not* be the Truth! Do we doubt the application even of Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity? We can only find out their power *if we put them to the test, against the wall, by calling their bluff!* But it goes without saying that, *we cannot test them without at the same time also testing our own logical consistency and honesty!* On the road we now walk, *the stakes are so high that we may not be lenient even towards ourselves!*] And now second, *what must the d and t be* that make the right-hand side of the above expression a *universal* quantity? *Incontrovertibly*, for the product $d \times t^2$ to be a universal quantity, the d and t *must themselves be* universal quantities, and no other than D (the *instantaneous average mass density* in the universe, this in order *not to pre-judge* the questions of time variability and uniformity of mass distribution but keep our minds open to *all options and finally to the only one correct mass distribution*, something the present fashionable cosmological considerations have *not* allowed for!) and T (the *variable/instantaneous age of the universe*) respectively! *No other* mass density and time period can be suggested of still greater *universal* significance! Therefore, *anything else, any lesser* consideration of these facts and *any alteration* of these two items smacks

of prejudice! Such being the hard facts, we are *not* free, as long as we assert that we are seeking the *objective* Truth to prejudice the issue! Insertion of *any* prejudice, however well hidden, will *not* be for Truth's sake, but for biasing the works in favor of an unconfessed outcome! Thus *here, principally here, all seekers of Truth (that is nothing if it is not objective), must remain uncompromising!*

(c) Which leads to the *incontrovertible* hard-fact conclusion that *every gravitational interaction in the entire universe recognizes and is regulated by the universal effect of each and both D and T, hiding as per the above relationship within G. But equally in other words, Newton's universal Law proves that there are two universal measures, of total mass density the one, and time the other, that despite their being dimensionally independent of each other, by means of the above combination are nevertheless directly involved in every gravitational interaction everywhere!* The importance of all this *cannot* be overemphasized! Physically, *nothing* is more fundamental!: The universality of G points to the *objective* existence of

$$G = \alpha / DT^2 \quad (22)$$

as an equally hard fact of Nature, an irrefutable universal Law, inextricably related with Newton's Law of gravitation. Now, remembering that $D = M/V$, we see at once that, the above expression also takes the form of

$$V = GMT^2 / \alpha, \quad (23)$$

which *incontrovertibly* permit *only eight* ways in which the ultimately *constant or variable* (again *not* prejudging the issue!) G, M, V, D and the *variable* T can be combined! E. g., if M and V are both constant, D *cannot* be variable. If G is constant, then necessarily $D \approx T^{-2}$; and if in addition M is also constant, then $V \approx T^2$. When each of the eight cases is written down and its cosmological consequences are fully examined, it is found that seven of them *must* be rejected as either internally inconsistent or as not in accordance with the world out there. The one case we *cannot* reject, and thus the *one and only* possibility that remains both internally consistent and externally compatible with both Newton's Law and all other properties of this Uni-verse observed as a whole, is the case of constant G and M. The constancy of G and M thus results from strict logical analysis and the *incontrovertible objective* physical evidence; it is *not* introduced prejudicially a priori to cloud our understanding.

(d) Thus is it found that, the *correct* option of constant G and

M in accordance with the last expression above makes it *incontrovertible* that, *as derived solely from Newton's Law of gravitation, and consistently with it, the Uni-verse expands smoothly and monotonically: its volume, having started from zero at zero universal age, increases with the square of its age!* Thus is it found that under constant G and M, Newtonian gravitation and universal expansion *are tied together* as the two sides of the same coin! *Incontrovertibly!* The universal expansion thus ceases to be mysterious, problematical, or incomprehensible except through relativity and Friedmannian considerations. It is mandated by none other than Newton's Law of gravitation under constant G and M, and it is verified out there by the work of Hubble! This issue, to which *no past theory has come anywhere close to giving us an answer*, the physical dimensional analysis of Newton's Law resolves *in practically no time for all time*; free of charge, except the fallen pride of those who for the sake of their own empty theorizing, rejected this cornerstone! *Every honest reader can now judge!*

§118. Now, *what* happened at zero universal age? And *can we be at all sure* of anything that *did* happen then?

– First, *we can be sure* that, consistent with the above, whatever happened happened *in totally free space as we understand it in the strictest sense!* Obtained *solely* from Newton's Law, *the above expression speaks only of the volume of the universe, NOT of space, NOR of "space"!* On the *Newtonian fact* that the entire universe was then confined in zero volume, *we can categorically state that the surrounding (and entire) space both then and always was/is free of everything physical (pertaining to mass, length and time)!* Beyond this, *we may not speculate on space!*

– Second, *equally categorically, we can therefore state that it was in free space* that the universe was set on its course, *subject only to its internally applicable laws operating smoothly from zero age!*

– Third, with the universe started on its course in free space *explosively or not* (of which in a moment), *also applicable from the start along with the above laws, we must take the law of conservation of (instantaneous) momentum!* It seems to me *inexplicable and suspect how totally this law has been overlooked* in relation to the expansion of the universe in the context of current theories!: It is clear that, unless a body *is given a physical push from outside*, it cannot get started on a translational motion! As *nothing was/is physical outside the universe, translational motion was/is out of the ques-*

tion! Therefore, *all* subsequent motion was obtained from *within* the universe, *with all impulse supplied from within, under the operation of this last law!*

– Fourth, as a direct consequence, *there was and remains a permanently static point* at which the Law of universal momentum took effect! *It is the point at which all (partial) momentum vectors together sum up to zero! This point is no other than the center of the universe! It is clear that Newton's Law establishes both an absolute spatial reference at the point of zero total momentum, and an absolute temporal reference at the zero age of the universe! Which sufficiently and incontrovertibly proves fallacious the entire theory of relativity, built on the explicit denial of the existence of absolute spatial and temporal reference! Einstein's effort to "show" Newton's Law a case of his relativistic "gravitation" [remember those five ad hoc assumptions] did not uncover his true greatest blunder, which was no other than starting his entire relativistic speculations! Further comment is not needed, except to say that, it is the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity that sweep clear the floor of so much twentieth century "science"! The rest must be silence!*

– Fifth, with the Universe in free space and the Law of momentum operating, if the Universe signaled its birth with a flash of light, as indeed it *must* have done, *necessarily*, that *first* light was broadcast as a *perfect* sphere! Do we wish to deny that *light was the first (and spherical) product of universal expansion?* Then, *we must take it as a fact that matter heavier than light traveled at first faster than light! That the velocity of light was not always limiting! I don't think that anything relativistic that is currently believed can be saved by taking this line when all relativity is now crumbling! The conclusion is inescapable: At first, the universe broadcasted the first light!*

– Sixth, the first light *necessarily at all times constitutes the spherical front of the expanding universe!* What happened in the beginning *cannot later be recalled!* Under the *continuous* operation of the Law of momentum, *nothing subsequent* can skew into aspherical the expanding front! [And it goes without saying that, we shall *never be able to see the front or anything that happened before a certain substantial age: First, in order to see the front, light must come back to us from the front, which is impossible, as it would require that the front, under the local application of the law of momentum, accelerate to a superluminal velocity simply in order to be able to send back to us some of its light! Second, we can only see as far as the ra-*

dus at which matter *had already reached* when light from it started back towards us: The age of the emission of light and the time light has since been in transit towards us *must sum up to the present age* of the universe! *Every current theory has missed these hard physical facts also!* Professors of physics and astronomy are shocked to see it written that their theories of universal re-collapse (that is *they* through them) are exposed for having failed completely to consider what *must* then happen to the light also, that as part of the *Uni*-verse *must also* reverse course!]

§119. (a) The sixth item just above permits us to express the universal volume in terms of the universal radius of the first-light front:

$$R = (3GMT^2/4\pi\alpha)^{1/3} \quad (24)$$

From this: First, we note the *cube of lengths to the square of time relationship, analogous to that already known* from Kepler's laws! Second, we obtain the velocity of expansion of the front of the universe, being no other than the velocity of first light:

$$c = dR/dT = (2/3)(3GMT^{-1}/4\pi\alpha)^{1/3} = 2R/3T, \quad (25)$$

showing directly the so-called "Hubble time" [namely, the time the universe *would* have taken to reach its present radius under the *assumption* of the present velocity of light being constant] to be none other than the 3/2 of the *true* present universal age! Third, we obtain the rate of deceleration of the universal expansion, that is no other than the rate of deceleration of the velocity of the first light:

$$\begin{aligned} d^2R/dT^2 &= -(1/3)(2/3)(3GMT^{-4}/4\pi\alpha)^{1/3} & (26) \\ &= -(1/3T)(dR/dT) \\ &= -(2/9)(R/T^2), \end{aligned}$$

that *cannot be due to any other cause than the field of universal gravitation*:

$$G = -GM/R^2 \quad (27)$$

producing

$$\alpha = 1/6\pi, \quad (28)$$

$$D = (6\pi GT^2)^{-1}, \quad (29)$$

$$D_{\text{now}} = 5.45 \times 10^{-30} \text{ gcm}^{-3} \text{ (} T_{\text{now}} = 12 \text{ billion years),} \quad (30)$$

$$R_{\text{now}} = 1.70 \times 10^{28} \text{ cm} = 18 \text{ billion light years}, \quad (31)$$

$$Rc^2 = 2GM, \quad (32)$$

$$M = 1.15 \times 10^{56} \text{ grams.} \quad (33)$$

$$\phi_F = GM/R_{\text{now}} = -4.514 \times 10^{20} \text{ cm}^2/\text{sec}^2 \quad (34)$$

$$\nabla^2\phi_F = -(8/3)\pi GD_{\text{now}} = -3.047 \times 10^{-36} \text{ sec}^{-2}. \quad (35)$$

While, in order to have the *same* velocity of light everywhere in the universe at constant age, it is necessary that the *same* field of gravity apply everywhere as at the universal front, which produces the *local* density as a function of the reduced local radius $\rho = r/R$:

$$d = (9\pi\rho GT^2)^{-1}. \quad (36)$$

(b) *Only some* of these findings are immediately recognized from another context: E.g., the Einstein-deSitter solution of general relativity, giving $6\pi Gt^2 d = 1$, but *only* for a universe of *vanishingly small* mass expanding with an *ever increasing* velocity; and the Schwarzschild radius $R_S = 2Gm/c^2$ of a black hole, here found to be applicable to the entire yet *expanding Uni-verse*! The numerical values of average mass density and total mass fall *within* an order of magnitude of our best present estimates, obtained with so much effort! From these numerical agreements it is concluded that the present estimates of universal age and universal mass are *not* in gross disagreement, though the question of the so-called “missing” mass is still vexing all astronomers cosmologists and theoreticians. As here found, Newton’s Law of gravitation *resolves completely* this issue also: *No* part of the universal mass fails to report in the Law: yet, *only* the mass up to the limit of maximum possible optical observation, as already discussed above (§118-Sixth, p. 216-7) is astronomically observable! If in the future the age of the universe is revised, so too will be the value of the total universal mass, yet *without* the slightest effect on the internal Logical congruence of all the other above findings based solely on Newton’s Law under constant G and M! Generally, a (central) observer observes an object at the present age T_2 as it was at the age T_1 and stood at a distance $r_1 = \rho R_1$; the quantities ρ , T_2 and T_1 being related by the expression

$$T_1 = T_2 (1 + \rho)^{-3/2}, \quad (37)$$

subject to the law of conservation of instantaneous momentum.

(c) But here, the “fate” of the Universe, that remains so much in doubt under all current theories, *is decided specifically*! The fact alone that the present procedure produces these values from no other than Newton’s Law under the above *tight* reasoning *is altogether remarkable to be fortuitous*! How then are we now to insist that, an only “highly accurate but not exactly accurate” law produces all these *exact* results? *How then, if general relativity is, as*

claimed, more accurate, has so completely failed to produce all these specific and unquestionable statements? And why has it not exceeded them in strictness and specificity? Why no other theory has produced anything close to these results? All questions that all honest thinkers must consider and rationally answer! Many scientists have discussed the need of a "strong" integral theory making strict specific predictions! Here, just such predictions obtain directly from Newton's Law; while it is to be doubted that any theory, sought in the manner of Hawking and Company, shall ever produce so "strong" and specific results! Plato would say: "Let anyone produce something better!" Let anyone pretend to be doing Science while ignoring Newton's Law and its twin Law of universal expansion already verified by Hubble, both now seen to demand and establish in unsurpassed strictness both a spatial and temporal absolute reference that demolishes the foundation of relativity theory! He cannot be any other than a mere pretender! Please note that it is not I that says so! It is only the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity! I only put all these down to show how truly simple things are in all their magnificence, that the official science of our century has missed totally! Why? Because it only gave lip service to the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity that exists out there! And so, it built itself on the arbitrary principle of the constancy of the velocity of light! Which, in view of the infinitude of dR/dT at $T = 0$, its present finite value, and the Hubble Law, cannot be other than variable! For only thus can the velocity of light be at all times both the maximum and limiting velocity in the universe. The principle of the constancy of the velocity of light is thus now shown to be an arbitrary human supposition intrinsically contrary to Newton's Law and the incontrovertible physical and cosmological evidence. But so too it is now shown that, all "science" based on that principle is, therefore, entirely false! But also, it is now shown that, light, for its being subject to the deceleration of gravity, consists of mass, or the other way around, that ordinary bodies consist of no other than material condensed light! The "mystery" of the Michelson-Morley experiment, if there was any mystery left, and the question of what light is, or what is the ultimate constitution of ordinary bodies thus all find their definitive answers.

(d) Nothing in the above considerations is soft or doubtful in Sciama's sense. The atheists themselves admit that despite our "advances", despite relativity and quantum mechanics (now, we

must say because of them) we still do *not* possess a comprehensive and certain theory of the universe. What is here presented constitutes the beginnings of just the hardest conceivable theory of the universe, indeed the *Law* of the universe finally freed of *all* human bias! We now see the structure of the universe and admire its simplicity and determinacy based on *Law, Natural Law, not* man-made “law”! All that we said before now find their natural explanation. The universe *indeed has* a center! It *indeed had* a beginning! *Indeed its volume* (not “space”) expands spherically, as there was/is nothing out there to prevent the first light from spherically going out of $R_0 = 0$ with $c_0 = \infty$! The first ever command given “let there be light” now finally acquires its proper significance! *It* was the *sufficient only proper* command needed to be given, and creation from the pure engineering viewpoint proceeded according to Plan, using a *single* kind of “brick”, a *single* kind of fundamental particle, that can be no other than the fundamental photon of about 10^{-65} g of mass (see §122b, p. 231)! Indeed, the Michelson-Morley experiment demands that *all* matter be comprised of nothing other than light! I need not go into further details.

(e) But also indeed, the above relationships permit us to test even the hypothesis of a young or old universe: since $c = dR/dT$ and $M = 3c^3TG^{-1}/4$, an age of, say, 6000 years requires that $M = 5.73 \times 10^{49}$ g, $R = 8.51 \times 10^{21}$ cm = 9000 light years, $D = 2.22 \times 10^{-17}$ g/cm³. Thus, unless the adherents of the notion of a very young earth can prove the validity of these figures, they *cannot* in good faith still hold fast to the notion of a young universe. If they are willing to give up that notion and accept instead an age of, say, 12 billion years, they will find the values given above on p. 204, that are all safely within an order of magnitude of what the atheists themselves have calculated to be the best estimates. If the creationists do so, they shall vastly be rewarded, as the carpet *is* pulled from under the atheists’ feet! Little did the latter expect, when they produced them, that their own estimates would come back to hunt them! For it can no longer be held that the numbers here produced are biased in any way! Nothing has been assumed that is not known as *basic* science; here in addition examined under a microscope of very much higher power, permitting the removal of all that does not fit! By the token by which Newton’s Law is a highly accurate natural Law (even if they still should insist that it is not accurate “absolutely”!), to the extent that even

Einstein felt he *had* to produce it even if only as a “first approximation” by way of *at least five assumptions added to all those he made before*, by that same token *they must also accept the equally highly accurate* (if “not absolutely” accurate to a corresponding measure) validity of the relationships given above! So, if the above relationships need at all some correction, it *cannot* be more than at best “second order”, by the “arguments” *they* use! *Nobody* can reject these relationships who *cannot* reject Newton’s Law and the intrinsically objective nature of the reasoning given above, yet insists on a theory that intrinsically *cannot* even touch the Simplicity of the solid relationships given above! This refers to the atheists. Because vis à vis the creationists, the question *is highly simplified: Why* do they insist on “worshiping” God only with all their heart, yet *refuse* to do so with *all* their intellect also? Do they trust it so little? *No* man-written Scripture is worth more than what the Holy God *by His own Hand* wrote in the Heavens above! Distrusting themselves, *in effect they join the atheists!*

(f) So, now, as you too Dear Reader speak of Truth, please let me ask you: can we ever reach It *while stubbornly ignoring these hard physical facts, made available to both the world “scientific” and “theological” communities, that have mutely ignored and suppressed them since 1985?* So much about their commitment to Truth, to Science, to the Cause of God! And they walk the Earth, *smiling, unashamed!* At which point, an honest man will surely ask: But *why* did/do they act so? The reason *is* clear: It is *not just* that the twentieth century science is thus shown to have diverted itself *fruitlessly and embarrassingly* to a dead end! Rather, it is its “*philosophy*” that stands exposed, having always claimed that nothing other exists than this present material but *ultimately senseless* universe! This “*philosophy*” [so-called by people completely ignorant of what it truly means to be a Φίλος τῆς Σοφίας, a Friend of Wisdom, or else they would *not* be talking of senselessness!] caused even Einstein not just to commit his *admitted* “greatest blunder”, but the *far far greater* blunder of *his entire relativistic scheme*, before which that other one now pales!: Because, examined closely, the above relationships prove *conclusively* that the physical-natural Laws observed to be obeyed by matter are *not* its properties!: Were they, the Laws [understood *solely as tangibly rational “things”,* products of the Purest Spirit, of Logos Himself!] too, came into being out of nothing at all some 12 billion

years ago! Consideration of just one example should suffice: Light and *all matter is shown* to be made up of fundamental photons. But the Law of its velocity (that *never caused any anxiety* to current "science" as to *how it can possibly apply forever constant!*) is now seen to depend by means of the Law of expansion not on the mass of the fundamental photon, but on the mass of, and its distribution in, the entire universe; and besides, on Newton's (now proven to be a true) constant and the age of the universe! The Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity of the above expressions show them to be *neither* of the fundamental photon *nor* of the universe as a whole as we have understood it up until now! The universe is *not* made up of mass, length and time, as science has so far claimed; but rather of G, mass, its *measured* age and Law! Without the latter, all other three *cannot* even stand, *cannot* produce one iota, *cannot* make themselves sensed! What we had thought was a mere proportionality constant is now shown to be a *fundamental* ingredient of the universe! While *length has no independent existence* as another "dimension" of the physical world, but is a *derived dimension dependent on those other three and the Law that connects them* ! While what we call physical time is *nothing other than the age of the universe*; and, as such, the latter has *not always* been around! The mere fact that what we thought was a mathematical proportionality constant (and of dubious nature at that) is now found to be fundamental shows that the "laws of nature" are *not just* properties of matter, but *Laws in the strictest sense of the word*, obeyed by the *entire universe from the fundamental photon on up!* Although we have a *direct* sense of mass and of the age of ourselves and of the universe in terms of what we call "time", and although we also have a direct sense of distance, we do *not* have a direct sense of the *hard fact* that length is a *derived* property of the universe due to its expansion controlled by Rational Law; while *we cannot have a direct but only an indirect* purely mental sense of G, the fundamentality of which we never till now imagined but may *no longer* doubt, the existence of which we only most dimly acknowledge for the "fact" that a fabled apple fell on Isaac Newton's head some three hundred years earlier! Which all brings into sharp focus the next pricking question: Were these Laws thought up by, brought into being by, in order that they be obeyed by, communicated to its members by, imposed on itself and its members by, and reported on by its members

to, the Universe? Or were they imposed by an *outside*, the *only other remaining*, Rational Authority, the one we call God-Logos? In the first case, *all machinery needed* for thinking up these *mathematically and logically consistent simple Laws*; their being brought into being; their being disseminated to members; and the reporting back on by its members; on a *very complex and foolproof* communication network extending from the center to the front of the expanding universe and permitting of *infinite* transmission velocity (since *only thus* can the universal laws have an *immediate moment-by-fleeting-moment application everywhere*); *these all and perhaps more must be present and must, therefore, be physically discoverable within the universe!* Given the aforementioned findings, *the atheists would jump with glee, if these other physical desiderata were there and at their disposal!* Well, they are *not!* And because they are *not*, there remains *an one only* conclusion, coming in two parts: The first being that, the universe could *not* bring the Laws of Nature into being on its own along with itself! The second being that, *therefore*, God is the outside Law-imposing Authority, Whose existence is *ipso facto and sufficiently proven* by the operation of the Uni-verse under these *mathematically and logically consistent simple Laws!* But the atheists *would/will not* admit this finding! They are *first and only atheists!* And even if they appear as “scientists” too, *honest they are not!* On the other hand, *my total inability to find even one “agnostic”,* in a position of authority within the “scientific” establishment, *willing* to take up the challenge of these findings upon his word, as a *true agnostic*, of intellectual honesty and integrity, *exposes the entire sorry myth of the existence of such an animal!* The Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity is *too tough a nut* for the “scientific” establishment to crack *and* in their mouth keep their teeth! So, *in the purest primate fashion*, they did the next best thing they knew: They *suppressed the news and have since refused* to give my findings the hearing they deserve in the Holy Name of Truth! Earlier, we called this the Age of Deception! Now we come to know even of the *size* of Deception! Because, *before* the End, there shall also be the Age of Revelation, during which the Deception shall be exposed in all its horror-producing nakedness! Do you still fail to get it? Their name is Legion! And this is *Dies Irae!* Irae of *both* kinds: Holy *and* unholy! And *we all are* called to choose a side, *not* to stand aside! *We all must examine all our beliefs critically*, and determine which of them stand by *The One Logos!* *Only they* deserve to be kept!

23

**THE THEORY OF
QUANTUM MECHANICS:
PROBLEMS AND RESOLUTION**

§120. (a) In the annals of human thought, the theory of quantum mechanics is the prime example of *how little the obvious deeper issues* of existence and Logic have influenced the development of a most substantial branch of science, and of *how resolutely those issues are refused proper scientific consideration!* To this latter, allusion has already been made. [The Reader may want to refresh his memory by once again looking up the materials on pages 15, 48, 50-1, 71, 80, 97, 98, 102, 141, 185, 198] Here now, I must lay bare what the scientists in this most unique case *have determined to take unquestioned.* First off, I find it most curious that *no* link has been made between quantum theory and the ancient Democritean atomic theory, *that in truth was the first quantum theory!* When Democritus spoke of the *atom*, he *only* spoke of the *minimum fundamental particle of matter*; in other words, of the *least quantum* of matter! In his days, the great variety of chemical and subchemical particles was unknown, but even if it were known, the ancient Greek sense of Simplicity *would have remained unimpressed!*: Before us still is the *fundamental philosophical obligation to choose* between two options: *The simplest and most elegant creation that uses an one only kind of simplest fundamental particle/building-block and all the rest of complexity by a combination according to Law of the needed number of such similar particles*; or a *less elegant creation that uses many kinds of fundamental particles and combines according to a then necessarily much more complex law many particles of each kind with similar particles and with many particles of other*

kinds to build up the observed complexity, but still in order to attain the same objective? How are we to prefer the second that is obviously far more demanding of unneeded additional effort in imagination, invention, creation, combination under a mathematically and logically consistent law, and management, than the first? Doesn't Simplicity and Elegance reject it in favor of the first?

(b) Would you say that, "it depends"? [I determine to use the impersonal terms *you* and *your* for the compelling immediacy they impose on us all in our facing these issues.] But on *what*, given the same objective? Don't forget that, *all true and especially the Greek philosophy always seeks a rational purpose!* Purposelessness is never an option a philosopher may honestly countenance; and should one choose it, *we shall never be wrong to call him a total stranger to philosophy!* Now you of course see at once the purpose-driven cart of Design! Do you want to avoid this cart, *fearing it smacks too much of God to suit your taste?* First off, *why do you hate so much even the idea of God that, you deny this universe itself the possibility of being God, and of desiring something and adjusting itself to its desire?* Don't we too do very much the same? Or is it that *you sense this to be impossible* for the universe, before even you examine the scientific requirements of this possibility; which leaves you with the *only other option*, that of God Whom *you do not like for the rational and moral responsibility He cannot but expect of us all who seek Perfection, to which Design is tuned?* If not so, *please suggest something else on which "it depends"!* To save yourself from all possible embarrassment, whatever you suggest *must be more reasonable than here suggested!* The predicament becomes obvious! You see, the ancient thinkers lived in daily intercourse with the *artful* practical creators! Modern theoretical physicists live in ivory towers, worlds all their own! The ancient Greeks *judged Logically* their options, *uninhibited by preset, immediate, oppressive pro and con theological consequences!* But *not* because they were atheists, or "idolaters"! But because they considered it their duty as honest men of intellect to think Logically and to stand erect even before their gods, which meant that they were fully cognizant of the *hard* fact that they profaned the gods, if they thought less of them than of themselves! *Don't* confuse the philosophers with the poets. The latter, as always, along with the current public wisdom *also* expressed the ignorant public opinion; just as their counterparts still do today, who either accuse God of cruelty when events turn against

them, or decide that He therefore cannot exist; which may on the one hand save them from thinking of Him as cruel, but on the other still *subjugates* their "logic" to their *unconfessed* desire to avoid even a slight insinuation of theological meaning, that causes them to fail realizing that to ignore God's presence, should He exist, *is no mere slight!* The ancient philosophers would commit neither slights nor profanities! Today, people such as Weinberg, Hawking and Company try fervently to devise a *purely theoretical* scheme of *supposedly* "logical" thought that will make the Creator superfluous; yet, *without first proving* the universe to have been standing on its own eternally! As, in the absence of proving the latter, the *invention and proof* of such a scheme as attempted *must inevitably exceed* a scientist's lifetime, as it now becomes obvious given the limitations at least of practical experimentation, *any scientist so spending his time must be held to account for possible mismanagement of it*, unless he *can* show that he could *not* have spent it more profitably for mankind in another field of endeavor, *given the hard fact that it is mankind that foots the bill!* Since he *cannot* yet show that his effort will *ever* reach a *conclusive* dead end (in Popper's sense) that only thus would *eliminate the need* to think of a Creator [that *would then be valuable for mankind to know*, even as it would bring us to facing alone our responsibilities without any help from anywhere!], the accusation that said effort is driven by the desire *to avoid rather than meet the present need of a fully possible definitive answer about the Creator, given the hard facts already before us, cannot be shaken off!* Therefore, unless we make *all* our scientific effort *a priori blind* to *possible* theological consequences *while keeping ourselves open to facing such consequences should they arise by the proof through the hard facts already before us of the existence of a Creator*, we *cannot* show that our science as so far developed has truly been our wisest and most honest option!

(c) It is this sort of *beneficial* blindness that points inexorably to the option of a *one only kind* of fundamental particle; which has *not* been what the modern quantum theory (*contrary* to the ancient) truly, even if subconsciously insinuates! Indeed, *it must be deemed a lame* "mathematical and logical consistency and simplicity" that *overlooks* these *basic* issues! The Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity that is truly worthy of our consideration and is Logically taken to reside in the Mind of God *cannot but opt* for an *one-only-kind-of-fundamental-particle* universe;

unless of course, and in keeping with overall parsimony and total economy, the desired objective was more demanding of means than all that such a universe could possibly give! Which, however, will take us too far afield if we cannot, *as we surely cannot*, show cause!

§121. (a) Ignoring *all these most pertinent issues*, the modern quantum theory *is indeed a most peculiar collection of fundamentally illogical ideas!* Ignoring the *need* that the physical quantum be conceived *also as a definite package of a definite amount of matter and energy coming in a definite volume, and not only of action coming regardless of these other qualities and quantities, modern theory has stuck, adhering tenaciously and stubbornly* (with well-hidden *bad* intent!), to the so-called Heisenberg uncertainty principle, expressed *most peculiarly and illogically* in terms of an expression of *not less than a certain amount of action!* [Just think of it in these simple terms: you define as *certain* the notion of absolute white in order to juxtapose to it the notion of absolute black. Then you turn around and make an all out effort to assert the existence of absolute black and *deny* the existence of absolute white! But if of these two, the former could stand of itself, what need did it have of the latter in order to define itself as its opposite? The quantum mechanicians *cannot even begin* to speak of uncertainty without the presence of the *certain* Planck constant!!! This, in the so-called “scientific” quarters passes as “Science”!!! However, philosophy it is *not!* Let alone Wisdom!] To an unbiased observer, our recalcitrant cynic *will* observe, the Heisenberg expression *is nothing other or less than the law of least action*, reexpressed *unawares* of its significance in the micro-world, after Planck *also unawares* had rediscovered its application in nature, this time most significantly coming in the form of *the definite least* of his “constant” h ! Which modern science, uses *in a totally other context, without bothering to explain how* (i.e., in terms of *Logic*) the *idea and Law of Least Action* can possibly relate to, *and only to*, the “principle of uncertainty”! With this, our critic will further comment that, even the term *science, let alone Science*, used in this context *is gratuitous!*

(b) Then again, *why* should the Planck h be a *true* constant? On *what solid arguments* do scientists apply the notion of a *constant* Planck “constant” back to the age of the initial singularity? Back then, it *cannot* logically have been otherwise than that *both* the least action as the minimal step of action possible *and* the total action of the universe were *both* zero! *Sufficiently*, because *no-*

thing had yet happened, as all time and all action was then in the future! By what Law then did, if it did, the least action suddenly come in the amount of the Planck h ? Imagine the first moment of time, of duration δt following the Big Bang at $T = 0$; i.e., with the clock already marking the continuous flow of time. Now imagine δt so short that multiplied by δe [the entire amount of energy then produced and present in the universe, given that $E = Mc^2$ and $c = (4GMT^{-1}/3)^{1/3} = \infty$ at $T = 0$] produces a quantity of action less than h , i.e., $(\delta e) \times (\delta t) < h$, i.e., contrary to the Heisenberg uncertainty principle [never stopping to bear in mind the inexorable mathematical truth that even zero times infinity, and infinite times zero equals zero, not infinity]! During that period, if h were truly constant, even the entire universe could still produce absolutely nothing! Would you try to escape the quandary by saying that this is a "good" argument for the "quantization" of time? But how, with absolutely nothing yet happening, could the universe mark out even the first quantum of time? Doesn't the marking out itself involve action, being itself action? It challenges not just imagination but also Logic to conceive of time quanta laid out one after the other serially and distinctly yet without break between them! Any break at all would involve a void in time, unbridgeable even by the entire universe, since "during" it (or if the term offends, "temporally within" it!), the entire universe would of necessity remain inactive! Would you say that the breaks could involve no void in time, by being of zero "duration"? But how could that differ at all from the time continuum? For the universe to be always active, it is necessary that the time continuum have no break at all! But then, with the clock running, it is necessary that the universe produce action even during however short a period of time one cares to imagine! [Today, we all have seen digital clocks operating, marking out whole seconds: Even as such clocks seem inactive during most of the time we do not lose the sense of the continuous flow of time! Would you dare say that we are wrong?] But this only does mean that the Planck constant can only have risen gradually to its present value, having started out with the value of zero at the instant $T = 0$ of the Big Bang and increasing since in proportion to $T^{1/3}$, in view of the fact that action is (energy) \times (time) and the universal energy decreases with the $T^{-2/3}$ due to the decrease of the velocity of light! Then again, action is involved in the activity not just of the entire universe, but even of the fundamental particle/photon. And under Mathematical

and Logical Consistency and Simplicity, *least action truly means a common measure, a one-only, the common at the time measure of least action! Thus, any minimal activity at all (be it of the fundamental particle/photon, or of ordinary bodies being made up of no other than light, or even of the entire universe) must only come in the contemporaneous least measure; and this while activities of more than the simultaneous minimal must only come in exact multiples of the contemporaneous least measure; and the total activity to date must come as the sum of the activities to date of all the particle/photons in the universe, each having a present value measured in terms of the present contemporaneous value of the action quantum!*

(c) The problem of the principle of indeterminacy has two more aspects: First, in its form of $(\delta x)(\delta p) \geq h$, the principle *denies not just an exact knowledge by us, but the existence itself, of an exact momentum for the entire universe very early on in the life of the universe, when one is again free to imagine such a short size for the universe immediately following the Big Bang as to keep the above product less than h, considered by the current theory forever fixed at its present value! Thus, the theory denies the simultaneous existence of both the exact position of the center of the universe as the zero point of zero total momentum, which is unquestioned under the law of momentum, and the then also exact velocity (given its constant mass) c_0 , under which, at the instant $T = 0$, the universe started on its expansion, without which it would not even know how to behave during all subsequent times! And second, it denies not just the possibility for the universe to react, but indeed the unquestioned fact that the universe does react with total knowledge, to the action of any one body within it, on account of which fact alone we are able to measure the inertial mass of a body and find it equal to its gravitational mass! The existence of exact and constant inertia (the fact of which is not exhausted within the limits of the present discussion!) proves the ability of the universe to deliver its exact reaction to/at an exact address! But under Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity, we cannot have both our quantum dog fed and our universal pie whole, unless the quantum hard facts are other than now believed! Before the "immovable rock" of unquestioned universal facts, it is the current quantum theory that must yield and get corrected! It is remarkable that it is exactly this rock that modern science under cover of quantum theory attempts to swallow! Surely, when it forbids even the last iota and dot*

to be out of place, Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity cannot tolerate such behavior!

§122. (a) Of all the above, *no discussion at all has ever taken place* in the context of the presently accepted quantum theory! Just as *no discussion has ever seen the light of day* respecting the relation of amount of mass contained in the particles and their geometrical size! The largest, if composite, body of sorts is surely the entire universe, of a huge geometrical size! *What* then would you say *is* the geometrical size of the fundamental particle/photon? *How tiny or large* would you say it is? Here too, another of our assumptions, *scientifically unwarranted yet accepted by scientists*, requires that the least massive particle also be the tiniest! The quandary of more mass *said to be hiding* individually in particles involved in particle-smashing reactions in accelerators than the particles reveal when weighed as packages, I have already discussed [§65, p. 103]. I now will discuss the *parallel* problem of the *geometrical* size of the particles and bodies in the universe: The neutron is *both heavier and smaller* than the *entire* hydrogen atom! [Remember: deuterium is *not* hydrogen!] Similarly, back at the initial singularity, the *entire* universe, the heaviest body that ever existed, was *all* contained in the “room” of *zero* volume! The wavelengths of more energetic photons *surely are smaller* than those of less energetic ones! These examples *suffice to show that compatible with Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity there is out there an inverse relationship of mass and geometrical size* (to which even the *speculated* black holes are subject)! Surely then, our current science *has a lot to explain*: Except for those it *assumes* existing in the nucleus, for which it *reverses* the rule, it regards *all* less massive particles to be *smaller*!: Example, the electron! Yet it *avoids discussing honestly and exhaustively* the problem of action at a distance, *necessarily present* between massive particles having *both* tiny volumes *and* standing apart! Example, *the proton and electron within the hydrogen atom*; in which case *undoubtedly only for the sake of electrostatic attraction between those two* has the *invention* of a “bonding particle” been resisted! Our current “science” *invented “curved spacetime”* in order to *avoid* the problem of action at a distance, *alleging* the force of gravity at *all* distances to be an *illusion*! It has *ignored* the *very same* problem in the case of *electrostatic* charges! It *invented* the particles it calls “gluons”, “hooks”, “strings” etc., on which other particles latch, to *mediate*

the interactions of other *tiny* particles standing *at a distance within the nucleus!* It thereby *insinuates* the existence of a *whole menagerie* of geometrically-tiny *and* geometrically-extensive particles; *needing* the latter to hold the former together in a scheme designed to *avoid* the action at a distance; *which it hates for never discussed purely theological reasons!* How such menagerie meshes with Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity, *which rather than respecting it modern "science" only insults*, this, too, modern "scientists" leave unmentioned!

(b) As to the still hanging question of the size of the fundamental photon, we only need to remind ourselves of the duality of light, here appearing as a particle and there as a wave: As $e = h\nu$, more energy is packed per cycle as the frequency is increased and the wavelength is decreased. It follows that, the energy and hence the mass is least when the wavelength is the greatest, i.e., equal to the diameter of the universe! This and the present value of h result in a mass of about 10^{-65} g per Democritean atom. The dual nature of light is automatically resolved the moment we realize that at every point (and in every volume element) of space there is all the mass corresponding to the *total* electromagnetic energy present at (or in) it, that in order to be absorbed by a particle, it requires a *reaction time* such that the product of the two equal the unit of action h . It is upon its absorption by a massive particle that light thus presents its own massive character! The wave nature of *light* light preserves its transparency; whereas, when it is absorbed and reports as *heavy* mass, it becomes opaque as it interferes with the transmission of light waves. It follows that it is by the *totality* of all this *diffuse* light that the "action at a distance" is mediated, and there remains no mystery! Put another way, the once thought to exist "ether", the existence of which the Michelson-Morley experiment failed to reveal, turns out to be none other than all this *very present, very much existing diffuse light itself!*

§123. (a) The modern quantum theory was founded on the work of Planck on the black body radiation, on the work of Einstein on the photoelectric phenomenon, on Rutherford's conception of the atom, and on Bohr's early quantum theory of the hydrogen atom. As enough has been said about the Planck h , I here only need mention Rutherford's conception of the atom: Even before the principle of uncertainty was enunciated, it ought to have

become a *clear* scientific understanding that *both* the original notion of the atom as a tiny solar system, *and* the subsequent notion of electrons chaotically roaming around the nucleus (taught by the “new” quantum theory), *being contrary to the observed facts, ought to have been rejected*, since *all* sorts of microscopic work *has* shown the atom to be very nearly a physical sphere, that may *not* be understood in terms of mathematical formulae that do *not* represent it! *Contrary to these hard physical and Logical facts*, the notion of a quasi-solar system originally adopted by Bohr for the hydrogen atom makes it a *very thin and empty* “disk”, which, coupled with the notion of a tiny nucleus and tiny electrons, reduces the hydrogen atom to a *mere dipole in space, many times thinner and emptier in proportion than the sun-earth system!* While it reduces the heavier atoms either to systems of particles at least as thin and empty in space as the solar-system “disk”, or to systems of particles chaotically scattered and scuttering in almost empty space, as current theory lets it be understood! *Contrary*, I repeat, *to the observed facts*, the *needed clear idea* of the atom as a sphere is *nowhere in sight!* This is *not exactly similar* to the case of Mrs. Ferguson’s grandfather’s oak chair: In that case, she contrasted the problematical human sensory experience to the highly magnified scientific “picture” of the chair! In this case, *it is the scientific pictures themselves that are at odds with each other!* Under the electron or atomic microscopes, the atoms *ought not to be seeable as spheres* of size about 10^{-8} cm, *if* current theory were correct! *If* the electron is of size about 10^{-13} cm, the *true* resolution of the electron microscope *ought to be of equal size*, and the picture *ought not to be of the atom as a whole, but of its individual nucleus and electrons!* But *we do not see them* under the microscope: we instead see the *atoms*, fuzzy though they appear (of which, later)! And this is *not* due to the supposedly inadequate time for the interaction of the beam electrons (standing for light in the optical microscope) with the electrons of the atoms: if that were the cause, under the electron microscope we rather ought to be seeing nothing at all; which means that we ought to see empty space!: Instead, we *do* see the atoms of about 10^{-8} cm in size.

(b) Though the electron microscope had not yet been invented in 1913 when Bohr proposed his “old” quantum theory, *the main facts and the understanding of their nature were already in place; as was, or ought to have been co-developing, the substance of the above*

arguments! At any rate, Bohr lived to see the electron microscope and observe things under it; but he *never* revised his view of things! It will be a *gross slander* to his intelligence to state that he played the central figure in the development of the *still dominant* "Copenhagen interpretation" under *any* illusions! It will be an *equal gross slander* to the intelligence of those who followed him to state that they still operate under *any* illusions! But *what* does that leave us with? What other than that *they deliberately insist on it for a reason?* The "old" (particle-mechanical) quantum theory was abandoned *not* for its unacceptable and uncorrectable geometrical problems but for the fact that *it could not be made to apply numerically* to other atoms. The "new" (wave-mechanical) quantum theory, incorporating the three-dimensional Schrödinger "wave-function", permitted numerical calculations on the energies of other atoms by the variational method; and Hylleraas used it *with the embarrassingly high number of fourteen specifically adjusted parameters* in order to *calculate a value* for the total ionization potential of the helium atom (containing just *two* electrons) *reasonably close* to the value experimentally observed! But not only did the "new" theory *not* resolve the geometrical problem, it *compounded* it!

—For one thing, despite its so-called "wave-mechanical" nature and its use of the "wave function" the "new" theory did *not* abolish the idea of the particulate electron but retained *intact* the idea of the electron used in the "old" theory, according to which the atom ionizes *from an infinite radius of revolution of the electron around the nucleus, "forgetting" that a single atom thus engulfs far more than the entire universe!* Which is as obviously wrong as our use of electricity *is* secure: *if* the negative charges had to be removed to infinity, not even just to the edges of the universe, *electricity would be an impossibility!* That electricity exists, works through the use of free electrons in metals and quasi-free electrons in semiconductors, *as per now common experience of even illiterate people using cellular telephones and is used even in the experiments of the propounders themselves* of these "scientific" ideas flies in the face of this theoretical pronouncement!

—For another, with the electron *assumed tiny*, the haphazard revolution around the nucleus of many electrons becomes an *exactly-unsolvable* many-body problem, that can *only* be attacked by *approximation* methods! This must be understood in terms of what

it truly implies: that the defect is *not* of our mathematics, but of *Nature*, working *ever approximately and never exactly!*

—For yet another, it is in the nature of the Schrödinger “wave-function” that *it do not deal with the real physical things* (in this case, the electrons) but with their *presumed* “probability” that they are where calculated! This *while there exists no objective method for the experimental verification of the prediction of this probability!* The *real* electrons in the *real* atom *were thus and most conveniently replaced* (though only in the *wily minds of quantum mechanics, where alone the reality and the probabilistic concept are willfully mixed together and their distinction is cunningly blurred*) by their “probabilities” in “probability space” in which alone the so-called “electron cloud” lives!

—For a fourth thing, how *limited though contrary to experience* the “improvement” allowed by the “new” theory truly is can be seen when recalling how *limitedly* in space are distributed the *probability density* lobes or “orbitals” of such *common* electronic states as the 2p, 3d, or 4f even of the hydrogen atom, which in fact mean that the probability of finding the electron *in any of all other directions is strictly nil*, which in turn means that the nucleus is *not ever spherically as it always ought to be* covered by the electron being in one of those states *in any of all those other directions!* Only for such as the *rearer* 1s, or 2s states is the *probability density* spherically distributed around the nucleus! In simpler words, *while our experience of the atom is that of a sphere with the electron being a spherical shell around the nucleus*, so that it be completely protected, the wave-mechanical picture of it is still that of a dipole in which the position of the electron can only be *probabilistically* stated to be exactly here or there, leaving the nucleus *totally naked in all other directions!* In *real time, absolutely nothing* did in fact change! Rather than the “new” theory *proving the atom always spherical when unperturbed, as is logically required, it instead retained the dipole, just as before; with additional constraints superadded to it, as it, by fiat of the so-called “experts”, forbids all discussion regarding the manner in which the electron moves from place to place around the nucleus!*

—For a fifth thing, on top of all the above, now introduced was the *chaotic scuttering scatter* of the electron or electrons around the nucleus! *Forgotten* was the old principle that when unperturbed, a body (and thus also the electron) carries on as before! The “new” theory *never* bothered to explain *what it is* that causes the electron

to jump from one place to another scurrying about in an *unperturbed* atom! For *without a physical cause causing* such activity, the electron *must remain in its fixed trajectory, if it is a trajectory along which it must move*, and the three-dimensional spatial, even if limited, probability distribution *must collapse into a near two-dimensional one*, and that in the shape of a *very thin ring!* [While it takes a string of about 74000 pearls each the size of the earth to fill its trajectory around the sun, it takes a string of about 314000 pearls the size of the electron to fill *its least* trajectory around the nucleus! The probability of finding the *unperturbed* satellite *outside* its respective ring *remains exactly zero at all times!*]

—And for a sixth thing, to make an already bad situation even worse, after they were armed with the “new” theory, the quantum mechanicians began attempting to make us believe that the *real* electron “can and does” jump *unpredictably* from place to place *without having to go through any other intermediate place at all!* [It in fact was of *this* idea that the Star Trek trick was born, according to which people could be “energized” and transported from place to place! Well, the Hollywood folks did *not completely* lose their minds!: They at least made said transportation *exact-to-a-minute-ly-predetermined-place* (down to the scale of the atoms and all levels below, as otherwise, the *exact* “reconstitution” of people even in the bowels of planets *would be impossible!*), *not totally unpredictable*, as the quantum mechanicians *insist* happens in the case of the electron!]

(c) Does all this make dizzy all people other than quantum mechanicians? Of course, but in fact *less than them!*: For *it is their greater dizziness* that makes them take the final step into the nether land of make believe while all other folks remain skeptical!: For it is *they*, with Heisenberg having led the way, that, in order that *they first* get out of this terrible predicament, crown all this confusion *by further insisting that we must think of the electron as a mere mathematical concept!* I.e., *that we forget the reality out there and think only of the equations themselves as the only “reality”!* This while *it is physical experiment* that measures such things as the *real* charge and mass of the electron, and there *never before or since* has in the annals of science been argued and insisted upon, let alone shown, that mathematical concepts have *real, physically measurable* masses, just as you or I! Where before the materialist argument had been “*show me, the real thing!*”, now the “scientific” argument

has become “here ‘is’ the *probability* cloud; therefore, *believe!*” And it is in order to strengthen this their position that they so stubbornly insist also on the “uncertainty principle”, *even as it is only the least action law!*

§124. What is *all the more remarkable and infuriating* to see done by scientists is their insistence that we may *not* [that is, *they attempt to prohibit us to*] look further into the nature of things, for “there is nothing more in the nature of things than just this”! Which, however, has *not* stopped them from milking the social cow for precious funds, *most frivolously spent, if they are right*, in their high energy physics work, where the existence of things *can never be ascertained but only conjectured even after expensive “successful” experiments, and nobody but very few and of their own can “test” the truth of Nobel-prize caliber work!* I, as an engineer, *am discipline-bound* to belong in the category of “*show me, the real thing!*”, and to draw from my engineering experience, *which is no other than common, yet disciplined*, experience!: As an applied industrial engineer, I have worked in mines and done precise underground geodetic work needed for the exact positioning, in the solid bowels of the earth burrowed hollow, of galleries and shafts and other facilities. But as an applied research engineer, I have also done work at high temperatures and determined solubilities of elements in solid and liquid metals from steel and above down to sodium; in which, *small amounts of dissolved oxygen will cause corrosion in the stainless steel container, that will cause a fast breeding nuclear reactor, denied cooling as a result of corrosion and corrosion-induced fatigue and failure, to blow up in the span of two seconds!* These *show the need for precise work*, geometrical the one, quantitative the other. Whence the question: *Where does Nature stop, or begin from, caring about precise work?* Even if it be argued that all macroscopic work is at a level above the Planck h , dilute chemical solutions work such as is involved in fast breeding nuclear reactors *most certainly is not!* The Planck h *figures significantly* in chemical reaction kinetics. Therefore, *if nature stops, or begins, caring from some level up, that level cannot but be within the limits even of my work!* So, even such people as I ought to be *greatly concerned about indeterminacy, and are by the nature of their work entitled to voice their opinion on the matter; which, as is here shown, is not the exclusive domain of quantum mechanicians!* Besides, as nature *most certainly is of one kind, the same for*

quantum mechanics and astronomers, so too she is the same for engineers! Therefore, only fools may dismiss as out of place the legitimate concerns of engineers! But my engineering experience teaches more: For I have yet in my professional life to see certainty built on uncertainty, unless there is a law underneath that resolves the uncertainty into certainty!: Take the simple experience of all, that, all games of chance rely on their intrinsic uncertainty. The cause of which however, no intelligent human may misunderstand!: That uncertainty is itself built on certainty! E.g., the certainty of equal probability of heads or tails in the throw of a coin! Which depends entirely and can only be secured upon the underlying law of construction of the good coin! I refer here to this fact because, though probability and uncertainty play an important role in science (and not only in the context of the present discussion) and engineering (where the assurance of the quality of industrial products is often studied statistically), not only every common human, but, obviously, not even every famous scientist, knows, fully appreciates and respects the fact that, historically, their scientific study began with the study, by Gauss, of what truly happens in the common games of chance, that are all built on the certainty of the strict law of good construction of such things as coins, dice and packs of cards! Even the famous quantum mechanics willfully ignore this truth!: They insist on the probability being primary when it is only derivative, of intent based on certainty! [In the case of casinos, the intent of profit, and the certainty that the operators shall not lose their own shirts!] And they refuse to explain how if uncertainty is primary in Nature, that uncertainty brought about the certainty of their own "principle" of uncertainty; which certainty they cannot and do not practically ignore in insisting on the primacy of their "principle of uncertainty"!

§125. (a) But there is more of the same vein in what quantum mechanics claim: An engineer must produce safe works! In the face of catastrophe, he cannot excuse himself on chance, probability, or quantum uncertainty! He goes to prison for negligence! The quantum mechanics (at least the atheists and agnostics among them, in whose ranks not curiously are found the most eminent of them!), free from the practical legal consequences of their statements, also feel themselves free to deny, because this is exactly what they all along have been trying to deny, the existence of underlying Laws that unite all Nature under certainty! Don't expect of them to

be honest-mouthed about it!: What they on the surface deny is “simply” the existence of what *they* call “hidden parameters”! Under which code-name they mean *rational Laws* operating at a deeper level, tying concretely together those “hidden parameters” and making *true Sense* of that *they choose to slander* as “senseless” Nature! In the language of engineering drawings, the components depicted *are clearly told apart*, and the contractor *knows, based on the drawings*, what comes first, what next! So are the works, houses, bridges, ships, airplanes, even super-conducting super-colliders, built! That people use and enjoy *safely*! This *is practical responsibility*! It is in this same vein that we may not lose sight of the fact that far more than equally safe also is the natural world in which we live, play, work, produce safe works, construct theories! How that safety came about out of *their* quantum uncertainty, the quantum mechanics under the *presumed* protection of *their* uncertainty principle *have not felt themselves honor-bound to explain*! Instead, with far less verisimilitude than of magicians bringing doves out of hats, and with *no respect for the “hard facts of nature”* (in B. Russell’s sense), they claim that *safe and certain reality “just” sprang up out of their “probability cloud”*! But by so doing, they also present an inexorable dilemma: That for the *hidden cause of their claims and refusals of responsible explanation*, we choose between *innocent confusion and infernal intent*! But to excuse them on however innocent confusion and in so doing accuse them of puerile “muddled thinking” (in B. Russell’s sense) *would be an insult both to their experience of the world and to their intelligence*! Alas, for *their total absence of anxiety* over these matters for the greatest part of this *least innocent, most experienced, and most sophisticated* century, we are left in the *no-choice* situation ourselves to infer the reason of *their infernal intent*!: The *intent of in the name of “science” covertly claiming, and by their academic authority persuading (though only the innocent and the gullible among) the shamelessly so-called “masses”, about the nonexistence of the He Engineer Himself, Whom they totally lack the manly courage openly to state by His full Name!* Only this, no other, is their **most ancient** reason!

(b) The above are more correctly said to be my own misgivings regarding quantum theory. This does not mean that other people have not expressed their disagreement and reservations about the theory. Notably Einstein himself; who in effect parted ways with Bohr over the dispute as to whether or not a probabi-

listic theory as fundamental as the present form of quantum theory claims for itself can be both natural and correct. Of the rest, nobody called more vociferously than Paul Dirac for the need to develop a *really new* quantum theory that would eliminate the weaknesses of its present form. It is *not* a little thing that even a non-believer in a Personal God as was Einstein could not accept it as reasonable that, putting it most succinctly, "God plays dice with the world!", or in other words that, "basically, physics should be of a deterministic character" Of the rest, most do not mind! And some, as we have seen, do not mind at all to go to the extreme, believing the world to be meaningless! Dirac conceded that as things now stand, the majority of scientists stand with Bohr, especially as many tried but failed to produce a better understanding than provided by the Schrödinger "wave function". But he did not mind to "think that it might turn out that ultimately Einstein will prove to be right, because the present form of quantum mechanics should not be considered as the final form. There are great difficulties, which I shall mention later, in connection with the present quantum mechanics. It is the best that one can do up till now, But one should not suppose that it will survive indefinitely into the future. And I think that it is quite likely that at some future time we may get an improved quantum mechanics in which there will be a return to determinism and which will, therefore, justify the Einstein point of view. But such a return to determinism could only be made at the expense of giving up some other basic idea which we now assume without question. We would have to pay for it in some way which we cannot yet guess at, if we are to re-introduce determinism"³⁷. What Dirac disliked the most was the "departing from standard rules of mathematics and [the] neglecting of infinite quantities" that is constantly involved in what is called the "renormalization out of infinities", that is regular fair in the current form of quantum theory. On this point, Dirac was quite explicit: "I disagree with most physicists at the present time just on this point. I cannot tolerate departing from the standard rules of mathematics. Of course, the proper inference from this work is that the basic equations are not right. There must be some drastic change introduced into them so that no infinities occur in the theory at all and so that we can carry out the solution of the equations sensibly, according to ordinary rules and without being bothered by difficulties. The requirement

³⁷ Paul A. M. Dirac: DIRECTIONS IN PHYSICS, Lectures delivered during a visit to Australia and New Zealand, August/September 1975; John Wiley & Sons, Publ., p. 10

will necessitate some really drastic changes: simple changes will not do, just because the Heisenberg equations of motion in the present theory are all so satisfactory. I feel that the change required will be just about as drastic as the passage from the Bohr orbit theory to the quantum mechanics"³⁸.

(c) I came to know of the existence of the above lectures by Dirac after most of my private work from the Spring of 1974 to September of 1985 was complete and I was in the process of putting it all together. The early part of the work had to do with the extraction of all that could be gotten from the physical dimensional analysis of Newton's universal gravitational constant. The results it produced, fully at variance with relativity, left no doubt: Such simplicity, such concreteness, such clarity, such absence of conflict, such compactness of the universal facts simply could *not* be the result of pure happenstance, serendipity, or good luck, with no Mind at all standing behind it! All the great minds of the world had for long centuries, essentially throughout all written human history worked on the "mysteries" of the world, and they all had missed it: What? That the world *is* either the product of Mind, or it is not! That it *is* simpler, the world being what it is, that *it truly is* the work of Mind! That the Mind, that at some time called us to love our God "*and with all our intellect*", was simply calling our attention to *every* detail, being certain of the fact that He had *not* missed anything, over which *because He had missed it, if indeed He had missed it, He would* be found out by us as Himself lacking perfection, by us *lacking* perfection yet paying attention to detail with *all* our intellect! That *by the details would we surely know* of His Presence! All this is nothing other than also a part of what I called the *Most Elegant Design*. Indeed: *always does the detail the Master reveal!* The first part of my work had already shown the Master. I started the second part of it with the *absolute certainty* that *He would* show Himself in those other details also, those that are seen not through the telescope but indeed through the microscope, all the way to the very bottom of things! If not *all* is paid *all* the attention it *all* deserves in the *Most Elegant Design*, then *surely* the word *Universe is* a misnomer! I had no idea how that would eventually come, how far it *would* be possible for me to proceed. But I had no doubt: the *Most Elegant Design* means

³⁸ Ibid. p. 36-7

Absolute Determinism! And that meant the overthrow of all inexactitude in the current form the quantum theory also! It was with *this* philosophical analysis in mind, *all based on nothing other than the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity*, as the *applied* part of the Most Elegant Design that I presented myself with my own dilemma: *Either to show them wrong in their own game of basic Faithlessness, or just shut up accusing them of heinous intent against the Holy God!* If, I reasoned, Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity exists and is operative in the world, it *cannot* fail to show them wrong! If I too can see what all *can* indeed see, then it is *not* the eyes that do not in fact see, but the *minds that refuse to acknowledge* what the eyes are sending to them for processing!

(d) Two more remarks must here be made: First that, when Dirac's lectures came to my knowledge they served as an *ex post facto* support from an eminent physicist for my view that return to determinism was indeed needed. Second that, return to determinism simply cannot be had without the fullest corresponding acknowledgement of the Determiner, Who alone is the holder of the Most Elegant Design that ignores *nothing*. My efforts closer to home to obtain an understanding with physicists had not borne fruit, for the reason that, much to my surprise, those people were *not* willing to make the necessary concessions to the Determiner, that cannot but be included in the integral-holistic approach to *all* problems an active intellect recognizing *no* frontiers considers incumbent to be taken. I did not seek to establish a contact with Paul Dirac in his already advanced years, fearing that it might be taken the wrong way, in view of my approach to the gravitational constant, being entirely different from his own, that *could* be viewed as a direct though tacit personal criticism. *unwilled on my part but certainly present by the nature of things*, even as it eventually led to, in fact, *more* determinism than even he would envision as a physicist, if unwilling to refer to the Ultimate Determiner; a determinism that put even the quantum theory under an entirely new light.

§126. I *had* to start with the Rutherford-Bohr conception of the atom as a miniature-solar-system model: If the atom shows itself to be spherical (as it *most successfully does specifically in our too wide to be ignored crystalline-metallurgical experience*), it *cannot but be* spherical! The idea, therefore, of the Rutherford-Bohr mod-

el *had, has, to go!* Even if in the process, *all conceptual structure intrinsically built on that model also has to go!* I *had* to return to the Lorentz idea of the electron as a hollow sphere, which, as will here be shown, *it has been a grievous mistake not to have been followed* to its ultimate conclusion. A *hollow sphere consisting of both mass and negative electric charge; in itself held together in some manner, while as a whole centered on and surrounding the nucleus.* In this conception, (a) the exact disposition of mass and charge in the space within the spherical shell constitutes the internal structure of the electron itself; while (b) the exact disposition-and-motion of one or more electrons around the nucleus constitutes the mechanical structure of the atom. *Without question,* the interaction between nucleus and electron(s) *must* affect their separate internal structures but to a *lesser* degree; while *most* of their interaction *must* relate to the structure of the atom *as a whole.* As Bohr's original theory and what was later built on it related to the atom as a whole, I too limited myself to it. The internal structure of the electron and the nucleus is still nowhere near being resolved. It is important to note that *it had already been realized early on* that if such a spherical shell rotates, the tiny rotating charges will form circular currents, and they in turn will cause a magnetic field surrounding the sphere; together producing an electromagnetic moment *half as great* as the moment produced by a charge equal in size to the total electronic charge revolving in an orbit of equal diameter! Clearly, while this accounts for the *half spin* quantum numbers and does so in a *fully classical* manner, such numbers in the now standing theory do *not* have a *clear* corresponding physical picture! It is inevitable then to conclude that, what had been missed early on was the *manner* in which the electronic sphere *vibrated* around the nucleus; vibration being the *only* mode of spherically symmetrical motion about a center!

§127. (a) If we imagine the electron as an elastic spherical spring harmonically vibrating under force F , but *never* collapsing down toward the nucleus, first off, the problem thought to exist of the *failure* of the electron to fall onto the nucleus and release its potential electrostatic energy as required by the classical conception *is automatically resolved by fully classical means!* But second off, because the Coulomb electrostatic F_c (or the lesser gravitational) force of the nucleus *cannot* be ignored, a *balancing* force F_b (incorporating the gravitational and all other ones) *must* be re-

garded to exist such that

$$F + F_c + F_b = 0, \quad (38)$$

where

$$F = k \cdot |r - r_0|, \quad (39)$$

$$F_c = -Ze^2r^{-2}, \quad (40)$$

r is the instantaneous radius of the electron, r_0 its average ("equilibrium") radius, k the elastic constant, e the unit electrical charge and Z the number of protons in the nucleus of a hydrogen-like atom. This scheme *frees the chemical atom of other than thus present internal sources of tension, yet, keeps it subject as a whole to both external forces (including both perturbing forces at close range and the gravitational forces of all external bodies) and the force-free cosmological expansion as it applies to it!* Under this scheme, *no force, whether internal or external, remains unaccounted for, while the idea of the atom as a stable wholesome unit is fully assured, except as its stability must be affected by the cosmological expansion. The clear superiority of this scheme over the Bohr and current conception, both of which consider as operating only the Coulomb force is already evident!*

(b) That the above zero sum of forces truly applies may at first be questioned; specifically as nothing precise can at present be said of the nature and source of the balancing force, except that, first, in the study of the electron as a harmonic oscillator within the atom, knowledge of its mathematical expression is *not* needed as it suffices that it equals $-(F + F_c)$, while second, the operation of the electron as a harmonic oscillator *cannot truly leave unaffected the nucleus, that must respond in a counterbalancing oscillation!* While this latter question must remain for the future, *all doubts regarding the above scheme are removed by the success of its application to the electron.*

(c) *Without doubt, all these, relating closely to the sphericity of the unperturbed chemical atom, are most important characteristics not only of the atom as a whole, but also of the vibrating electron and the nucleus; bearing on their structure too, bridging the superatomic and subatomic structure of matter; and making a unity of the two and indeed of the whole physical world! Yet, not only they so far have been ignored, but the quantum theory has failed to consider the full implications of all our observations! Whereas our ordinary observations, begun to get scientifically organized with the development of modern chemistry, point to the unquestionable fact that*

nature reserves for the chemical atom the bridging position between the subatomic and superatomic components of matter, our cosmological observations have *equally unquestionably not affected the quantum theory*: We did *not, as we ought to*, rush to redraw the quantum theory on learning that the universe *expanded from zero volume and was once smaller than the present atoms*; which *cannot* have left unaffected *even the atomic and subatomic matter*! *There has been one of these two options*: either the micro-world always did and does participate in the universal expansion *under the very same laws as does the macro-world*; or else, *additional universal laws have decided* (a) the dimensions of the components of the micro-world, (b) the time of their fixing *if they ever were fixed*, and (c) how they participate differently in the universal expansion, *if they do so*! There can be *no* question as to which option is indeed preferable under the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity! *All this has so far been ignored*! All reference to the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity under the now accepted theories has been *so loose as to reveal our total failure* to appreciate its commanding position over what we ought to be thinking about the world!

§128. (a) Upon these basic ideas, step by impeccable step, the *full resolution* of the structure of the atoms made up of a nucleus surrounded onion-like by *concentric* electrons is obtained. The *approximate* model of the electron as a full vibrating sphere was developed first. This model was then modified to contain the electronic mass and charge in a vibrating spherical shell. The addition of extra electrons to build multi-electron atoms was then negotiated. As the detailed development of the ideas cannot here be reproduced, the findings must however be stated. In keeping with observed facts:

- (i) The Balmer law was reproduced!
- (ii) The Rydberg constant was reproduced!
- (iii) The wave number was reproduced!
- (iv) The Planck "constant" h of action *was not introduced arbitrarily*, as in the Bohr and current theories, but *naturally*, following the recognition that *the rate of change of the polar moment of inertia of the spherical oscillator has the physical dimensions of action*!
- (v) The amount of action involved *was not assumed* to come only in whole units of h . Rather, the action involved was introduced as the quantity nh , where n was taken to be *some but not neces-*

sarily whole number. That n is indeed a whole number came directly from the spectra that were reproduced only for whole and sequential values of n ! [exclamation, not factorial.]

(vi) So, not only was action found to be a *natural* property of the oscillator; and not only was indeed the *same* least amount of action found involved in the harmonic motion of the electron as had been found by Planck in the black-body radiation and by Einstein in the photoelectric phenomenon. But *now unquestionably shown was the fact that that amount of least action comes in exact whole-number multiples directly from the physical-natural system of the world, not from arbitrary human assumption and invention! Nature itself is thus shown to obey an objective physical-natural Law cognizant of the sequence of the cardinal numbers!* In plain words, *not only humans, but now in a certain sense, Nature itself was shown to "know" arithmetic!*

(vii) We do *not* have to renounce visualization of the electron and its operation in the atom as a *fully classical* harmonic spherical oscillator! Not only *are* the transitions from one stationary state to the next *smooth*, as *the amplitudes of oscillations of adjacent states overlap spatially*, but also the geometrical characteristics (such as the average radius and thickness of shell) and the operational characteristics (such as the amplitude, frequency, period, velocity, polar moment of inertia, and energy of oscillation) of the electron *can be given in explicit numbers!* All this in full juxtaposition to the belief in the nonexistence of the so-called "hidden parameters", that forms part and parcel of the present and still taught form of the theory!

(viii) The geometrical and operational characteristics of the oscillating electron combine to form an additional factor ξ^2 multiplying the already known expression of the energy at each state. The value of this factor at each state is unique. The values of this factor at adjacent states differ very little from each other. The values of this factor for all states are very nearly one for hydrogen, one half for helium, one third for lithium, and so on!

(ix) The energy at each state *is positive*. This has the effect to *reverse and correct* the picture we have of the atom. As energy is added, the electron in the atom *pulls together and becomes geometrically smaller*. And ionization does *not* obtain from an infinite radius, but from a radius very close to that of the so-called ground state. This *resolves* the quandary, that the Bohr and current theo-

ries *chose to ignore discussing*, of the atom increasing in size and progressively engulfing the world as the electron takes more energy and progresses towards ionization! And the resolution is *compatible* with the general picture we obtain of the entire world, having had more energy when it was smaller and gradually losing energy as it expands to an infinite radius, at which there shall be no gravitational or other force left to cause it to return from by some no longer possible re-collapsing!

(b) Besides the picture of the hydrogen atom, *characteristically clear* is also the picture we obtain of the configuration of electrons in the other atoms; *contrary to the insistent statements* of quantum mechanicians that such picture "is" impossible!: It indeed is impossible, but only when it is attempted to be obtained based on the current form of the theory! Therefore, *the hard fact alone that as is now proven Nature allows a clear and classical picture to be had suffices to deliver the death blow to the current form of the theory, despite its great successes!* It was found that:

(i) The electrons are arranged in atoms onion-like!

(ii) The electrons vibrate in tune!

(iii) Each electron has *one* quantum number!

(iv) The energy levels producing the spectral lines are *not* those of the singular electrons but of the *entire ensemble* of electrons!

(v) An additional factor $(q_1/q_1 + q_2/q_1 + q_3/q_1 + \dots)$ containing the quantum numbers of the electrons of the ensemble multiplies the energy expression obtained for the hydrogen atom. Here, q_1 is the quantum number of the first electron (as is the case of the hydrogen atom), q_2 is the quantum number of the second electron (as is the case of the helium atom), q_3 is the quantum number of the third electron (as is the case of the lithium atom), and so on!

(vi) At energy levels far from ionization, the quantum numbers of electrons are equal, meaning that the electrons have equal energies. But also meaning that as ξ^2 takes on values $1/2, 1/3$, etc. for helium, lithium, etc., the product $(q_1/q_1 + q_2/q_1 + q_3/q_1 + \dots)\xi^2$ retains a value close to unity for all electrons in all atoms at energy levels away from ionization!

(vii) As the energy increases towards ionization, it is unquestionably the *inside* electron that takes on the higher quantum number and acquires the more energy!

(viii) At ionization, the total energy of the ensemble divides between the ionizing electron and the *remaining* ensemble, the energy of which fits *exactly* the resulting configuration of quantum numbers and energy, as well as provides a *seamless* transition from the neutral atom to the first ion, to the second ion, and so on!

(ix) As the onion-like arrangement *is a single ordinal arrangement*, Nature *is shown to "know" how to place itself in order!* As a result, the atomic energy-level diagrams are greatly simplified; and their haphazard picture obtained on the basis of the now accepted theory is gone!

(c) To the detailed findings given above, an additional statement *must* be added: that in order to obtain them, *absolutely nothing was adjusted* [just remember Hylleraas]! Which clearly demonstrates, *even to those remotely familiar* with the claims of the now accepted form of the theory, *how vastly superior* to that envisioned by it the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity of the Most Elegant Design makes the order of Nature! *Thus it is that it now becomes scientifically incontrovertible* that to the extent the picture of Nature here revealed is imperfect, *its true picture must be even more ordered than is here revealed, and not less ordered* as the present form of the theory insists on teaching! What this makes of its present form, vehemently denying the so-called "hidden variables", and of *all* efforts to obtain an "equation of everything" based on no better than the present form of the theory, now also becomes all too clear! As also of the value of the belief in the *supposedly intrinsic* uncertainty of Nature, *here shown to be totally false!* Uncertainty remains *only as it relates to prediction of some specific result* in terms of direction and velocity of particles flying off after an atomic (or subatomic) collision, hereby seen to result from the *oscillatory nature* of the electron (or nucleus) and *our* ignorance of *all* values applicable to the event observed at the *exact moment* it is taking place! Just try snooker billiards with *vibrating balls bouncing off the vibrating balls of equal size making up the walls* of the pool table! But just as before, when the uncertainty in games of chance was shown to result from the *underlying laws of the construction* of such as dice and decks, so too now, the uncertainty of *prediction* is shown to result from the *totally incontrovertible underlying Laws of the structure of the atom!* Uncertainty *remains within bounds* exactly as a result of *those* Laws determining *both* the time-dependent size of the unit h of action

and the sizes, amplitudes, frequencies, and vibratory velocities of the colliding particles, that *cannot but fly off with transitional velocities and in directions dependent* on the sizes, amplitudes, frequencies, and vibratory velocities of the colliding particles *at the exact moment of collision!*

§129 (a) To all the above, in order to unite as much as it is possible the scientific picture of the world, the following must now be added: We seek to determine the physical character of the still mysterious electrical charge. If by analogy to Newton's Law, we write Coulomb's Law as

$$F = \epsilon (q_1)(q_2)/r^2, \quad (41)$$

where q_1 and q_2 are the two electrical charges, r the distance between them and ϵ the universal electrical constant, fully analogous to the universal gravitational constant, it becomes clear that the very same physical dimensionality holds for the product $\epsilon (q_1)(q_2)$ as does for the product $G (m_1)(m_2)$. The negative unit $-e$ electrical charge we know is that of the electron; and the physically identical to it except for the sign, positive unit $+e$ electrical charge is *not* that of the proton but that of the positron [there being little doubt that the difference in signs between the two is due to some, as yet unknown, kind of mirror-image structure-arrangement of the masses forming the two otherwise identical particles]. It follows that if the entire mass of each of these particles is involved in this spatial arrangement, the physical dimensionalities of $\epsilon(+e)^2$ and of $\epsilon(-e)^2$ being identical to that of $G(m_e)^2$, give the exact dimensionless ratio of the strengths of the electrical and gravitational forces $\epsilon(e)^2/G(m_e)^2$, that does not give the hydrogen atom. The determination of this ratio and of the exact physical nature of both ϵ and e requires additional input. Under the force of attraction $\epsilon(e)(-e)/r^2$ acting between them, the electron and the positron starting from a (practical) infinity reach each other sufficiently close to effect their annihilation under production of (usually) a pair of γ -rays of a total energy of 1.0215201 Mev = 1.6366576×10^{-6} ergs. But this is none other than the energy of transferring the force of attraction from (practical) infinity to the distance r_0 of annihilation, which is $(\epsilon e^2)/r_0$, that is also equal to $h\nu = hc/\lambda$, where h and c are respectively the Planck constant and the velocity of light, while ν and λ are the associated frequency and wavelength of the γ -radiation. If the wavelength equals r_0 ,

the distance at which annihilation takes effect, then the value of ϵ can be determined, there then being:

$$(\epsilon e^2)/r_o = hc/\lambda = 1.6366576 \times 10^{-6} \text{ ergs}, \quad (42)$$

$$r_o = \lambda = hc/1.6366576 \times 10^{-6} = 1.213722 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}, \quad (43)$$

$$\epsilon = 1.6366576 \times 10^{-6} (r_o/e^2) = 7.738484 \times 10^7 \text{ cgs}, \quad (44)$$

$$e = 1.60217733 \times 10^{-12} \text{ cgs}, \quad (45)$$

$$= 1.60217733 \times 10^{-19} \text{ C}, \quad (46)$$

$$\Lambda = \epsilon(e)^2/G(m_e)^2 = 3.5876003 \times 10^{45}. \quad (47)$$

(b) In view of the latter fact, nothing more may be said about the universal electrical constant and the electrical charge other than that the product $\epsilon(e)^2$ stands physically (and dimensionally) as the product $G(m_e)^2$, and vice versa. The (classical) mechanical characteristics of the universal gravitational constant and the *quantity* of matter are not further analyzable based on the gross macroscopical properties of matter. Nor is the present quantum mechanical theory truly better suited to elucidate what is clearly revealed here to refer to the essential details of the microarchitecture of matter, especially given its denial of the existence of what it calls "hidden parameters"; that cannot be judged as anything other than a naked effort to hide from view our essential ignorance. It *is entirely possible and in fact unavoidable* that the quantities ϵ and e refer both to the detailed microscopical internal architectural structure of matter and to the way this is converted to its observed gross macroscopical electromechanical properties. It is certainly naive to take the view that the Democritean atoms, present within the observable particles in vast numbers, are not there *specifically* organized. Present-day science may *not* ignore the Logical necessity of the existence of this *detailed* organization, even as it can say nought about it. Humility requires to state that present-day efforts *may not* be judged as anything more than searches in the dark, with tools *unsuitable* to the task! Dirac was *not* wrong to call for a new quantum theory that will take in view *all* true facts, the need for which is starkly demonstrated here.

[It should be carefully noted that in this presentation, the universal electrical constant ϵ is used in the numerator of the Coulomb Law, *contrary to the permittivity of free space* ϵ_0 placed in the denominator of the Coulomb Law as used in the historical long-standing development of the unrationalized and rationalized electrical units of measurement and in the parallel deve-

lopment of electrical practice and theory. Current practice and theory adds the ampere as a fundamental unit to the kilogram of mass, the meter of length and the second of time. The use of the universal electrical constant, along with the corresponding universal magnetical constant

$$\mu = c^2/\epsilon = 1.1614098 \times 10^{13} \text{ cgs}, \quad (48)$$

would bring the understanding of all these Laws to the same conceptual footing.]

(c) So far, no consideration has been given in this discussion to the universal facts presented earlier. As the quantities c , h , ν , λ are subject to universal variability depending on T , the age of the universe under constant G and M , so too is the product $\epsilon\mu$, but not the dimensionless constant Λ . It follows that, while

$$\epsilon(e)^2 = \Lambda G(m_e)^2 = 3.5876003 \times 10^{45} \times G(m_e)^2, \quad (49)$$

how ϵ and μ vary individually with time or remain at a fixed ratio cannot be answered; and so, neither can how or whether e varies with T . If, however, ϵ and μ remain constant so too does their ratio

$$\epsilon/\mu = \kappa = 6.663009043 \times 10^{-6} \text{ cgs}, \quad (50)$$

and the electrical charge e becomes none other than

$$e = 6.8088549 \times 10^{18} \times (G^{1/2}) m_e. \quad (51)$$

[It should also be noted that, contrary to the belief that the electron has a diameter of about 10^{-13} cm, and in the face of the fact that the size of the hydrogen atom is determined by the diameter of the electronic envelop surrounding the nucleus, the annihilation distance r_0 of 1.213722×10^{-10} cm suggests as truer the diameter of about 10^{-8} cm and a practical total overlap of electron and positron, both shrinking under attraction to the annihilation distance, before their spatial internal structure can be destroyed and the (presumably structureless) gamma rays appear. This also explains the failure to detect the proposed "positronium", a structure in which the positron occupies the position of the proton in the hydrogen atom. The observed since 1951 annihilation of the positron, does *not* require the existence of "positronium", but rather demonstrates its *non*-existence, as annihilation takes effect at the radius of about 10^{-10} cm, i.e., *before* the positron even comes to shrinking to the size of the hydrogen nucleus. This also explains the failure to detect the (expected to be double) characteristic emission spectral lines of "positronium".]

§130 (a) If all these, made in addition to my earlier discussion of energy, gravitation, relativity, and the Michelson-Morley experiment, surprise you Dear Reader, you surely will *not* be less surprised to learn that the scientific establishment *has been duly notified of them, since 1985, has not refuted them, has refused to admit their existence, has suppressed them, and has continued to teach the now all too clear falsehoods of the still accepted theories to trusting students paying them good money, whom they thus miseducate and corrupt in no ordinary but the corresponding extraordinary measure!* The accusation *is indeed heavy!* But it is *not* leveled by me! Only by the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity; that *may not and does not* mince words, numbers, significance! *Science is a deadly "game"!* For it involves not only the good name and honor of scientists and the integrity of Nature, but also the integrity and honor of the Holy God Logos Himself, *no less!* To add to blasphemy, not only was the "Scientific Establishment" notified: *So was also the Church!* That the world saw and heard nothing from either quarter only shows the respect to which all those people hold what they claim to be their "Faith"! The world has reached the point *we all, except those paid to smile, now lament for the active inactivity of the people appointed to guide it safely along the razor's edge!* Now, even the end of that *is in sight!*

(b) If, as in her book Kitty Ferguson mentioned and I here have already discussed, the scientists had/have *good* reasons to be preoccupied with God, just imagine what happens in their souls since 1985! It is *there* that the battle of Good and evil rages wilder than has ever raged in the souls of men! She ended her book saying that "*Truth also seeks us*". Here *is another aspect of Truth that also seeks to liberate us!* But here too now are those who choose to *keep It well hidden from us!* Most certainly, *not* in order to make us free!

(c) Because the public, on learning of the underlying Laws, *shall demand to know of their source!* Which, however, our pseudo-agnostic and atheist friends, *all of them vehemently practicing anti-Theists, are not willing to reveal!* Because, *what can they then say?* That the underlying Laws are of the making of the *physical* universe? But have they not all along *refused* to recognize *any* mentality, and so also *any and all* Law-making ability, to the universe, in effect recognizing *only themselves as the sole proven to exist sci-*

entific conscience and consciousness of the universe? Other than their own brains, consciousness and conscience, the universe out there, as we have already discussed but *can* certainly bear repeating, *cannot* be shown to possess a central Law-making establishment or Law-emanating and report-receiving mechanism *as are indispensable* if the underlying Laws are from *this* universe! And they *have surely missed* the existence and weight of all that is here discussed! *What other* can they thus say regarding the source of the *indisputably existing* underlying Laws? That it is a “mystery”? Call it a “mystery”! Or call it what you will! Have we humans not given the name of *Lawgiver*, and *Maker*, and *Creator*, and *Logos*, and *A and Ω* , to *exactly that* “mystery”? If, then, the *irrefutable existence* of the underlying *physical-natural* Laws, here revealed in all their glory lying in the *irrefutable numerical* results of our *scientific experiments*, makes the existence of that “mystery” *equally irrefutable*, *how exactly* does that differ from the *equally irrefutable proof* of the existence of God, *Lawgiver*, *Maker*, *Creator*, *Logos*, and *A and Ω* ? Is it not an *ipso facto negation* of its “mysteriousness” to reveal a thing *in all its glory*? How much “mystery” remains in Him, then, *now that He is thus revealed scientifically in all His glory*? For very long have people sought *proof irrefutable* of His own existence! Now, that proof *is given them scientifically*! In *what other Logical* form, could/would one think, the *scientific proof* of the existence of God could/would possibly come? It is the compelling nature of the *obvious* answers to all these questions that the “Scientific Establishment” of our time *cannot* avoid facing, except by puerile denial! Is it not thus also shown that geniuses *can* be puerile? Is it not thus also shown that geniusness is most certainly *not* equal to wisdom? And is it not *also known, if only to the wise*, that you *cannot* make vanish what *only puerily* you deny?

24

THE PASSING OFF
OF THE SUBJECTIVE AS OBJECTIVE
AND OF
THE FALSE AS TRUE

§131. Following all the above, hardly can any longer this statement be disputed: That a scientist calling himself a creationist has less-than-half-done his duty if he only points out the fallacies and blunders of atheistic “science”; and that he will only have done his work when he presents the *correct* scientific vision of the objective world, of which *only he* is objectively capable. This, of course, will chagrin and infuriate the atheists. But it is true that only the creationist, exactly for his believing in the infallibility and absolute perfection of God is capable of true objectivity, *knowing full well that the Perfect God cannot but shall in the end objectively triumph*, for having absolutely nothing to fear: For, this is certain: Without perfection, all, even if it for a moment can be assumed to exist, is nothing but genuine trash! The atheist scientist, *being scared of objectivity, fails to realize that of everything that he objectively faces and of which he can intrinsically have the best possible knowledge, it is himself that he degrades the most*: For this incontrovertible simple hard natural fact: that the human body, within which even his own atheistic spirit dwells, *is a perfect solution of the most complex known quantum-mechanical problem!* And it is the saddest of all our social hard facts that, the Nobel prizes are awarded by and among people who *totally discount exactly this appreciation first of themselves*, standing to receive the highest accolade for *reasoned achievement*, believing themselves to operate

on a sound "philosophy", though it is in the most fundamental conflict with the foundation of their own living existence! To spite the Mathematician Who first wrote down the grandest of all equations and then *all* the solutions, one of which is even each of themselves, they declare the universe they study and themselves "Onatop" as totally meaningless, yet deserving both the respect of the rest and the million! Objectively evaluated, this, *by definition unrecognized, is the highest schizophrenia!* Ordinary lunatics think of themselves as Napoleons, here we have the Doctors who think of themselves as trash, and teach this "philosophy" to the world! All the very worst for themselves, *if* they truly believe it! But they don't, they are mere cheats, sycophants of the very worst kind, licking the dirtiest boot on whose pay they subsist, profaning the Holiest Spirit by Whose Grace they truly transist! Nothing does the atheist scientist fear more than solely himself! Nothing does he avoid to study, speeding most hurriedly past it, than of himself! For, very deep down, *he still cannot but concede that he is a cheat, knowing himself to be by all standards sane! Except the one by which his "philosophy" dares be profanely nonobjective, which the atheist dares not discuss even with himself, remaining psychologically not just constrained but literally bound: just remember Einstein's aforementioned statement!* The atheist's extreme touchiness *is solely due to his unmistakable consciousness of just this his own omission!* Perhaps nowhere else among the writings of the great scientific figures of the twentieth century is this tragedy more obvious, and all the more so because it is left unconfessed, than in the stark juxtaposition of theistic and atheistic science presented in the writings of A. S. Eddington on the philosophy of science. But even there, the juxtaposition is very far from being complete; for the theistic science *is deliberately left undeveloped and well kept from the hurried ordinary view.* On p. 161 of his *The Philosophy of Physical Science* (Ann Arbor Paperbacks; 1958), Eddington states that "it has been my special task in these lectures to study the subjective element of the physical universe, so that the objective element has been kept out of the lime-light", doubtless for the already *confessed* (on p. 156) *fear* of his critics! It is nothing short of tragic how Eddington *distinguishes* the "subjective element" of (*atheistic*, though he does *not* call it so!) human science from the *sole meaningful* "objective element" (though *pretends* to have difficulty with this term!) of the *objective* (the

theistic, the created, which he does *not* call it so!) world, and how desperately, in evident order to mollify his atheistic critics, he attempts to avoid raising the heavy question of the *innate* objectivity of the objective world (the physical universe) and of its *total* separateness from the “universe of physics”. Elsewhere, he gives ample examples of his respect of God as any true believer having searched his own beliefs understands Him. But in his attempt to equate those two universes (p. 159), he behaves as a fully fledged atheist, with all consideration of the relationship of the objective world to God gone! To mollify his critics, on p. 158, he “reject[s] a definition postulating objectivity”, for even this is deadly to the atheistic dogma; and so, his otherwise fine intellect finds nothing wrong, despite the fact that on p. 217 he “take[s] it as axiomatic that the external world must have objective content”, with stating on p. 159 that “there is no difference between the physical universe and the universe of physics”; the latter, of course, being no other than what the *atheists* have decided constitutes the sole domain of reality! Just imagine a host of uncouth guests feasting on a table decked out as never again, never once for a moment toasting the *seemingly* absent host! An *unseemly* picture! The atheists! *And* their fellow-travelers, people of *soft* “faith”, thinking it proper to belong to both camps, dispensing broad smiles in all directions, in a desperate attempt to be pleasant to all, *except* the Holy God!

§132. The whole discussion and “understanding” in Eddington’s writings, just as is nearly everywhere, is marred and confused both consciously and unconsciously by misunderstanding and double-playing with the meaning of Greek words used in science, of which the non-Greek has no innate knowledge and is ultimately dependent on a dictionary for a definition: “Physical” derives from “*physis*”, *not* “*physics*”. *Physis* is nothing other than the *constantly objective* natural world as *it* exists and functions, both as a whole and in detail, regardless of whether or not humans understand either it or the manner of its functioning, and thus as it already existed and functioned even before man appeared, and thus without any “*physicists*” being around atheistically to “*rationalize*” its manner. On the other hand, *physics* is the “*science*”, our *constantly developing and changing understanding*, of *physis*. Broadly, *physis* means nothing other than Nature; but the two words have different etymologies, φύσις (*physis*, deriving from φύειν, the coming into being like a phytón, a vege-

table, *requiring nurturing, not being autophyés*, coming into being entirely on its own), whereas nature derives from *natum* (= that which is born; but seen narrowly as apart from parents, automatically having its own developing nature). But since the Age of Reason, and in the aftermath of the abuse of “natural law” by the medieval scholastic “naturalist” moralists (*literally* beating into the souls of men the fear for disobeying the *human, not the divine* word, rather than most tenderly cultivating in them the love for Logos, Who oversees all, and so even *their dicta*, for which *sole* reason they have chosen to remain foreign if Him!), physics has come to mean something entirely different from the science, the study of *objective* physis and of the *objective* Laws “out there” that regulate it. Thus has “physics” now been appropriated by the atheists, and means no more than the “science” of their own devising that falls under the purview of the human sensory apparatus (stated as the sole legitimate conduit of information examinable by “science” after transmission to the human brain, where “alone” it is *religiously* believed information is comprehended and science develops by human reason alone, yet *atheistically bi-ased* to consider as “scientific” *only what is obviously materialistic, under complete disregard of the clearly intellectual processes inescapably underlying the natural Laws that apply out there independently of human mental activities, that as Laws are not, cannot be, products of thoughtless processes.* All this despite the *inescapable need, studiously ignored remaining to be scientifically satisfied*, of how the “*real Law out there*”, not the “*in here supposed natural law*” obtained in the absence of an All-controlling Logos, i.e., *before all* such human “scientists”!

§133. In its deepest and widest sense, human reason *is* innately superior to the sensory equipment feeding it with *external* experience. Thus it is by right permitted, and indeed obligated, to separate the *proper, legitimate* and thus *Logical* experience from all illusory, illegitimate and illogical *seeming* “experience”. And thus it is obligated to hold scientific reasoning most of all in *constant check*, by *refusing* (which the atheists do *not* do) to generalize (which the atheists *do*) beyond what are the utmost reasonable-legitimate bounds, in view of the built-in uncertainty due to the imperfection of our sensory experiences obtained by our imperfect sensing devices both natural and man-made. As, strictly, science is knowledge obtained by studying and experimenting

with the objective world out there and systematized by the most austere reasoning we are capable of at any one time, it most certainly *cannot* be said to extend to *imaginary, supposedly existing, yet even forever unobservable but still called "physical" objects!* So, scientific reasoning in *constant check* also means delimiting our *reasonable* certainty regarding the physical world *inside the bounds of our limited* sensory experience. Only as *that* experience broadens may we expand the bounds of our reasonable certainty. Only as *our* Reason improves does our reasonable certainty become firmer. The atheists scientists do *not* operate within these constraints of Reason: they hasten to declare all Reality beyond what *they* call reality "non-existent"! The open, still unexplored horizons before human Reason are *not* tolerated by the atheists, unless *they* control *even them, even as they still remain unknown!* Thus does their "physics" and "science" deny and suppress the existence of anything that is not subject to and does not conform to atheistic materialism! For atheistic "science" there is no metaphysics, not even as the objective substratum on which matter exists; let alone the substratum that determines its *purpose!* However, it does not hesitate to presuppose *without the slightest indication, let alone proof,* at least the past everlastingness of the physical world, so in effect elevating it to *divinity* in substitution of God, though it still calls it ultimately purposeless!: The moment the world is shown to have had a *definite beginning and to operate based on objective, not "scientifically" imagined Law, showing that "science" false,* the definite news of it is suppressed to all extent possible! This is why Hubble's findings so stirred the murky waters and Einstein chose to pretend to have learned nothing by the black backdrop of the sky at night! This is why desperate efforts have never since ceased to be made proposing as "solution" a "possibly infinite universe of universes" *permanently* invisible to each other on account of the relativistically "expanding space"! This is why the *definite news* produced in 1986 of the physical universe built integrally around Newton's Law of gravitation declaring dead all relativistic speculation *has* been suppressed!!! Because the atheist physicists *cannot* tolerate the true objective world that works independently of them: Relativity, *even as it is now dead,* "must" go on ad infinitum! The now accepted form of quantum mechanics "must" continue to be served, even as it is Logically unacceptable! Undeterred, the professors *consciously* continue to

proffer falsehoods, believed as truths by the uninformed, the badly *mis*informed “masses”! In the modern atheistic parlance, the “physical world” is *not the objective natural world out there*, but the *fiction* of the “world” had in the *skewed minds* of “physicists”, laboring to create a mental picture of the real world as real as Picasso’s pictures are those of the real world, rather than only of *sick souls, ghastly figments of aimless souls pretending to be living!* Such is their arrogance! Such their teachings! And such their fruits, that we all now taste!

§134. (a) The related deliberate double entendre’s of “physical” and “natural” in modern parlance are very useful to the atheists for their letting them camouflage the scope of science and equate the natural world with the concoctions of the physicist: Pre-Copernicanism had been the medieval “philosophy” of *believing the secretly chosen to sit as the primus, not always even professional, though objectively ignorant of the wide World* “theologian” at the center of the wide World, attaching to *him* all the glory that naturally belongs to that center. Modern meta-Copernicanism is the *even worse* “philosophy” of *believing the (any, every) atheist materialist physicist observing the world from any position in that envious very same position*, by denying the world of Nature autonomous functioning, independent of the atheist nihilist physicist, be he a relativist or a follower of the current form of quantum mechanics! Of late, this profanely called “philosophy” has advanced to the point of the so-called “anthropic principle” that is nothing if not an attempt to turn cause and effect preposterously upside down, and declare the existence of the atheist physicist to be the *sufficient* cause for blind nature, haphazardly thrown here and there by pure chance, to produce him at *some time somewhere in the infinitude of the universe of universes*, yet solely in order to justify through his sayings the blind workings of that very chance, *not* of Nature!

(b) At this stage of our discussion, it will be well to consider in some detail the views of the eminent physicist Steven Weinberg, Nobel prize holder for his work on the so-called “weak force” and a living self-confirmed atheist, as he expressed them in his (about 4200-word main body and about 750-word reply to respondents) essay “*A Designer Universe*”, “based on a talk given in April 1999 at the Conference on Cosmic Design of the American Association for the advancement of Science in Washington D. C.”, excerpts

from which we have already discussed (see p. 198 et seq.). In his reply he writes: “[s]uppose that calculations showed that the chance of any single planet having surface gravity, temperature, and chemical composition favorable for the appearance of life, and of life actually arising on this planet, and of this life becoming intelligent through natural selection, is no greater than one part in, say, a million million. Then with only one planet in the universe, it would be difficult without supposing divine intervention to understand our great good fortune in having come into being. Of course, we now know that a good fraction of stars have planets, and that there are at least a hundred billion billion stars in the universe (perhaps an infinite number), so we need not be surprised that chance events governed by impersonal natural laws have produced intelligent life on at least one of the planets. With these odds it would be surprising if intelligent life had not appeared”.

A seemingly cogent argument! But is it? What [here, the probability of intelligent life appearing on a single planet] “is no greater than one part in, say, a million million”, can also be no greater than, say, one part in a quadrillion quadrillion (which may not be denied under the suppositions Weinberg sets, including the true, not the supposed odds hiding in natural selection, as we already have indicated as exclusively reasonable; namely, the building up of all complexity found in Nature starting from the supposed flux within every Planck cubicle during every Planck time interval (“timecle”?) in a universe self-set to expand as already presented, through to the proton and the electron and all elements and then to organic matter all the way up to the present generation of homo species, and not from some already present (indeed, how developed?) primordial cell with genes already in place, from which Dawkins and Company arbitrarily start, conveniently ignoring all evolution of physics and chemistry (including the evolution of the laws governing those sciences); which the more they are studied all the more are they stupendously found to be subject to the structure of otherwise totally abstract mathematics, that in itself is a noetical universe of pure thought, independent of the particular physics and chemistry observed out there! All those who love atheistic evolution can only impress us if, as indeed they are honor-bound to do, they take and make sense of the entire gamut of the natural evolution they proclaim, and not pick and choose from it what they please à la mode de la carte! And that is certainly smaller than one in a hundred billion billion! What we really need, which Weinberg

does *not* give us, is an *actual calculation of realistic probabilities; most certainly not suppositions* on probabilities! It seems that quantum mechanicians are so far removed from reality that they can only conceive it through *unexaminable* suppositions! Then again, is the real question about *intelligent* life (on this or perhaps also many other planets) in the universe, or rather about the intelligence of what Weinberg *consciously chooses to diminish* by calling them “impersonal natural laws governing chance events”? And this when in the main body of his essay he admits that “[t]oday we understand most of these things [the physical phenomena] in terms of physical forces acting under impersonal laws. We don’t yet know the most fundamental laws, and we can’t work out all the consequences of the laws we do know. The human mind remains extraordinarily difficult to understand, but so is the weather ... I see nothing about the human mind any more than about the weather that stands out as beyond the hope of understanding as a consequence of impersonal laws acting over billions of years”. Now, does he or not *arbitrarily* call the laws we *believe* we know “impersonal”, even as he admits *ignorance* of the most fundamental laws [on which the laws we *believe* we know are based], that may well turn out to be not in the least impersonal but beaming with what we here already have seen to be elegantly understated intelligence? Isn’t this intellectual license inexcusable of a holder of the Nobel prize? Or shouldn’t *every* reader stand aghast at the admission this Nobel laureate makes who “see[s] nothing more about the human mind than about the weather”? Spinoza wrote his “*Ethics*” *without a single* reference to Justice! Einstein wrote his general relativity theory having as “main object to develop the theory so that the reader will feel that the path followed is *psychologically* natural” [*his own phrase only slightly smoothed out!*]. “Scientists” *deliberately* keep on “confusing” the mind and the brain. Just as the brain is made up of particles of matter affected by the processes they suffer under forces they do not understand yet certainly “feel”, so indeed do the particles of air. But is the human *mind* a mere feather carried on the “wings of winds”, concerned only about its own psychological needs? [Will such “scientists” at last give us the *physical* bridge between the molecules of the *brain* and the psyche of man? Einstein bequeathed his brain to science; and slices of it are kept in an untold number of university laboratories having ascertained that

it too was just another brain! The psyche *is beyond the reach* of such investigators! These *are* hard facts!] If as per Weinberg, there is “nothing about the human mind any more than about the weather”, I propose that henceforth *all* Nobel prizes barring none be awarded to the “weather” (*not* the meteorologists!); that despite all its whimsicality, nevertheless manages to keep most of us breathing *and* luxuriously fed, which is a *real* accomplishment, *altogether far beyond chance* (or else, we all *would* have vanished long ago!), supposition, dispute, or sophomore pedantic debate! At least, this way, the “weather” would pass the annual Nobel rewards to quite a number of hungry babies to which it fails to give food under the normal course of events! The real question being about the Designer, we may *not* call impersonal the Laws *He* has chosen to impose upon Nature, and thus attempt to divert attention to *side* matters! This may be attempted by a crafty advocate in a human court of law, but most certainly *is* (at least ought to be) beneath a Nobel laureate! The *real* question is *not* about the intelligence of *our* “principles” and the “laws” *we* think apply to Nature under them, but about the intelligence of the *Designer’s* Laws!

(c) It is also astounding that this quantum mechanician simply “[s]uppose[s] that calculations showed that the chance of .[etc.] is no greater than one part in, say, a million million”, rather than using quantum mechanical reasoning to obtain some far more realistic probabilities. For the theory has advanced to the point of speculating about what happens down to the level of the so-called “Planck length” $l_p = (hG/2\pi c^3)^{1/2} = 1.6605 \times 10^{-33}$ cm over periods of time as short as the so-called “Planck time” $t_p = l_p/c = 5.39056 \times 10^{-44}$ sec! The use of Newton’s gravitational constant permits us to remember that, as we already have mentioned, Newton’s Law of gravitation recognizes no limit of applicability from zero length to infinity; thus applying not just only to this but to *all* conceivable universes. Let us therefore confine ourselves to a mega-universe a billion times as large as this one, extending one thousand times as far as this one in each of the three spatial directions. The cube circumscribing this mega-universe is of size $(1000 \times 2R)^3$ and contains $(1000 \times 2R/l_p)^3 = 8.5846 \times 10^{192}$ “cubides” (tiny cubes of Planck length in each direction). Over the period of 12 billion years (the presumed age of the universe so far) there have been

$T/t_p = 7.0251 \times 10^{60}$ “chronides” (periods of Planck time duration each). Imagine a huge lot machine thoroughly mixing up all the cubides and then letting them settle in their *exact places each!* Why *exact*? For the *simple yet sufficient* reasons (i) that as there are no voids between the cubides, their orientations must be so exact that there absolutely be no misfits; (ii) that a cubide suitable for an *exact place on the retina of your eye*, or a *particular rose petal in your garden*, most certainly may *not* be thrown either in the far inter-universal space, or at the center of the sun, or at the center of a galaxy; and (iii) that from *each* cubide there pass lines and surfaces of a whole multitude of isodynamic potentials of *exact value and exact gradient each, suitably unique to the exact positions in space of each cubide!* This *despite* the speculations of the theory regarding the state of things within each cubide during each chronide! It makes no difference that the universe develops as it does in its own stately manner. Under no law whatever, under pure chance, over the life of the universe, the lot machine has let things settle down some 7.0251×10^{60} times, and each time each cubide has found its *exact* place, for it is *in/from that exact* place that *each* cubide has participated in the development of the mega-universe!

(d) How exact must the geometrical fit be of each cubide? Certainly, no worse than a second of a second of a degree in each of the three spatial directions. This makes the total probability of this requirement no better than one in $(360 \times 60 \times 60)^3$, or 4.5939×10^{-19} . The probability of each cubide to find its place (apart from orientation) depends on the manner the places are filled. If all are filled at once, the probability of each one to find its right place is one in 8.5846×10^{192} , or 1.1649×10^{-193} , so that the probability of each one to find its own place *and* fit geometrically is no better than $5.3513 \dots \times 10^{-212}$, or one in $10^{211.2715 \dots}$. It follows that the probability of all cubides to find their exact right places is this last probability raised to the power of $8.5846 \times 10^{192} = 10^{192.9373 \dots}$, that (after expressing all numbers as 10 raised to powers of 10) makes it one in $10^{195.2622 \dots}$. So, it is *not* the probability of a *partial* occurrence that seems “reasonable” to happen somewhere in the vastness by which we must be impressed, but the probability of the *entire* occurrence that permits the part to appear somewhere! And this latter probability *gets reduced faster as the whole gets larger!* And if

these numbers are impressive enough, in fact *they are not yet impressive enough*, as this last probability, minute as it is, is that for a *single* throw as it were, for the happenings in the mega-universe during a *single* chronide! But the mega-universe has already been around for $7.0251 \times 10^{60} = 10^{60.8466\dots}$ chronides, which requires that the probability for the entire mega-universe to have developed as it so far has by pure chance is no better than one in $10^{211.2715\dots}$ raised to the power of $10^{192.9373\dots}$ raised once again to the power of $10^{60.8466\dots}$. Expressing all numbers as 10 raised to powers of 10, we find that the probability of the mega-universe to have lasted for so long by pure chance is no better than one in $10^{10^{256.1088\dots}}$.

[One gets a better idea of the size of this number by considering one's chances of picking one particular hydrogen atom painted, say, white, out of the entire thoroughly mixed universe in which all the rest of its mass is converted to atoms of hydrogen painted black. That chance is about a mere 1 in $10^{80} = 10^{101.9031\dots}$, which makes the ratio of these two probabilities $10^{10^{254.2057\dots}}$. Are you still not duly impressed? Just consider that if pure chance is in fact at work, as our luck has already lasted for 12 billion years and has been extraordinarily good, it gets to be all the more likely to run out in the very next chronide, lasting only 5.39056×10^{-44} sec! At which point it is entirely proper to ask whether Weinberg, and all those preferring to believe in chance and meaninglessness rather than in God and *His* meaning, and all nihilists and opportunists it is by *this* time span that they make their plans, organize their lives, produce children, get educated and are consumed at work in an effort to produce something worth their while, something *meaningful*! For otherwise, there can be no escaping from the thought that there are plenty of professors and "specialist" Nobel laureates who still have *not* thought through the Reality in which we all spend our lives, and the "reality" *they* have chosen to teach, freely riding on the *real* one!]

These are *the best* probabilities we may consider, because the more strictures we conceive as operating purely by chance there enters yet another power to which the earlier probability must be raised! To put it in more pedestrian terms, ladies and gentlemen, we are *not escaping from God* by considering a yet larger universe, we *only increase our obligations as thinkers*! Failing to consider *them*, we

constrain ourselves to adopting the *yet narrower view of even worse peasants* ensconced in a yet smaller and narrower valley; more like moles burrowing out tunnels and raising molehills, or even like little ants, as we think that we liberate ourselves from the obligation to consider the whole and how *it* came about! When at last will we realize that the more we play the lottery the worse off we get? Our chances to win against God? Simply, none whatever! Simplicity, Economy, Logic demand that the Universe be the least that can serve its objective! And the Universe, as we *shall* show, indeed has a most worthwhile objective! Only peasants, moles and ants think narrowly of themselves!

§135. (a) In his essay we mentioned above, Weinberg admits that “there seems to be an irreducible mystery that science will not eliminate” because “even when we have a final theory, ... we will still be left with the question ‘why?’”. If we all agree that answering this question will go far toward satisfying our ultimate quest, I, for one, will argue that, answering this question involves a great deal more objectivity than we so far have exhibited and are willing publicly to admit from positions of eminence: Having already sent so much material (which some, not altogether unreasonably, just call it trash!) into the universe, we may suppose that in a remote planet, somebody having no knowledge of us yet indeed finds (which *is* our admitted objective!) a mechanical piece of ours, hopefully not altogether reduced on falling there to scrap. Would he be right to conclude automatically that its purpose was/is non-existent, because he cannot answer “why?”? If not, how right can *we* be to conclude that the *entire* universe, *evidently governed by Law*, or else *all* our so-called “Science” *is* a farce, has no purpose and is ultimately meaningless; *which is the standing position of atheism?* As Weinberg also admits that, though “quantum mechanics is the one part of our present physics that is likely to survive intact in any future theory, ... there is nothing logically inevitable about quantum mechanics [and he] can imagine a universe governed by Newtonian mechanics instead” [which indeed presents the most compact set of Laws governing the entire universe down to its fundamental Democritean atoms since the moment of the Big Bang, as presented to the physicists since 1986], *why does he (along with all formally chaired professors) still refuse to admit “see[ing in that] the hand of the designer”?* If besides the (scrapped?) mechanism, the aforementioned discoverer found no trace of life on

that remote planet, should he, *having the knowledge he does*, consider himself obligated to call the existence of the mechanism a mystery? Or would he, rather, conclude that *somebody did indeed drop it there*? With *our present* knowledge, how well justified may we consider ourselves if we judge as mechanisms pieces made of metal or *low-grade* "inorganic" and "organic" matter; but dismiss, excluding from consideration, "pieces" of *living* matter? Why indeed only the former should demand a conscientious constructor, a mechanic in a workshop to give them the form they have, yet the latter should demand no constructor but just be products of "evolution"? If nothing but chance originally shifts through all materials as Dawkins insists, why should only the latter go through the subsequent stages of "development" and not also the former? Just only because only the latter are "living"? When quantum mechanics speak of the "froth" down at the level of the so-called "Planck length" and "rudimentary" processes taking place down there in the span of the so-called "Planck time", of which *all* matter non-living *and* living is made up, *how* do we define "life" quantum-mechanically? Indeed *how intellectually honest* is it of an atheist quantum mechanician to take refuge behind "evolution"?

(b) Weinberg also "guess[es] that if we were to see the hand of a designer anywhere, it would be in the fundamental principles, the final laws of nature, the book of rules that govern all natural phenomena. We don't know [he says] the final laws yet, but as far as we have been able to see, they are utterly impersonal and quite without any special role for life. There is no life force". The discoverer of the weak force seeks the discovery of yet another form of force to be persuaded of the existence of the "designer God". But why just stop at four or five so-called fundamental forces? Some other imaginative guy *could* demand his own particular x-force! Weinberg *is just not objective enough!*: If he were, he *would* have realized that the Ultimate Simplicity of the Most Elegant Design demands *just one only* force, operating on a *one only kind of fundamental Democritean particles* combining under *the* Perfect Quantum Law to bring about *all* the solutions, each one of them fitted exactly to each one of the multiplicity of forms we observe, *including* the particular ultimate solution we identified above as the human body! It is *not* the particularity of separate creations that is the most elegant presentation of Wisdom, but the *singularity of Creation that under a single*

Law, acting on a single kind of particles by a single force brings about all the riches of forms! Just as we here have tried to show! Just as Weinberg, too, *would* be satisfied to find the “book of rules”, and, doubtless, the thinner that book the better! Just as our other-planetary friend would be satisfied if he were to find a more general explanation for that piece of ours he happened to find, “inexplicably” as he first thought on that other planet!

(c) We simply are *not* objective enough; so, we remain victims of our subjectivity! Of which, Weinberg offers himself as example worthy of studying!: For he attacks belief in God because “[He] in the Old Testament tells us to bash the heads of infidels and demands that we be willing to sacrifice our children’s lives at His orders”. Yet, in his reply to his respondents he stated that “... but I think that in fact my non-designer argument is eminently falsifiable. All that’s needed is a miracle or two. In reply to a question after my talk ... I suggested that everything I had said would be refuted if a bolt of lightning were to strike me down at the podium”! So, here is a Nobel laureate who dismisses belief in a God Who *supposedly* demands blood, yet *is willing to believe in just such a God* if He were to strike him down, in evident retaliation for his unbelief in Him! The laureate does not realize that he thus does indeed offer obeisance to a God *publicly proving Himself evil*, even as he despises Him for being such! So, despite his claim, he does *not really* reject belief in a *cruel* God, yet he *thinks* he produces a reasoned argument for withholding and rejecting belief in a *kind* God, the one freely self-offered first to the Jews in the person of Jesus Christ, Who offered them *only benevolences in miracle after unbelieved miracle* and suffers *seemingly* nonchalantly [for we may *not* forget the *Perfect Justice* of the *Kind* God, Who would *not* be Kind unless He also dispensed *Perfect Justice*!] even this his own so public blasphemy! Thus in effect, this Nobel laureate tells us that if he were present at the time of Christ, he too would have acted as did his forefathers; but would have gladly become an ardent follower, had Christ shown Himself to be cruel as they expected of Him and had struck down not just the general evil, but only those *they* considered the enemy! So, even an atheist, at least the one so talking and writing, cannot escape from just the very same age-old grip of subjectivity that supposedly characterizes uniquely the believers—but not in God, but their own advantage! Here comes a Nobel laureate who utterly fails to see that he attacks

personally God *but only for the blasphemous misconceptions of men*, that have been put down even in the Holy Writ of his own forefathers; who fails to see that frail and vicious men dare speak and write of God even as they think of themselves! Who does not see that even “the God of traditional Christianity and Islam damns us for eternity if we do not worship Him in the right manner”, yet *solely according to men’s interpretation of man-written* so-called [semi]-“Holy Scriptures”, having taken after the example of the Old Testament, and taught *not even quite as written* by men who only care to maintain and advance their own grip on society, rather than solely the Cause of the Holy God! A laureate who continues with “I know, I know, we are not supposed to judge God according to human standards, but you see the problem here: If we are not convinced of His existence, and are looking for signs of His benevolence, then what other standards can we use?”, and conveniently “*forgets*” the benevolence of Christ; and *refuses* to declare his belief in Him for just His *always healing* miracles [but by his own admission, he rather *is* willing to believe in an *evil* miracle!]; and thus he does *not* put to shame the Christians of two thousand years for *not taking after Whom they call their Master!*

(d) So, Weinberg regards it innocent to ask “what other standards can we use?” (obviously meaning: “other than our own?”)! This is exactly the crux: *the, our*, subjectivity! Both in his essay and his response he does *not* fail to attack Hitler, about whom he admits that “[n]o one would say that Hitler was a Christian zealot, but it is hard to imagine Nazism taking the form it did without the foundation provided by centuries of Christian anti-Semitism”. What do we have here, you ask? A *general attack* on centuries-old “Christian anti-Semitism”! The Nobel laureate “*forgets*” that “Christian anti-Semitism” was *not* universal either during the Second World War or during the centuries; that there have been untold numbers of Christians who at the risk of their own lives hid Jews from the Nazis; that it is *not* gentlemanly to attempt to pass on the evil of one man or a narrow group of people to a whole nation (in this case the German) or to the followers of a whole religion (in this case the Christian); and that it is particularly offensive to the intelligence of his audience and his readership for a renown physicist to consider an action, even if it be social, without an *equally austere* review of the *reaction*. Surely, after a war that cost upward of one hundred million lives, of whom six million Jews, and after

more than fifty years after the end of that war, it is most certainly not intelligible that no one has called for a *general study* of the relationships of Christians and Jews during the twenty adjacent centuries; of *how and why* it was that the Jews continued to live scattered all over among the Christians even long after the reasons for their expulsion from Palestine no longer mattered; of how it was that the Jews adopted personal names indistinguishable from those of their Christian neighbors; and what the intimate local structures, both social and religious, were of the medieval societies, in the midst of which the Jews lived and *could not but stand apart from but even thus also affect them*, and how easy or difficult it then was for such societies to tolerate the *always simmering in their midst conscious rejection of the benevolent Crucified!* We may *not*, for the fact that we almost all now ignore the Crucified, judge past generations by *this our atheistic contemporary* standard! Are now or ever the Jews right to wage such a general at least verbal attack on the "Christians" even from within what *used to be Christian* societies? Then, also, objectivity demands that the remaining *Christians* ask: by what right do the Jews even now continue to want *even the name of the Crucified completely erased from memory?* Two thousand years after the fact, we *must* at last find the courage to ask: What other than pure benevolences did *He* shower upon *them*??? The crimes of "Christians" may *not* be charged to Him! This *cannot* be Justice, but *evil unjustified attack against Holiness once made visible!* *Are we clear? Are we clear?* I know, I know, that I dare raise and ask *the* most prickly questions! But at the present age of globalization, it is intellectually and morally inadmissible to continue, for the sake of *subjectivity* standing thus to be damaged, to evade exactly *the* most prickly questions, by an honest answer to which alone may we advance as a global civilization proud of its standing! All else *cannot but be cheap excuses*, attempting to cover our indifference about our common global civilization, and conceal our singular care about "our" always crass "profit"!

(e) So, to continue with Weinberg's question, "what other standards can we use?", I for one cannot but state "but certainly *not our* standards"! Because even little children teach us, *if* we truly care to observe: Little girls play adult women by trying on their mothers shoes, yes? So, why do we not try to step in God's shoes, and just begin to think of *His* obligations first toward Him-

self setting the example and then toward the world, whom He cannot but govern by exemplary Justice? If we did, we *would* see that asking Weinberg's last question yet insisting on *our* standards is equivalent to trying to see the world from the perspective of the little girls, rather than that of the grownups, i.e., God's Himself in this case!

(f) Returning now to the end of the quotation from Weinberg's essay discussed above in (b), what "special role" (in other words, *purpose*) would *Weinberg* consider satisfactory for *life, specifically our life*, to exist, for which God would consider His effort and time well spent in bringing into being the universe, *especially if it be solely for our sake*? A Nobel laureate for work done in physics *is honor bound* to consider especially this possibility, and he may *not* constrain himself to just asking "Why?"! He must also dare propose an answer to his own question! After all, he got the prize for proposing a *theory*! So, why not also proposing just only yet another *simple hypothesis*, on which if not he someone else may build? Stopping at the "Why?" is never stopping to wonder like little boys; while little girls, assuming the airs of their mothers, try on *their* shoes! Moreover, a Nobel laureate may *not* accuse the religious for not asking and attempting to answer themselves the question for feeling satisfied to consider "that God 'by definition' is the ultimate answer to any chain of 'why' questions", as Fr. Ed. T. Oakes, S. J. stated in *his* letter on Weinberg's essay, if he is not willing himself to make a plunge! May I assure him that the water *is* indeed deep, but is also well oxygenated; and once in it, one may swim like a fish? May I suggest that the answer to the "Why?" that surpasses all subjectivity and reaches at the feet of objectivity is nothing other than "For the sake of *Holiness, both God's and ours!*"? Isn't that the extreme opposite of the *nihilism* he prefers *but is ever so careful as never to mention*, hiding behind the innocent-looking general atheistic assertion that "God does not exist; therefore, life is utterly meaningless"? And is it truly too much for a Nobel laureate to realize that *Holiness is unattainable without the possibility of evil, which only we bring into being by choosing it* rather than *Holiness*? Is it truly too much for a Nobel laureate to realize that the world would *not* be better without the *possibility* of *Holiness*, that *alone requires the objective existence of the possibility* of its opposite? Weinberg says "I don't need to argue here that the evil in the world proves that the universe is not de-

signed, but only that there are no signs of benevolence that might have shown the hand of a designer. But in fact the perception that God cannot be benevolent is very old. Plays by Aeschylus and Euripides make a quite explicit statement that the gods are selfish and cruel, though they expect better behavior from humans" Question: How legitimate is it for a twentieth century Nobel laureate to "argue" for the nonexistence of a designer, based on playwrights of a period in which the qualities, *not of God*, but of gods and men were all mixed up in the minds of ordinary people, who had deified even their own Fates; playwrights intent only on stirring up the questions in the minds of *ordinary* people while entertaining them, rather than educating them on the depths of Science, Philosophy and Theology; playwrights who chose *not* to sit down with their contemporaries Socrates and Plato who *had already decided, without the benefit of the light of later days*, that God is Good? [Does Weinberg ignore that playwrights are far more akin to the poets than are to philosophers, or does he forget that Meletus, one of the plaintiffs against Socrates, represented the poets? Or has he never heard of *selective, at best second-hand hearsay* and how it is treated in *our present* judicial system? If so, what witness indeed can a poet of *any* age bring against God that can today command some attention?] Can Weinberg bring just one citation from Socrates and Plato stating the nonexistence of God? Socrates was *wrongfully* accused of introducing "new gods" when he *obedient* to Apollo the God of Light only sought to cast God's Light to the souls of men, to the point of teaching them even how to give up their lives as *free, erect/correct, standing up citizens* believing in righteousness! This *was a benevolent civic lesson* come to men either from the God of Light, or from a mere man the like of which and of whom the world has never before or since seen! Most certainly it was *not* a nihilistic lesson in the meaninglessness of the world! Four whole centuries later, Jesus Christ filled Palestine with *benevolent* miracles (*not the malevolent* miracles Weinberg concedes would be persuasive!), but Weinberg continues to state that "there are no signs of benevolence that might have shown the hand of a designer"! But he also admits: [n]ow it doesn't settle the matter for me to say that we cannot see the hand of a designer in what we know about the fundamental principles of science. It might be that although these principles do not refer explicitly to life, much less to human life, they are nevertheless craftily designed to bring it about". But quite

apart from the “fundamental principles of science” that are mostly *our* “principles” that *we* have elevated to the status of universal laws (and *perhaps* it is only for that reason that we do not see them to refer explicitly to life), the real question about life Weinberg does not answer is whether *he* regards life beneficial. If not, his entire argument regarding *all* manifestations of malevolence in the world become simply vacuous! And if he does, and at the same time admits that *it is not our principles but the Laws of Nature* that “are craftily designed to bring it [i.e., *life*] about”, why does he still refuse to confess that benevolence in the world starts from very deep down indeed, as it is the *Laws* that are “craftily designed to bring [life] about”? Is it not a *deliberate* distortion of the meaning of language to use the passive voice [here, “[life] craftily designed”] without *clear* reference to the *active* agent Who *so craftily designed* all these matters from so very deep down indeed? We need *more honesty, more objectivity* than Weinberg is obviously capable of! The “Christians”, those he may accuse; their crimes *are* indeed legion! But Christ (i.e., God’s *own face as the Creator*), Him he may *neither accuse nor ignore*; for *He only healed!* And *only for that* has He to this day by the Jews been rejected! In studying the world, we need *more honesty, more objectivity* than Weinberg teaches from his high professorial chair and the podiums the world offers him! Pity on you, Herr Professor! And, alas, pity on us too!

(g) Not even Hitler, whom Weinberg so attacks, was a nihilist; And a nihilist, as Weinberg truly is, propounding the views he presents, as do almost all so-self-called “enlightened” people nowadays calling the universe meaningless for *supposedly* having come from nothing, meaning nothing, intended for nothing, may *not* accuse *any* non-nihilist for being worse than *he* is! Does he not see that if he be right, he has been honored with the Nobel prize for honestly nothing?! Do we already really live in such an upside down “Brave New World” that the nihilists look down with utter contempt upon people still holding some however noxious but still higher than the absolute zero beliefs?

(h) Indeed, what lesser than Holiness purpose would the *Holy God and* a self-respecting man consider for *any* life endowed with intellect; all of which the Nobel laureate Weinberg equates to *nothing*? How can he possibly fail to see that from the war of Good vs. evil the Holy God could neither possibly absent Himself, nor appear in all His Glory that objectively *would* burn the

material eyes of *all* sinners, if they by some miracle could but for a moment see Him in Person? How do we all fail to see that the human flesh *is* the proper dress the Holy God *had* to choose to make Himself visible to us all, to deliver His Lesson? And how can a Nobel medalist possibly fail to see that in this war *only freely* can a Good Man choose to stay sinless? The whole debate among *Christians* has been how we men are to understand this union in Holiness of God and the Good Man in a *seeming* single person called Jesus Christ! If He were only the Holy God, what gripe can *any* man have against Him, other than that He indeed showed us the Way? And if He were “only” a Good Man, *as at least every honest man must concede*, how come do the Jews not take particular pride in Him and become His followers to the last man, exactly for His having been one of them, leading the world to Holiness?

[But this second possibility raises another question: Can a Good Man rise to Holiness in the absence of God? As nothing can come out of nothing, the atheists have advanced the idea of an ever-present *material* universe; *have been upset* by Hubble’s finding; and *continue to propagate the idea of a periodically re-collapsing universe*, conveniently forgetting the fate of the outgoing light and how it too is going to be recalled upon re-collapse as an integral part of the material universe! That Holiness may come out of nothing *is by definition far far more demanding* than that of the material universe coming out of nothing! The atheists *cannot*, therefore, accept either the proposition of Holiness coming out of nothing, or the idea that the material universe is itself Its presentation! This is exactly why they insist that the universe is meaningless. They *know* that Holiness is *not* meaningless! Therefore, a Good Man *can neither appear nor rise to Holiness in the absence of God!* So, the opposition to God imposes the opposition to the Good Man also! This is why the atheists will have nothing to do with Jesus Christ! This is how and why the ideas of the world and of Holiness *are* intertwined and *cannot* be considered apart from each other; to the chagrin of *both* physicists and “theologians” who since 1986 *pretend* not to understand my *refusal* to separate the two ideas and, in *their* words, “to forget God” in my writings about the world!]

Now, therefore, that Weinberg has chosen so to treat the subject of the “Designer Universe”, I for one, setting for a moment aside

all other questions, would indeed be most interested to see his considered reply to *this* central historical point! And, will he insist that Holiness, *including the constant benevolences of Jesus Christ*, is just *nothing*, while the million coming with the Nobel award *is* something? And, would he be kind enough to tell us where indeed could Holiness sprout better than in one of Hitler's concentration camps? *If* it did not, was Hitler truly responsible, whom Weinberg correctly attacks for his crimes, though *conveniently* forgetting that he does so on the basis of morality *pegged on God*, for without God setting the norms of morality, in a world meaning nothing as per Weinberg, there can be *no* immorality and so *neither* crime? And if *all* the concentration camps did produce though just one only Saint, will Weinberg, the nihilist, dismiss him on grounds of too much waste? I do *not* mean to excuse Hitler and the concentration camps anywhere! I say that life, and the universe that supports it, *is utterly meaningful even if only one Saint ever appears in it*, especially when all others, despite all the rich gifts showered on them (certainly *not* by chance, for then they would *not* be solely rich gifts!), choose to consider themselves and the universe utterly meaningless!!!

(i) Not only so thus is Jesus Christ central in world history. But so too, *by definition*, is the *Christian* debate about His nature! The *Christians* have it decided: *No other life can be better* than the one that *unites but does not confuse* the natures of God and Man in the *common* search for Ultimate Holiness! That *is* the Ultimate Objectivity! *All else is subjective!* If anyone has a *superior* counteroffer, let him produce it! It shall still be welcome! So far, it has been a debate from which the Jews, scattered among the *Christians*, *consciously chose* to remain apart, though they indeed had much they *could* offer! That debate affects *everyone*, and *everyone must* make his contribution to this, worthier than which there is none, search for the Ultimate Holiness! *All* that has happened during the last two thousand years, and *all* that remains to happen *cannot* be separated from the reality of the barnacles weighing to the bottom the *common* ship on which *we all* travel! Today, all three monotheistic religions, and all the schisms within each one are at war, open and secret! So, who indeed can be proud? And who indeed can watch with glee, who offers *no cure* other than his message of ultimate meaninglessness? Indeed, what cure can *that* be? The world burns! Are we so blind, so very much out of our minds

as no longer to see? Have we no other than acid and poison to pour on the gaping wounds of our *common* world? Have the Nobel laureates no balsam other than throwing *their* kind of fodder to this world conflagration? We *all* have indeed much for which we all *must* offer our apologies! Brothers all: *enough!!!* Let us at long last begin the healing, before it gets to be much too late!!!

§136. Eddington was, of course, not as explicit as all this. His admitted fear of his critics held him in check and prevented him from denouncing openly this sort of pseudoscience that insists on passing for objective truth (loc. cit. pp. 185, 217). but his basic honesty prevented him from not alluding even tangentially, between the lines, to the intrinsic and unavoidable distinction between the subjective (i.e., the physicist's own) and the objective (the truly existing) "physical universe". Yet, his fear of the critics prevented him from showing that, human scientific knowledge, for its insisting by selective subjectivism on including in "science" only what the atheist physicists deem proper, is therefore basically incomplete and even outright false. He was far more in the cast of an atheist scientist himself and far less in the cast of a fully rationalist thinker to examine the full implications of modern atheistic science. He was the first to expound on relativity theory, that he adopted, so much so that his "*Mathematical Theory of Relativity*" of 1923 was held by Einstein himself to be the best presentation on the subject. But even for his contributions to atheistic science, the atheists could not and still cannot forgive him. His insistence on the selective-subjective nature of "physics" was indeed the monkey wrench in the inner workings of atheism for the doubts it raises of its validity, for them to tolerate him.

25

THE PROPER PLACE OF MATHEMATICS IN REASONING

§137. With the complete separation of Science and Religion in the modern times, we have yet to realize the nearly impossible place in which we have placed the subject matter of mathematics! To most readers, this statement will appear peculiar, until they think back of the Greek statements of “μηδείς ἀγεωμέτρητος εἰσ-ίτω” and “ἀεὶ ὁ Θεὸς ὁ Μέγας γεωμετρῆι” [respectively, “no one ignorant of geometry may enter” and “always does the Great God geometrize”], and the infinite mathematical care with which the Greeks built their temples! There has been nor can be a better example of the *Logical unity* of thought with which *any* other people that ever lived conducted their daily lives more constantly bearing in mind Science (that *inescapably includes* mathematics), PhiloSophy (that is near empty words when it ignores mathematics) and TheoLogy (that most certainly reduces itself to “theology” and *profanes* the Lord the moment it ceases to regard Him also as the Ultimate Mathematician). [And if this reads and sounds “Masonic” to some traditional “Christians”, I shall offer no apology, but only a plea that *they themselves reconsider what they have wrought for two thousand years* by means of their rejection of the ancient Greek mode of Reasoning, that by no stretch of anybody’s imagination may be accused of having had anything to do with Free Masonry!] It, alas, has been the nearly unbearable price civilization has paid on passing from what obstinate ignoramuses still call “idolatry” to, in essence, *Jewish-oriental* Christianity that has made “piety” of haughtily ignoring the *perfect and complete* intellectual attributes of the *Personal Deity*, in Whom

the "Christians" *merely pretend* to profess belief, without in the least realizing that their love of God is nothing at all beyond *pathos* (relating to the possessive, selfish and malicious, rather than the *healthy sympathetic* aspects of passion in standing with the Spirit-Lord, Whose icons we are in all that Holiness regards Just), as long as they neglect to love Him also "with all their power and all their intellect" (and thus *also* with *all* the power of *their* intellect), that is inescapably lame when its mathematics is being restricted to the mere counting of obols collected (in which effort we certainly cannot afford to displease any giver!), that is the second most most important activity of the Churches; the first being the constant pursuit of absolute power, that is *all* the power they can get *for the men at the top*, who have never given a thought to the *unforgivable* blasphemy of the Spirit, that *we certainly practice when we neglect to offer the Lord all that is due Him, including the mathematical aspects of the Spirit!* That Christ among the Jews acted as He did had only to do with *what was then there most needed!* He left it for the Holy Spirit *working in us* to remind us, supplement His statements, and guide us *concretely* on Up! The "Christian" priesthood decided, alas, otherwise: they stuck to the Jewish paradigm, and *completely* neglected the Spirit! It is in bitter sorrow that I have to say all this, as I can no longer expect from them a confession of the ultimate sin! They simply refuse to realize how Jewish they become in their *still continuing slander* of the ancient Greek Spirit, that bequeathed the world its language, without which Christianity would inescapably have come to nothing at all! Nor, alas. do they realize wherefrom the continuing war of every probable and improbable origin against the Greek paradigm springs, that is *also* a war against the Lord up on high! The *slandered* Greek "idolaters" *never* committed this *supposedly* "pious" blasphemy! When prominent prelates and theology professors ignore the pleas of reconsidering their crime of splitting the Spirit in half and surrendering Science and Reasoning to the enemy, one *cannot* but suspect *conscious* intent, or, else, idiocy!

§138. This work would be incomplete if it did not include an examination of what is enacted against the Spirit of God even from within the basic quarters of theoretical mathematics. It was in 1931 when the theorems of K. Gödel and in 1936 of A. Tarski appeared and have had their impact. They were developed on researching the axiomatic cohesion of the foundations of theo-

retical arithmetic, dealing in the unlimited set of natural numbers ($N = 0, 1, 2, 3, \text{etc.}$). Since ancient times, arithmetic has recognized what we call numbers and their interrelations that hold them together by such *additional and clearly extra-arithmetical connective* "particles" such as 'not', 'and', 'or', 'if ..., then ...', 'if and only if ..., then ...', other operators; symbols such as: 'equal', 'not equal', 'larger than', 'smaller than'; etc., without which we simply *cannot* have arithmetic. In themselves, the numbers are purely *mental* constructs that attached to *other* "things" help us in considering the latter, that can be other mental constructs or even physical items or "things". It is thus that we speak of "one or two ideas that may be helpful", "three friends", or "two pairs of horses". It appears that, before the beginning of the twentieth century the mathematicians had not undertaken a rigorous research of the strength of the logical foundations on which the science of numbers has been built. Then, three distinct "schools" undertook to lay the new, self-consistent and hopefully unshakable foundations of mathematics: the "logistic school" of B. Russell, the "axiomatic school" of D. Hilbert, and the "intuitionist school" of L. E. J. Brouwer. By common agreement, none of these schools supplied an entirely satisfactory complete proposition regarding those foundations; either proving itself, or verified by the methods of the other two schools, nor did it answer the specific problem created by the Gödel findings. This failure *cannot* but lie in our *still incomplete* understanding of the specific *quantitative only mental* nature of numbers and our *obviously faulty* appraisal of their limitations within the far wider (for including the *qualitative* universe) content of mind, and of how rationally may qualities and quantities relate at all; of which Gödel's procedure is but an example:

§139. Carefully expressed, Gödel's **first** theorem states that "there exist *arithmetic* propositions (even of comparatively elementary nature) that *are evidently true yet cannot be deduced* from within the formalism of arithmetic". Carefully expressed, Gödel's **second** theorem states that "a formula (consisting of axioms and, optionally, additional truths) written in accordance with the rules of the formalism of arithmetic *cannot* be shown to be consistent (i.e., free from hidden contradictions) within said formalism"; or, in other words, that "*arithmetic* cannot prove itself to be free from

contradictions"³⁹. **Together**, these state that "any proof that a formal system is free from contradictions necessarily requires methods beyond those provided by the system itself; accordingly, one cannot prove that number theory is free from contradictions by means of finite methods in the strict sense. Today, there is still no clear agreement on the type and the range of admissible extensions of finite methods. ... [F]inite investigations are not limited to the question of freedom from contradiction, but refer [also] for example to decision problems. and generally to the analysis of the finite core in fundamental mathematical and metamathematical results of infinitistic nature"⁴⁰; a situation that has not yet changed.

§140. (a) As if these findings were not unpleasant enough, they were soon followed by others; according to Bronowski, A. M. Turing and A. Church "showed that no mechanical procedure can be devised which could test every assertion in a logical system and in a finite number of steps demonstrate it to be either true or false, [while A.] Tarski showed that there can be no precise language which is universal, every formal language which is at least as rich as arithmetic contains meaningful sentences that cannot be asserted to be either true or false"³⁹. Evidently, what "precise language" and "formal language" mean is no other than a *human axiomatic formalism*, that has not been understood that exactly because it is set down as an axiom, it (and every other system containing it) *cannot* examine its own veracity. But this is a far cry from asserting that Truth and falsehood are impossible to be told apart: a statement referring solely to itself *cannot* constitute a (let alone *the*) proof of its own veracity! That proof is safest when it comes from the *entire universe of facts, in which no instance can be cited as contradicting it*. This is what Plato had in mind when he said that we must watch out for *all consequences, obvious and hidden* of a statement we make!

(b) It is improper to consider the Gödel and the Tarski theorems apart from the times in which they were developed. They had been preceded by the *unsuccessful* efforts, already referred to, to set down the firm foundations of arithmetic; as well as by the presentation of the theory of relativity, the theories (old and new) of quantum mechanics and the Heisenberg uncertainty principle,

³⁹ Cf. J. Bronowski: *A SENSE OF THE FUTURE*, MIT Press, 1977, ISBN: 0-262-02128-5, p. 58-9.

⁴⁰ *THE VNR CONCISE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF MATHEMATICS*, W. Gellert et al., Ed., Nan Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1977, p. 719.

all of which exacted a *heavy* toll on the firm till then belief that Aristotelian Logic is unshakable and the world is constructed on Laws that do *not* contradict each other; and lastly by the *numerical* dress J. Richard gave to the ancient Epimenidean paradox, on which dress Gödel fashioned the proof of his theorems⁴¹. All these together constitute what can only rightfully be called the modern *pseudoscientific* justification for blurring the distinction between Truth and falsehood, which, it must *not* be forgotten, is solely due to the *modern* separation of Science from Religion, and from the consequences of which the Churches, now (im)properly scared, attempt to distance themselves in order to salvage what faith in God still remains in their prelates and their faithful, rather than in humility to face the problem head on for its being, for *their own neglect*, a *direct* attack against God (all the more so in the form of the Gödel and Tarski theorems, for the fact that, by undermining arithmetic that undelies all exact sciences that study the natural world as creation of God the theorems cast doubt on *His Logos*); in the face of which, as the world keeps on learning more from atheist professors, is all the more left unguided on how to keep *both Faith and Knowledge intact and together*, by *clearing them both from all that in each of them is untrue*. The Greeks never got perplexed in the face of the Epimenidean paradox as today's intellectuals evidently are: It was their *biting with its humor* reminder that it is *every* rigorous thinker's duty *never* to overlook the danger of, and thus *always* to watch out to exclude from his reasoning, self-contradiction, the *unreasonableness* of accepting at once *both something and its opposite*! Modern thinkers regard the paradox very nearly as a perplexing *intrinsic* defect of formal logic!

(c) But there is more here at stake: If Gödel was right, not only those believing in Science, but even those still believing in God *must* be upset! In the measure that Gödel's findings are correct, as arithmetic is the basis of all mathematics, not only is P. K. Feyrabend correct attacking scientists for inventing fuzzy theories, but so too has Einstein been in gross error, and so too is S. Hawking for attempting to invent and found a *believable theory of everything*, and so too indeed is *everything we have ever thought we*

⁴¹ Cf. J. Bronowski: A SENSE OF THE FUTURE, MIT Press, 1977, ISBN: 0-262-02128-5, p. 65.

have discovered about the world! And so too *must* the believers in God be upset, *mainly for their own standing inactive* on hearing that there is anything fuzzy in the Mind of God! So, the question is reduced to just this: Are we all the rest mere charlatans, or Gödel alone and those that admire him for his findings? And I am *not* here suggesting that the matter should be decided by the power of the democratic majority of those choosing to cast their ballots, but by a *rigorous* study of the question! For if Logic is but a figment, there is simply not right and wrong, but only the power and the pleasure of the most heinous villain! Unless *you are him*, it is only natural that you take an *immediate* interest! We have had quite enough of fuzzy thinking, whether it refers to mathematical theorems of this most fundamental mathematical nature of the *mind*, or uncertainties of any type at all in the physical Nature, and this as a matter of the Law acting on it!

§141. So it is that we must finally turn our attention to the procedure Gödel, then a young man, followed in, first, formulating mathematically the elements of the problem, in order, then, to produce his conclusions based on those mathematically formulated elements. One cannot but agree that “arithmetizing”, i.e., converting non-arithmetic elements of the mind and language such as those mentioned as “particles” in §138 to numbers is a *totally arbitrary* operation that by no stretch of a rigorous mind can be tolerated! Replacing such elements by numbers is also giving to them the value of the number standing for each. How do we dare give *arithmetical* values to such elements, thus calling each of them *worth just so much, and neither more nor less*, relative to other numbers and elements? Then again, arithmetical operations produce only numbers. How do we rationally convert those numbers back to *non*-arithmetical elements of thought and speech, that clearly refer not just only to numbers but also, through the use of numbers, to vastly foreign fields, such as those of logic, physics, philosophy, and even TheoLogY? That the set of natural (*and* the subset of prime) numbers contain an *infinite* number of members, and thus more than the number of Democritean atoms in the universe, constitutes no justification for engaging in this “arithmetization” also called “Gödelization” procedure. That I draw up a plan to do just this does not mean that by so doing I axiomatically justify the procedure! Axiom in Greek means ἀξίωμα, which is the end product of ἀξιῶ, meaning “I demand that ...”

But demanding *must be rational*, or else it properly belongs in a lunatic asylum! Not everything that I demand is allowed me, even if I devise a *literal game* that lets me play with numbers! Precisely because numbers, even as they are infinite in number are only numbers (or *quantities*), and as such *totally lack qualitative characteristics*, they naturally *cannot* express any one of the latter.

[One need only consider the “if ...” sentence: the expletive sign *cannot always* have the same any some value: the *complete* sentence for which it stands has in *every* case a *different* character, structure, quality, importance, unquantifiable value, weight, it can even contain *several other similar-looking* “if ...” sentences, each with its own unique characteristics: how are all these *justly* assigned a purely *numerical* value during “Gödelization”? What *numerical* value do you *justly* give an axiom such as that the velocity of light is constant, and what *must* happen to the entire construct based on it when it is found that the axiom *opposes* a Law of nature such as Newton’s Law of gravitation? One reads⁴² such as “let L (a ‘formalized’ language), U (universe of discourse) and their and their semantic correlation be included in a new universe of discourse U and let L be an adequate language for U . Thus L is called the *object* language of U and L the *metalanguage* for the system $\langle L, U \rangle$. The coding of L makes it possible to project certain predicates of U which in the first instance are only metalinguistically expressible into the object language L . An example of a predicate in the metaobject domain is the one-place predicate ... To this there corresponds a certain arithmetical predicate ... Under the assumptions made on U an expression $Nb(v)$ can now be constructed so that on substitution of a natural number n for the variable v so that the statement $Nb(n)$ says ... By means of a further device, a so-called *diagonal argument*, one can now find a natural number m so that $m = Nb(m)$. The statement $Nb(m)$ can then be regarded as self referring statement with the meaning ‘I am unprovable’”. But this is neither bona fide mathematics, nor language construction that a rigorous linguist could regard adequate, but *mere substitution* of “this” for “that”, *under assumptions based of doubtful axioms*, newfangled “diagonal arguments” having no place in formal logic, and a “can then be regarded” standing as if it were “*must then be understood to mean only that...*”! Under such a scheme one *cannot*

⁴² THE VNR CONCISE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF MATHEMATICS, W. Gellert et al., Ed., Nan Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1977, p. 721.

possibly find it impossible to set down a number standing for the meaning "I am not a number"! Would that negate all arithmetic?]

Nor can qualities be converted to quantities, and then be treated as such. If a particular word be given a number, that number *cannot possibly remain fixed* regardless of its placement in a piece of text: placed here it produces a certain sense, placed there it produces another—or sheer nonsense! Then again, other sequences of words, poems, sonnets, stories, novels, treatises too, the contents of entire libraries too, deserve to be "Gödelized", and thus "evaluated". But the process *cannot* determine what *truly is valuable!* The fate of Gödel's (first) "incompleteness theorem" was preordained (to be produced): The expression of a qualitatively *foreign* and thus *greater (for including also the concept of number)* whole by some qualitatively *naked* and thus *lesser* set of infinite members *is impossible*, and this is *not* a judgment made (or, that can be made) within arithmetic, but certainly outside it, though firmly within the *far wider than arithmetic* universe of Logic! Gödel and Company, *ignored this inescapable qualitative fact*; and, dazed by the infinitude of the set of natural numbers, reversed the blame for their *logically expected negative finding* to a *supposed* shortcoming of the language, rather than in the logical impropriety of their game itself!

§142. Close examination shows Gödel's procedure to be so axiomatic as to produce *no* justification of its own method, and his "proof" to depend *entirely* on a highly ingenious yet *contrived* series of remarkable but *arbitrary finite* steps taken in arithmetizing the formalism. But axioms are used in theories, and they need not supply *a priori* justification of the axioms they use. Nevertheless, *all theories, and especially those producing highly unexpected conclusions, depend on subsequent independent practical verification to gain acceptance; and when they are not so verified, either their axioms are revised, or the theories are rejected in their entirety.* This does *not* seem to have happened in Gödel's case; *his findings have in fact been swallowed, though with difficulty yet with resignation!* As if in this unique case, it were allowed for the axiomatic theory to stand for its own proof! Can it be that the axiomatic nature of his procedure together with the abstractness of the field have obscured (or have they excused?) the *fact* that Gödel's *is just a mathematical (but still a) theory, that must be treated as*

any other theory before it is accepted? Or, is it possible that it too has been allowed to stand for the “support” it provides to the entire set of twentieth century “scientific facts” that supposedly permit us to doubt right and wrong; here and there; now, future and past; to be uncertain on principle about practically everything, and thus finally also about Truth and falsehood, and Good and evil? In these thoroughly suspect times, when even God is academically doubted and the Church prelates remain inactive, no human activity bearing on the universal may be held to remain above our suspicion! Congratulate the teachers of our world!

§143. (a) Consider H. Weyl’s⁴³ choice of the simple formula $1 + x \neq y$ (loc. cit. 226), by means of which he “attempt[ed] to describe Gödel’s discovery with as much precision as is possible without becoming too technical” (loc. cit. 221). In the description, the formula was treated as if x and y were *both* variable. But it is here already that a non-expert in symbolic theoretical mathematics is stuck, who may *not* for the sake of technicalities overlook all other co-indicated facts: for if x be variable, *so indeed is* $1 + x$; and there is *no* way that this sum can *never* be set equal to another variable, here named y ! (exclamation, not factorial). Though the formula $1 + x \neq y$ *seems* legitimate technically (though thus only for most, but most certainly *not for all* cases!), *qualitatively it is illegitimate*, as it in fact states that “what is a variable is *not* a variable”! But in the specific example of $1 + x \neq y$, that Weyl picked to demonstrate the method, there is indeed more: the formula *contradicts also the recursive nature itself* of number; that is *secured by its opposite formula* $1 + x = y$, that is *correct in every case in which x and y are consecutive natural numbers!* Yet, neither Gödel [hinting at a theory in which “every concept is significant everywhere except for certain ‘singular points’... so that the paradoxes appear as something analogous to dividing by zero...” (loc. cit. p. 234)] makes any allowances for such conflicts as just pointed out (that are *not* paradoxes but *gross logical errors*, if they are not excluded from Gödel’s treatment, that thus ceases to be universal), nor Weyl takes note (let alone sharp exception) of these exact conflicts (even in a book named *The Philosophy of Mathematics and Natural Science*, even as he clearly laments the state mathematics was brought in

⁴³ THE PHILOSOPHY OF MATHEMATICS AND NATURAL SCIENCE, Atheneum/Princeton Univ. Press, New York, 1963, p. 221 et seq.

with Gödel's theorems (loc. cit. 219-20! So, there is indeed more to the "integers [natural numbers, that] were created by God, [while] all else is [incidental, transient and] man-made" (according to L. Kronecker's famous saying), as is indeed verified by the analysis of the emission spectra of the atoms to which we have already referred (§128v-vi, p. 245); that in so far as these here remarks are valid *can continue to be trusted as since ancient times within arithmetic* and with them the structure of the world is still completely secure and is not threatened by the Gödel catastrophe!

(b) Keeping these in mind, let us now *evaluate* the Gödel procedure in the light of its own assertions: Even without a detailed description of it as that by Weyl, *a simple introductory outline of it suffices to persuade that Gödel's entire conception is a formal mathematical theory depending entirely on its own finite steps*. One such outline has been preceded by the first statement quoted on the top of p. 278, from which it is clear that before a theory may claim application to a wider field *including it* (as here to the entire number theory that contains it), *it must itself satisfy its own conclusions*. But in light of the statement just referred to, *the Gödel procedure concludes denying the validity first of itself and then of its own conclusions!* Finding that "any proof that a formal system is free from contradictions necessarily requires methods beyond those provided by the system itself" *suffices for concluding that the formal system made up of the Gödel procedure is not free from contradictions precisely because it fails to use methods beyond those provided by this system itself!* And a self-admitted so failing system *cannot claim to produce valid results!* Here then we have *the most remarkable par excellence* situation of the world scientific community *accepting (or at least lamentingly swallowing up) as probably unquestionably true an assertion* (first about the *rest of arithmetic* and then about the *rest of the world!*) of a theory that *mutely admits* of itself that "all I state cannot be proved to be true, even this very statement"; which constitutes the latest pseudo-scientific version of the ancient Epimenidean paradox! A *formal* effort in the hard core of science devised to resolve axiomatically *all* uncertainties (including paradoxes) comes full circle first to admit itself as paradoxical and then to reestablish the ancient paradox as intrinsically irresolvable! The world scientific community laments yet *swallows the assertion and honors the theory!* In the face of which, it, respecting itself, *cannot but must* admit that all the trouble has been due

to the fact that in devising his method, Gödel *failed to ensure that it did not contain a hidden self-contradiction exactly of the type Epimenides warned the world against*, that alone led first to its paradoxical conclusion about itself, and only then to the content of its theorems! Gödel's procedure *is* intrinsically flawed and scientifically worthless!

§144. (a) Another example of faulty understanding comes from the work of B. Russell, who in his effort to establish mathematics on an unquestionable "logical" basis, resolved to *prove* (by general agreement *unsuccessfully!*) *the most basic*, namely that $1 + 1 = 2$. He *overlooked* that $1 + 1 = 2$ is *not* an equation requiring proof, but the *reversed misstatement of the definition* of 2 as the sum of two units: $2 \equiv 1 + 1$! It is *logical* that what is only defined *cannot* be proven as a matter of logic! If I define that "day is night", I need *not* prove it, I determine to use the two words interchangeably. The madness comes in only for the reason that the two words have already astronomically fixed *opposite* meanings!

(b) So, coming now to facing the wider question, *which* of the two are we to conclude? That Reality is intrinsically irresolvable as a matter of its own ontology? Or that even first class mathematicians *are* subject to error (especially in the forefront of research, where alone "problems" appear that are *never* met in the wide field of applied arithmetics, in which operative is *not* the theory but the *recursive-definitional* nature of number that guaranties the absence of error)? If we opt for the former, *we must give up at once* all further scientific effort to resolve the great unanswered questions, and face nature much as animals do! And then, as indeed imbeciles do, take pride in our own rectitude—which however *cannot* be guaranteed (except *doubtfully*, by ourselves) in a Reality characterized by its own *irrectitude*! The first option *is thus shown unable* to save our honor (to the chagrin of those who want us to give up all the honor of reasoning persons! Which *is saved* by the second option, that allows us to proceed, though with *all* due circumspection that Reality properly requires!

§145 Considering now Tarski's theorem stated above on p. 278, and in view (a) of the fact that there is no language that is richer than arithmetic, and (b) of the fact that all common languages (*including* as we showed above Gödel's on which Tarski's reasoning was based) have their weaknesses, what are we to say? At least these: (a) That given the infinitude even of the prime

numbers, every word we utter and every nuance we give it, and every statement we can make made up of words, given the fact that the human inventiveness and power of synthesizing complex meanings is not infinite, can each indeed be represented by a unique to it prime number. (b) that even in so organizing all these words, nuances, statements, thoughts, we *must* take so complete care as to exclude every and all contradictions, or else we somewhere shall get in trouble! This is exactly what Gödel did *not* guarantee! Tarski basing his reasoning on Gödel's erroneous theorems could not but reach an erroneous conclusion! In other words, searching for Truth is indeed hard, but it is *not* hopeless! The Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity of the world based on the *Most Elegant Design* is *not shaken* by the *wrong* findings of Gödel and Tarski. Truth is indeed There and it is calling us Up! The question is whether we shall be careful enough to avoid *all* traps of contradiction, persistent enough to ascend, humble but erect enough to admit that even ascending *has* its invaluable rewards! Of the Beauty at the Top we cannot yet speak—not because it is not there, but because our misguided “science” in its more than one hundred year old effort to turn us *ever down* rather than *constantly* Up has denied us even the imagination to come closer to it! It is for our rejection of Reason that we go headlong for the abyss, despite the misty eyes turned to the stars of such as the late Carl Sagan, despite the mixed utterances of Einstein, the resignation of Bohr, the total surrender to doubt of Heisenberg, the false conclusions of Gödel and Tarski, and the naked atheism of such as Hawking, Weinberg, Dawkins! Reader, make no mistake: Faith in Reason is *not* Religion! It is Faith and Duty first of all in oneself! That *we are not all insane, only misguided!* That we are *not* resigned to alms from God, Who in His Holiness did *not* seek to make passive beggars of us, but *active* seekers of *that same* Holiness seeing it to be *our Duty to ourselves to earn* our Way! Insanity is to go the easy way down to the abyss, lured by the Sirens! For all their faults, the Greeks taught us lessons immortal. The trouble is *we misunderstood them!* We chose to make violent Hollywoodian scenarios of their struggles, *not* debates following up on their debates, συζητήσεις, *common researches of the One Truth!* Misguided *not* by the scientists, but by the so-called “theologians” of West Asian origin who drove the impious wedge right down the middle between what can only be called *their* “faith” in God

and the *correct* Faith in the one *indivisible* God-Logos! So is it that nearly all we do is *first* disrespectful of Man propaganda serving current insatiable demands, and *then* blasphemy of the Lord! Christ was crucified once, and the evil ones cry out that we forget Him! In order that they shamelessly serve us even worse than do so already! The daily rivers of hot human blood *won't* obviously be enough until after if ever we turn ourselves into veritable devils maddened by the cunningly taught daily madness! If not themselves criminals, and insane, then at least *degreed imbeciles* rule from their high seats the world! The obvious "leaders" are only *pawns*! The queens and the kings *never* show themselves! Even charlatans *have* recognizable limits. When elevated high, these people do not even see, let alone imagine, the naked incompetence they exhibit. Only imbecility has no limit! Let us *all*, each and everyone of us take a *good* look at ourselves and decide who and what on the side of What we *would rather, had better* be: However unpleasant as it indeed is, this now becomes *the* most personal! We *all* must confront ourselves, all the way down to the abyss of our souls! Only there may there still be something giving a pulse! If not, we *are* dead! *So, does it become our very personal duty, of every self-respecting still thinking person* to demand of himself, and to his utmost capacity to contribute to the badly needed debate on the clarification and the ultimate meaning of our *entire* planetary civilization! Doing anything less, and so far *we are doing far much less*, is tantamount to *resignation* from our spiritual essence, on account of which we are called in Greek ἄνθρωποι, ἀναθροῦντες ἅπερ ὀπώπαμεν, that is to say *Immortal Spirits, not* just destined to rot as does mere flesh, re-examining *all* that already has come to our attention!

26

LOGOS
AND
THEOLOGY

§146. (a) It was after the following two chapters had been written that I realized that the previous chapter *had* to be included, as errors *have* occurred not only in the broad field of tangible (experimental and theoretical) physics, but also in the understanding of intangible (for it possesses no experimental counterpart) mathematics that by the findings of Gödel and Tarski was brought in broad agreement with the twentieth century's theories regarding the *said to be doubtful* deeper nature of Nature.

(b) And then, I found that I *had* to bite the bullet: This book, I first recognize, is like no other in its unabashed mixing of Science and Theology. As I dare write this last word this way, I owe it to the Reader to answer his no longer mute question about whether if anything, and what exactly it is that, I find objectionable in current "theology".

— It is *not* that I want to belittle the latter that I write it this way, but I mean the word to include *every aspect of every past and current religion*, that is *both* followed by the billions of people out there *and* written by some or other human hand that had *not* previously dipped its pen in the deep red blood of its not very agonizing soul—or else it *would* have sought to take the fullest possible account of the resounding hard facts of Reality *both* out there *and* deep in itself!

— Nor indeed does it seem to me, as it must to anyone willing to give the matter serious thought, to be reasonable that I or anyone should remain mute on theological matters who is not licensed

to speak on them by some or other religion. As indeed physical science *is one for us all*, sufficiently for the fact that Nature too is one, *so also theology* for the fact that it seeks to answer the *still harder spiritual facts* of the *same one overall Reality*, cannot either be cut to pieces so that everyone may take the part he likes, or be restricted to be spoken about solely by those whom *essentially self-appointed human religious authorities* license to speak about theological matters. Let us all be humble enough to realize *our common spiritual essence, recognized as inalienably personal for each one of us in the face of Reality*. This recognition cannot but be followed by the *right Reality itself* has given to everyone to contribute his bit to the common search, and be judged for its value. Faced with this fact, only those who doubt their own spiritual foundations seek to limit the license given to us all to be concerned about these matters, in order that *their* grip on the minds of people may not loosen!

(c) And as it is not very profitable to take every known theology to pieces and subject them all each in turn to minute examination to find its faults, I resolve to follow a way that will be hard to put down for not being universal enough in its own approach to the subject. Then, each believer can compare this work's findings to his present beliefs and decide in his own mind and heart which is more becoming to his *anthropic*, no longer "*human*" nature to adopt.

§147. (a) There is yet another and by no means little problem that these words call our attention to, duly to register and resolve. I have alluded to the difference before. As this work nears its closing, it is not a tiring repetition to bring together the facts that the Reader needs to make clear in his mind before he can make sense of Reality. The words *anthropic* and *human* are *not* equivalent: every living so-called "*animal*" *is* a human; not every "*animal*" is an anthropos. I do not know whether the word "*man*" is in fact an abbreviation of "*human*" (= soily and moist) [rather than related to the Latin "*mens*" (= mind, intellect, reason, disposition etc.)]. If so, one can immediately understand where the *true* source of our infinite troubles is located: "*Dust to dust!*" *The* terminal full stop! The ancient Western Asian *axiomatic* statement of nihilism! *All* dust does finally settle and harden to senseless rock! Why ever look Up? *All* those who want to put *you* down, need only remind you of *this* axiom, to which they demand that you

subjugate yourself! On which the religion of the Old Testament does indeed rest as regards "human nature". God spat and of the mixture with the soil He made Adam! As *he* returns to dust, Holiness, the ultimate form of Up, is out of the question, for both him *and* God! Don't be amazed, see second axiom below!

— O.K., the first axiom is that "God is"! But about *Him*, *what truly He is in Himself*, nothing truly is said, and essentially nothing is by the authorities the "human" permitted to ask! All that we hear it said is what He is in relation to *us*! As if we are the Lydian touchstone of everything else! [Ask any "theologian" or priest: his answers are mere rephrasings! He does *not* know, because *he never persistently* knocked at the door; that was *not* opened, for the *fact* of his little faith! Ask *any* priest of *any* religion to mention to you *what ought to be the central prayer, thus in the mouth of us all barring none*, begging Him to help us understand Him while *we are fast at work working out the understanding!* That is the ultimate definition of Faith! But it has *not* occurred to *anyone* of them! Can *you*, Brother, assess the *just* weight to *just this* cause of faithlessness?]

— The second axiom is that He *thus* (as above) made Adam. In *His* image are we told, and in *His* likeness! And here it is that the second *big* trouble enters: As we know not and have not asked to learn a thing about *Who* God truly is, we also understand an *exact equal nothing* about ourselves, too! And as the religions tell us that we are dust, how indeed do *you*, Brother, avoid concluding that God too "must" be made of the *same* materials, having made us in *His* image and likeness? [Where in Genesis (or even elsewhere in the Old Testament) are we told Who/What God is? All we are told is that the spirit of God was bringing itself about (ἐπεφύετο) over the water. It is out of *Christian* piety that that *s* is capitalized! Remove *all* the Christian interpretation and see what you are left with! By "spirit" the Hebrews understood only *wind!* And non-Christians, going back to the "original" (what the Jews reconstructed as the now known *Masoretic* text), do *not* have to accept the *Christian* interpretation! But if everyone "understands" what he pleases, *how* if not guided by Logos are we to come to an agreement, as Reality affects us all equally?] But then, unless you take us as something like the portraits (as they, too, *are* in somebody's image and likeness!), *how and why* do we need Him at all? If like is like, if the portrait is like the original, how isn't the original like the portrait also? And if *we* judge ourselves to be origi-

nal enough for being alive and “clever”, who needs *the* Original? — The third axiom is a well-hidden one: The serpent provoked Eve. She sinned. Then Adam, too! They were expelled. The serpent, however, *remained* in Eden, though condemned to crawl on its belly. How did it move about before? We aren’t told! But what is this if not *ancient* Western Asian theological Dualism, only later manifested as Manichaeism, allowing Good and evil to *co-exist* even in Eden? [Obviously, we should not get attached to the historically accepted appearance and recognition of these ideas but seek their most ancient essential Logical and ontological though for long gone unrecognized presence in the Scriptures of the world.] Then, in the New Testament, we are told to beware of him by whom temptation comes. Yet, we also pray daily that the Lord Himself t lead us not unto temptation! So accustomed have we become through rote repetition that we don’t understand, nor do we question, how all these *reasonably* mesh together! But this *cannot* be Faith in Logos! The Holy God-Logos *cannot* possibly lead us unto temptation, even as it is so stated in the New Testament as part of the Lord’s prayer! *The presence of the possibility to commit evil is necessary for the preservation of our freedom. Only if free* may we be rewarded or punished. This does *not* permit us to regard the Holy God as the one who leads us unto temptation, nor to pray that He do not do so! This is very nearly tantamount to holding God responsible for our sins for leading us unto temptation! Well hidden Asiatic Dualism, alas, continues to govern our *souls*; *though not* our minds as long as we keep them alert to avoid committing the unforgivable sin, which goes on being ignored by the “theologians”! This is why this sort of “theology” *deserves* to be placed within quotation marks! Those believing in *the* Good God can no longer accept the *essentially blasphemous* mumblings of the “experts”, who have finally brought us to the present impasse! Now, do I still have to spell out in black on white the names of all those who by the *Scriptures* co-taught and keep on teaching us *through their teeth* the letter of faithlessness?

— The fourth axiom refers to the beings called “animals” for having *anima* (= breeze, breath, life, and what makes them to be living, which was called “soul”). Of these, “man” set himself apart, saw that life was good, and death was bad, and sought the way to make himself immortal. Religion was founded on the “human” desire to defeat death. The dead bodies rot; Ah, but on dying,

they give out the last gasp, their anima-soul that will in time re-enter the bodies God will reconstruct! If He made them once, He can make them again! Do you question the power of God, now? Certainly not! But *why* should the Lord resurrect the bodies, what is so special about them other than the *fact* that *we* love them so? Didn't they fulfill their purpose while they were alive? And what legitimate (read: *Logical*) purpose can they serve by being resurrected that could not be served by the creation of brand new bodies unstained by sin and death? The Greeks, as they then best could, were abhorred on listening to these *Asiatic* ideas: They *had already solved* the problem: The bodies rot; the Spirit lives on, and in the Elysium duels on purely spiritual matters, having learned the lessons of this world. By getting syncretistic, Christianity carried the day *for the love of the flesh*, that was "dressed" with "spirituality" that is *ontologically foreign* to it! To this day you *cannot* find a "Christian" who can give you a *Logical* argument. That the Lord is *pure Spirit*, and only in *that* sense are we in His image and likeness, is an idea that the Greek loves, but the still *Asian* "Christian" abhors. He is shocked to hear that the *material* bodies have no place in the purely spiritual world. He thinks that this contradicts the Lord's Resurrection. He does not understand that the Lord resurrected Himself as the *finest possible material* light, of which *all* material bodies *are* made up, and in *that* form, so to say integrating in Himself the entire creation also, was He able to enter rooms through closed doors, though He still *had* for *our* sake to reappear in the form our ordinary material eyes could see Him! I honestly *don't* understand what is *il*Logical or blasphemous about this statement, and I respond by saying that for two thousand years, the Christian Churches have *ignored*, as they ought not to, the Lord's statement that the Kingdom of God *truly was then at hand, and it came with His Resurrection*, by which the *essential duality* of Reality [made of the Holy God-Logos-Spirit *and* the creation (also made up of our *also created* Spirits *and* matter, (or else we *would* be talking of Pantheism!)] *was* gloriously demonstrated; after which, ever since, *Logically inescapably* we truly experience the Day of Judgment! During which we continue to misbehave *as we are being judged!* The "theologians" *refuse* to separate the separate! And playing mute, they think they can escape the consequences *they* have brought about! Now, the Truth is upon us, and we blaspheme ignoring the now *hard* evidence that

the Spirit is Master! And He shall decide all *seemingly* remaining unresolved matters solely according to Logos, *that is one with both Justice and Love*, since it is just to love only the lovable and worth loving only the just, that are *solely spiritual* matters. For the love of matter and of the flesh, and for the love of power they through them exercise on men, Churches and Religions have failed to lead the world *that Way!* It has been for *that* failure that only now do we just begin to see the consequences that *are* due! What other can I say that it must be degreed veritable imbeciles who still follow the old *tried and failed* ways of war, bloodshed and mayhem while idiotically Churches and Religions watch on, and other idiots, purely for the extra business it will create if it be adopted, propose that we *bury* the carbon dioxide we produce in order that we avoid the “greenhouse effect” (the antechamber of living hell) simply because we intend to continue *wasting prodigally both* the carbon we unearth *and* the oxygen we breathe, that in addition we do *not* allow to be regenerated in the forests we cut down; thus also destroying the ozone shield that protects us? All this *very* democratically done! If that is not *the* conspiracy of organized Religion and Science against the Ἄνθρωπος, I, for one, want, Brother, that somebody tell me! Again the Scripture says: “Μωραίνει Κύριος ὃν βούλεται ἀπολέσαι”, namely, “the Lord makes fools of those He wants to destroy”! Most certainly, the Lord does *not* want to destroy anyone (but neither does He want to enslave us by denying us our freedom to sin—and *only if* we do, to reap all its *then due* fruit)! This is purely the “theologians” language, trying always to refer the blame constantly on Up!

(b) Consequently, to call, or even however indirectly through other statements and acts insinuate that, God is *il*Logical, *un*Just and *un*Loving *is* the ultimate blasphemy, regardless of who it is that commits it! Going to war for gain, calling the war “justified” *is* blasphemy! Shedding blood, let alone killing, in the name and for the sake of God you believe in *is* blasphemy! Because *we* are subject to death, our life is *not* the very highest good! Therefore, we may only risk our life for a *still higher* good, and as such, no rational person shall not recognize the *honest* pursuit of Holiness! Once you do that, you *must* regard yourself *dedicated to that purpose!* Killing somebody means denying Heaven the possibility to rejoice and get richer by the reception of one more saint! Punishment *shall be proportional to that greater than any usual offense!*

(c) This cannot but apply generally and equally to all, regardless of position or authority in society, or of power among the nations of the world. On the contrary, high position and power is accompanied by the proportional higher responsibility to lead justly, not only by mere and usually empty word but even by the living example. Alas, the world is rarely if ever so taught and so led. As a result, some assume they can commit *all* sorts of crime, not just solely of the ordinary kind, but even of the extraordinary; as is *every* legally protected criminality, hardly if at all hiding the conspiracy of "white collar" criminals committing their criminal acts from visible and invisible positions of power which the ordinary person does not even suspect, making it trying or even impossible for others to lead their peaceful lives in justice and the pursuit of a place in Heaven. How are these others to react? The freedom given us by God, may *not in any way infringe* upon the freedom of others. If, e.g., I so abuse my freedom, others *indeed have a right, and even the obligation* to protect theirs, in their inalienable effort to protect honestly the interests of Heaven. For people and societies truly believing in God, *absolutely nothing* can take precedence in their interests over those of Heaven. If, e.g., *after thorough searching of mind and spirit* society judges the Heavens will be better off served by the incarceration or even the execution of a so hardened criminal that he cannot be trusted to terminally discontinue his criminal acts, then it *indeed cannot* have the option to let him go unpunished. The interests of Heaven *must* be protected even by the prohibition of establishing a law for escaping just punishment on the grounds that society may not touch a criminal because the moral Law *supposedly indiscriminately* prohibits killing. This has *nothing* to do with exacting retaliation on the "eye for an eye" principle. One *must* justly regard that that principle was set as a *constant reminder for the potential criminal not to enact a crime deserving such retribution; not* as a general right of the party offended to demand and under the *supposed* cover of moral Law exact retribution! One *must* justly regard that that principle has been taken to establish the general right of the party offended to demand retribution solely for the hardness of heart of the party that demands retribution! Religions, *and* their leaders, pastors and priests have by and large failed to see things in this light! *So* has it been that there is so much hatred of "religious" origin lashing us!

(d) Here we appear to set so high standards that by today's loose habits will appear almost(?) inhuman. However, we also *must* demand of ourselves to set even our principles in just order *and* to abide by it. Belief in God *cannot but include the belief in a reason* for the fact of our mortality. Our mortality does *not* bestow an obligation that we attempt to extend this short life beyond the limit to which it is useful to the purpose for which it was given us! It was *no* accident, *nor* did it just not occur to the Greeks to allow lashing a citizen, or the institution of an executioner in their ancient cities; so much so that even Socrates, though condemned to death for (*contrived*) impiety, he was *not* executed but instead asked as a *free citizen though in prison* to relieve of his presence the city he obviously loved by *freely in prison* drinking the hemlock, totally out of sight of everyone, even of the guard respectfully standing outside his cell! That today we wonder what may be the meaning of such statements as "*free citizen though in prison*" and "*freely in prison*" only goes to show how far removed we are from the Greek conception of the meaning of "city" and "citizen"! The example (with *all* its rights and wrongs) the Greeks set, the *dubious* example the Athenian Court of the Five Hundred set, and the *unique* example Socrates set have yet to be fully comprehended in all their significance! Such as their civic behavior is totally beyond our modern *supposedly* "sophisticated civilization"! Lesser criminals were then expelled from the Greek cities and were left to care for themselves as best they could. There were still expanses of land where one could hide himself. Today, no inch of land remains unclaimed, and no society can be imagined let alone tolerated unloading upon another its own incorrigible criminals! We, therefore, despite all developments since, continue to have a duty to consider *every aspect of each our act*. The human lot has *not in the least* changed. Rather, we are called upon to become even more circumspect of the *integral* problem Reality constantly poses upon us as we "advance" (toward what we still know not!), even as now the world gets *visibly unified* ("globalized" is now the term—a direct measure of how, alas, *uncivil* we truly become!).

§148. (a) We started to examine the relation of Logos and TheoLogy and here we already discuss crime, criminals, general human behavior, duty, "progress", objective! Make no mistake: we have *not* veered off course! All is done because the problem

Reality poses before us *is* integral! Even the axiomatic establishment of Religion *must* integrally *follow* the dictates of Logos; which, so far, *no* known Religion has consciously and diligently done! As a result, we all *must* now admit that the axiomatic establishment of Religion, as today we assume it, *is still incomplete*. So accustomed have we become to the daily catechism that we have lost sight of the inescapable fact that *all* religions of the world had a *physical, not a metaphysical* start! But today, rather than restarting from the goat and the cow giving us their milk, or from the soil and the Greek ὑετός (rain) or the Hebrew spit of God, having advanced to this present level, we *must* re-examine the relation of Logos and TheoLogy from the most solid and universal hard facts we already have in the palm of our right hand. And that is the Law that permits the entire physical world (on which even physical religion after untold labor sprouted) literally to stand on itself! This is no word play, nor do I mean to use it as such! The physical world *literally stands on itself* in the middle of the infinite vacuum beyond as a result of the *hard and unquestionable* fact that it is governed by the Law of gravitation. The Law *is unquestionably physical, not a figment of Newton's imagination*, that we swallowed unthinking. But equally unquestionably also, the Law *is a hard mathematical fact!* And mathematics *is* part of Logic! *Thus* comes in the question of the *origin* of this Law, that for the hard fact that the universe stands on itself based on the operation upon it of this very Law [that for its also being mathematical and thus also Logical may *not* come into self-contained antinomy] *must* be sought in an origin *capable* of not just only mathematical but also *faultless, for its being complete* [or else mathematics would be its own raison d' être, which would be absurd!] *reasoning* (in Greek, λογικεύεσθαι: Μόνος ὁ Λόγος ἀσφαλῶς λογικεύεται ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἀπολύτως)! If the origin truly be none other than the physical universe, it is *it* that *must* then be shown to possess these *additional mathematical and perfect Logical* characteristics. But *all our Science put together has flatly failed to show* that the physical universe truly possesses such characters! On the contrary, the world closely examined at least as seen from here on Earth shows itself to be in serious conflict with what *we now as scientists* choose to regard as acceptably reasonable, who nevertheless *don't* doubt that there indeed *is* a higher order (thus inescapably *both* mathematical and *so also* inextricably Logical) operating underneath

the (to us) *seeming* antinomies! But here indeed is the crux: No matter how finely bisected, Logos permits *no* antinomies to exist within Him! So, to the extent that antinomies and *seeming* antinomies *appear* to be operating in the world, *both* the world *and* what we regard as antinomies within it *cannot* by themselves be the source of Logos! The Logos *is*, therefore, *otherworldly*! He belongs in a World entirely of His own! But He is *not* imprisoned in His World, nor is He indeed self-imprisoned!

(b) Which is a *self-evident fact* on account of that other unquestionable *fact* that the Logos in the form of mathematics, cognizant not just of numbers but also of the *qualities* of the things that combine in the mathematical equations, in effect *rules* the physical universe! Were the Logos a hermit in His own exclusive *Other World*, *this* world would simply *not* be as it stands! We *must* finally comprehend this *only one-way* connection! This world stands solely for the *fact* and at the pleasure of the Other World! What *only dimly* the “seers” could till now “see” and make an attempt to describe, *is now much better seen* with the help the physical world offers to all those willing to see how it is that *it* stands! *Only* the Logos is truly free and completely capable of self-definition, self-recognition and *perfect* justification of Who He is and what He does: The axioms we examined above cease to be mere human opinions the moment we recognize that they constitute the part we too can indeed see of the structure of Logos that non-mathematically also refers even to us, exactly for the fact that it is *we* who are in His image and likeness, and *not* He in ours; or else, as the physical world operates in a way we only observe but do *not* in real fact comprehend, it would simply not at all ontologically be if the original were none other than us and the Logos a mere portrait of us! So, the Truth is the *other* way around! It is thus altogether absurd to deny the *independent of us* existence and operation of Logos! Just as it is also absurd to deny the now self-evident fact that the Logos *is* truly God! Just as it would also be foolish to dismiss as untrue that it is *only for His Logicality* that we trust in what we, were He without it, dimly call “God”, who otherwise would remain *completely unknown* to us! We exist at *His* loving pleasure, but our existence, solely for His *Logicality*, is *not* without justification, and so, neither is it at all hopeless!

(c) What thus remains to ask those that oppose this setting in order of things is whether they have something definite and

superior to propose: The so-called “scientists” *have* already resigned: We already have seen how unable of some reasonable resolution of the real questions are the theories they have for a hundred years proposed! It remains for the traditional so-called “theologians” to declare whether they prefer in *il*Logical or a *perfectly* Logical God! I do *not* ask them to tell us what they *like*, but what they *would acting rationally rather choose!* Now, with the blasphemy in the face of the Holy God fully exposed! I admit that the Pure Logos, other than the power to be self-consistent, thoroughly just, fearless of examination, and open to all those willing to pay their obol for His priceless gifts, has no other power! All the power that remains other than that of the Logos *is* essentially raw! If all the power there is belong in a single Being, would they rather choose a Being with *un*Reasonable power or a Being that *would* by His Nature and Will *never* behave *ir*Rationally? The Holy God is *not* only Love! He also *is* Truth, He also *is* Justice, He also *is* Perfect Logos! He also is what in my dimness I still know not on account of His Total Perfection! But this I all too well know: Total Love without Total Logos in Total Control [remember the “love thy God with ... and with *all thy intellect*; and thy neighbor as thyself”] is *the* Most Dangerous there is Total Passion exactly for the fact that it dresses as the Highest Virtue! I *cannot* imagine the Deceiver as not constantly trying to dress himself just that way! So, I, for one, shall *not* blaspheme the Lord’s Holiness by calling Him *un*Controllably Passionate! Would *you*, Brother?

§149. (a) It is on exactly this matter that we foolish men differ from God: Neither our intellect loves Logos enough, nor our love is guided perfectly! And as we act ourselves, so too do we think that the Lord acts also! Or else, at least we Christians would have developed a much better TheoLogy than the one we have attached ourselves to for so many long centuries, taking after the *Asiatic* mode of thinking about the Lord. After the First Oecumenical Council (A.D. 325) we “believe in one God, Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth, and of everything that is visible and invisible” In *Asiatic* fashion, while we recognize God as the Father, we *ignore all* the attributes God as *the* Perfect Father cannot but have and immediately jump to His Power! And we call Him Maker, but *fail* to pay *all* due attention to *all* the *Logical* self-inspiring, purposive, intellectual, executive etc. attributes without which *no* maker can be Perfect. We call Him *one not One*, and for all this

our *incomplete* reasoning we then also declare faith “in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, Who was born of the Father before all ages. Light come out of Light, True God come out of True God, begotten not made, being of the same substance as is the Father, through Whom all things were made”. Question: “Is the only son of an ordinary father of the same substance as his father [kindly forget the contribution of the mother, here we are talking of the *co-substantiality*! And it *is* unquestionable that an ordinary father *is indeed co-substantial* with an ordinary mother!]?” Answer: “How not so? Of course he is!” But the son *is also another* person! Is the Son of God another Person in the exact same sense? In an absolute monarchy, *everything* belongs to the king, *nothing* is done unless *he* says so, and in this very real sense *he is* the maker of all that is done in his kingdom. But it *is also true that of himself he does nothing*! He has a chief executor (and he in turn delegates authority). Is the Son of God His Father’s chief executor “through Whom all things were made”? Is the Father no more than acting as an Asiatic absolute monarch? We *must answer this and all related* questions also, or else we *shall* be accused of *not* having a very clear idea of the God in Whom we declare belief! Then again, we declare that the Son was “born of the Father before all ages”. Do we understand the *illogicality*, incongruence and antinomy of this statement?: Before the act of birth, there necessarily was indeed a time during which the Father had no Son! How then do we say that the Son was born before *all* ages? Will you admit that there was indeed a difference between the “all” and the *all*? Don’t say: “Ah, *details*, let me alone!” *Absolutely nothing* referring to the substance and essence of God is a “detail”! *Everything appertaining to the substance and essence of the Lord God is the one indivisible crux*! As set down in A. D. 325, the Creed was a *compromise* of screaming bishops all/each arguing in favor of their/each-his-own view of the Deity; it was *not the anguished outcome of strict and austere Philosopher-Logicians* having for very long turned repeatedly their own brains inside out before each turning in their *wondrously identical, uncompromised* opinion! The Church *never*, alas, had such all her bishops! That the Church’s understanding of God was then and in fact remains still incomplete is demonstrated by the *historical fact* that it was during the *Second Oecumenical Council* in A. C. 381 that the Creed included the remaining (8th through 12th articles), starting with the “And in the Holy Spirit, the Lord,

the Giver of life, who proceeds from the Father, Who together with the Father and the Son is worshiped and glorified ". The Great Schism of the Church over the "filioque" is the *solid* proof of our still inadequate understanding of God. If you give *all* these "details" *all due* proper deep thought, you *cannot but conclude that all conflicts and all debates about the seeming incongruences vanish* under the proposition that the Lord God is *not* three separate Persons, each of Himself *incomplete* without the other two, but *One, Perfect and Complete unto Himself*, possessing *all* attributes of αὐτεμπνέεσθαι, αἰσθάνεσθαι, συναισθάνεσθαι, σκέπτεσθαι γενικῶς καὶ ἐπὶ σκοπόν, ἐκφράζεσθαι, καὶ γενικῶς ἐν πλήρει τελειότητι λειτουργεῖν (self-inspiring, sensing and feeling, being fully conscious of oneself and what is opposite and/or beyond, reasoning generally and towards an objective, expressing oneself, and generally functioning in the fullest possible perfection) which *all* are *spiritual* attributes, that we still think as divided among the three Persons, to which superadded is also the power to perform works (and miracles) outside the purely spiritual realm. The Father *never* was or will be without the ability to express Himself, nor without the ability to inspire Himself. The Son *never* expresses Himself separate from the Father and the Holy Spirit. And the Holy Spirit *does not* dwell in the vacuum but in a Complete and Perfect unto Himself *One* Person. The term "Holy Trinity" expresses, in men's *inadequate* understanding of personhood, the Perfection of Ultimate Personhood. And so also, it takes no great brains to comprehend how this understanding *unites* the fundamentals regarding God of *all three* monotheistic religions! Therefore, *all further resistance, unless it can further improve our understanding of the Holy God, cannot* possibly be from Him. The believers of *all three* monotheistic religions *must* therefore take due note, and *immediately* cease warring about the Essence of God: Their friction so far was due to their *inadequate* reasoning. Should they continue warring, it *shall now be due only to their now exposed as malicious and evil intent!* One need only consider the *deliberate emotional sentimentalism*, or the vitriolic attack against the believers of other creeds and religions always under a *seeming* cover of "pious sanctity", often *unselfconscious* of its own sanctimoniousness or the pure total nonsense of abstract words thrown together in an effort to "explain" what is so expressed, or the visible chagrin due even to the *felt* inability to hide the inability to present a *solid* TheoLogical argu-

ment by an ordinary “theologian”, to fathom the present true state of intra- and inter-religious affairs spilling over as *naked raw feeling* affecting the daily personal and social behavior even of laymen! We simply do *not* understand how truly expressive of our *unchecked faulty* conception of God *all* we say and do truly is!

(b) Kindly *don't* return to re-argue this last question. Here we *don't* discuss aprioristically-axiomatically-dogmatically the question of Who/What God is. We do it *aposteriorically*, having studied the physical universe, and having found it imperative to introduce the *needed* spiritual-mathematical attributes, which *are part of the indivisible spiritual-Logical whole*. And if you find that the word “miracle” offends, be kind enough to consider that the entire physical universe *is nothing short* of the grandest there is miracle! Once that is recognized, *all else* falls in its proper place! No one who has seen a scientific laboratory, let alone one who has built one with his very hands, shall ever be found to argue that it is the product of throwing all those innumerable dice up in the air, that, on falling, they produced the *operating* laboratory! It boggles the mind that there are bona fide scientists believing themselves serious when they “argue” that the *operating* universe is not an *operating* laboratory that *somebody* built!

§150. *That* somebody was none other than the one indivisible Lord-God exhibiting His capacity of ἐκφράζεσθαι, of *expressing Himself*, of making tangible even physically part of what *He* has in *His* Mind! That somebody was none other than the one known as the second Person of the Holy Trinity, the Lord Jesus Christ. You have as much right to deny entrance of the Creator in His own world, as you have doing the same to a scientist who owns the laboratory *he* built at *his* own expense! But Jesus Christ did not appear in a capacity capable of persuading us of His true identity? But is it not an expression of *short* belief to demand that God appear as He truly is in *all* His Glory? Are *you* sure *you* could stand to see Him as you demand? Here you cannot stand Him even as he appeared in the very *mildest* form possible for the Holy God, His full Glory of Holiness: Restlessly for three whole years, *including the Sabbaths*, He performed miracles under the tight scrutiny of priests, supposedly worshiping God in His abode, yet unable to stand Him in person, trying *but failing* to find in Him the slightest fault, watching Him as ravens watch their victim. If you, Brother, can give me a better definition of Benevolent Holi-

ness walking the Earth than Jesus Christ presented to the eyes of those priests, please kindly do enlighten me! That He performed miracles even on the Sabbath was a violation of God's or man's strictures? Had He finally entered Jerusalem not on a humble little donkey but on an armored warhorse, surrounded by a host of similarly armed angels, and had He delivered the world on the platter to those very priests, as they expected that the Messiah would, please be honest and tell me: would *they all not be at His feet*, the staunchest "*would be Christian*" yet *hardest* masters of the world? [Let us all be objective: Here we do *not* accuse solely the Jews: *No* nation in their position would have done otherwise. Even the Greeks under Alexander had not done so; and to this day, no nation aspiring to world domination does not believe it does so under God's orders and protection, regardless of whether they admit it or not. That they believe in this or that conception of God makes no difference! They believe it to be their "*destiny*", *not* their *greed*! That says it all! Nor is it only the nations, but even the priesthoods of the religions. See how they treat *their* faithful, whom they literally milk, supposedly under Christ's license, calling themselves *their* shepherds! Compare Christ's service and Holiness to theirs! *Don't* for Truth's sake dismiss God for the doings of *men*! Teach yourself to *see* the distinction! It is *not* in the interests of the people on top to teach *you* that! Each *shall* receive his just reward. Temptation comes in *many* forms, and the excuses of men *are* countless! Nor does the Jews' claim that the Romans crucified the Lord stand serious scrutiny: Pontius Pilate found *no* fault in Him. Rather than Justice, he chose the interests of the empire: he sacrificed an innocent man in order to avoid having to quell a major riot, when besides, he was told by the *priests*, no other, that if he did other than as *they* demanded *he would* be accused of covering up somebody opposing the deity of the emperor! Pilate was protecting the peace *and* his own head! It is always dangerous to go to war against the dicta of the priests, and if you do, you better have an insuperable argument. Nor was it true that their Law forbade killing: They *had* stoning! But cunningly, they judged stoning, which having not come to his attention they *hid* from Pilate, not exemplary enough! Then again, had Jesus Christ opposed the Romans, the Jews *must* be judged for the fact of *completely neglecting* during two thousand years to honor Him at least for resisting the occupier! To this day,

they would rather see His name completely excised from men's memory! It is the name of the heir in the parable of the farmers asked to deliver the produce of the vineyard they were hired to cultivate! Today, we all commit a disservice attempting literally to burn history rather than diligently learning from it! *Ours is all* the world's history, and the present clash of civilizations is still more aflame by those flames! The clash shall be quelled only in our *hot, not hypocritical*, tears!] Their rejection of Him was for the gift He brought to them [*to us all*; who in their position would *not* have acted at all differently!]: The gift *not* of world mastery, that we *all* idiotically seek, but the gift of the *example* of Holiness that *indeed conquers the Heavens*! Alas! Such a gift is no good for the lazy, nor for the soft-handed, nor for the weak-minded, nor for the narrow-hearted. It takes hard labor, worked hands, a strong *dedicated* mind, a broad heart to embrace and conquer the Heavens! Not everyone is willing to deposit the sweat this worthy conquest demands! So it is that we all are constrained to the "Kyrie Eleison"! So it is that there are people freely choosing to spend some sweat in order that the world completely forget the Lord's example of Holiness! Rather than work their way Up, they choose the abyss! Solely in order that they spite the Lord. So we now all see their already accomplished result: the world, starting from the environs of Jerusalem, has already begun to turn into ashes! We all are insane who think of vast future possessions. It is ashes we shall inherit! It is ashes we shall bequeath! Acting insanity's just reward! Will you call me a pessimist? I see the rivers of blood that with untold malice we shed daily—solely in order to tell the world the details! What do *you* only see, Brother, dollars, pounds, euros and yens? It is Easter time again. And the deadly poison is out again: Shamelessly in all manner attacking the Lord! Some directly, some indirectly; the latter by *pretending* piety, aiming at the collections! *Don't* get confused: We started out to examine the connection of Religion to Logos. Having found it severed, we could not but find religion having become *ir*Religion, and Logos become empty insane words! We still wonder who Jesus Christ was. The *One* Lord God *personally teaching* us Holiness! The *true* Owner of the vineyard, judging *all* the workers in it! Tremble, Brother, no longer the Judgment: that is being already enacted, but the Just Judge's final gavel! *Not* much more is left to be done!

27

**OBJECTIVE NATURAL LAW
AND OUR MORAL RESPONSIBILITY
AS WE STAND IN ITS FACE**

§151. I have considered it necessary to include Chapter 24, though it deals with what are called “highly sensitive matters”. I discussed them with all severity that I deemed necessary in order that all the better we all finally become acutely conscious of the compelling necessity (for we must feel it as such) to understand the vast difference that exists between subjectivity, to which we falsely have subjugated even the “science” of the physicists and the objectivity of the *real* world the Science of which *cannot* mince words, however “sensitive” we choose to regard certain matters. As for personal offense, I naturally meant *none whatever*; I *never* had personal dealings with the people whose writings, all in the public domain, I *had* to analyze in order to show how intertwined Physics and Theology, *both principal aspects of our integral personal and social lives*, truly are, despite the ill-considered teachings of centuries. In the strictest of senses, there are *no* atheists!: They *all* believe in a God. Some confess Him to be a Person. Some call Him Nothing! A Person does *not* have to be physical; in truth, a Person is *not* physical! We talk face to face; but it is *not* the faces that speak to each other; those are only our *physical masks*, and not only are they trainable to appear to be this or that in almost no time, but they also are carefully trained to *and* speak with *both* ends of the mouth! Then, they or their spokesmen (i.e., other masks) undertake to make “sense” of the *deliberate* verbal mess, delivered by the earlier masks, but designed to say this or that or both at once by the mind hidden behind! We said it once; and we

shall repeat it: the brain is *matter*, like the face, only softer; but it is *not* mind! Einstein's brain was sliced! Most certainly *not* his mind! Why is it so difficult for the professors to understand that? Such professors, regard their *person* insulted, but they don't understand that *they* far more than anyone else first insult *their* persons by admitting allegiance to Nothing! Which they confess their God! Nothing is *nothing at all!* And it produces nothing at all! Those, therefore, who believe in nothing at all first insult themselves as progeny of the nothing at all that preceded them, and *then* insult their audiences! Such speakers *choose* not to object to such their teachings, though *they* insult their parents and all their lineage; the audiences, however, *are* entitled, if they so freely choose, to take offense!: Now then, with correspondingly greater justification than that of the professors who feel insulted when the audiences do not take kindly the insults proffered from on high by the ultimate meaning of Nothing delivered! Atheism is the belief in the "God" called Nothing! Speeches delivered?: Poisoned feathers carried on the "wings of winds"! On the other hand, *scripta manent!* The poison becomes permanent. The written atheism is *not* simply ink dried on paper, in order to transmit the heavy written word, loaded with meaning! It is the *ultimate negation of the exhausting process of committing to paper the entire civilization of this planet, and all its history—of the civilization, not just merely of the planet!* Because, Nothing, also means meaninglessness. So, by *what* right do the believers in Nothing use the heavy written holy words? *How* do they dare attempt to destroy, to empty, what by nature *cannot* be rendered meaningless, the heavy holy words and the lives of generations spent in forming them, not just their outer shape but the solid inner Reality of the Spirit they contain?

§152. (a) What professors teach from their chairs, the podiums offered them, and the books they write affect personally all of us everywhere, rich and poor, in the "North" and the "South", literate and illiterate, educated and uneducated, people who understand the significance of every word and every equation and people who do not! Mainly the professors, but also all those who stand on the podiums may *not* throw about words loosely! For they *are* sharper than Japanese swords that split hairs alongside in half! And they cut and kill not only bodies, but also the consciences they house! In fact, they cut and kill the bodies, *after* they

have already done *all possible* damage to the consciences within! Now, what consciences do professors have who are *not* conscious of the hard fact that conscience (= con science) forms after *all* the science commanded by the individual comes together to inform one's consciousness? Most of them simply assume, hypothesize, theorize, that *all* is built on *simple, but mostly unexamined* assumptions, thrown together. The result, at the *absolute best*, can only be what the assumptions that are thrown together really mean. Most of the time, what we know *doesn't even come close* to that level! Yet, so much are the professors carried away by this their "accomplishment", that they have the temerity to call what they produce "Science" and firm knowledge of the objective world!

(b) Do you want proof of this charge? Just consider their *preposterous* claim that they have come to "knowing" what happened as far back as just three seconds or so after the Big Bang! But by *what* clock did/do they measure the time as far back as then? They insist that all matter was then plasma of ionized hydrogen atoms! *What real clock did then function?* Today, the claim is that cesium atoms under standardized conditions present the most accurate clocks—at least this is the agreed on *assumption*, hidden under the name "convention"! Back then, cesium atoms and standardized conditions were, by today's vernacular, *science fiction of the altogether unknown deep future!* When the universe expands, by what *rational, not assumed* [a word here to be understood *not* just in the sense of mere assumptions coming by the dozen per dime, but also in the sense of an *illegitimate* claimant *assuming/pretending* the rights to a throne!] professorial fiat do they claim that not everything in it expands? The entire *uni-verse is* a mechanism! [Or else, astronomy *is worse* than astrology! Because astronomers, *if* else, only *pretend* to be scientists, whereas astrologers never made such heavy claim!] And it expands! [Or else, so much of Hubble, and so very much more of the entire astronomy!] *How and when* did the parts of *that* mechanism which we call clocks cease to expand and began to work as we today *assume* they keep standard time? On this question, the physicists and astronomers remain firmly mute! In words more direct, *how* do we know that the time durations/periods we now call seconds were equal to all so-called "seconds" even of the so remote past age of this uni-verse that still keeps on expanding? In fact, by today's standard "science", we *don't*, but the "scientists" will

not even admit that they *never* seriously faced the issue!

(c) In strict fact, so far, we *only count the ticks* of the clock and *assume* that the *real time durations/periods* between ticks remain equal! But look, grandfather clock periods *are* affected by the length of the pendulum that varies noticeably between cold winters (the pendulums shorten, the clocks run faster) and hot summers (the pendulums lengthen, the clocks run slower). Would you not expect that the analogous phenomenon *is* in fact universal and affects even the measurement of the age of the *uni*-verse? True, in past ages, the universe was much hotter, but it also was shorter! So, how did the “clocks” then really run? I am strongly inclined to the opinion that as the universal “pendulum” *performs action as it swings* (and *fully in keeping* with the pulsating electron in the hydrogen atom!) the *real periods of its swings remain analogous to the concurrent unit of action*, that, as we have seen (§121b, p. 228), is proportional to positive one third power of the “age” of the universe. Why “age” and not simply age, as so far even we here have used the term? Because, what we normally call present age, even as we keep it in years, is in fact only the total count so far of the swings of the pendulum. [Today, a digital clock can be set up to count *additively* the total number of so-called seconds passed; which, however, is *only the number of ticks* counted.] Set that number along the x-axis. Then along the y-axis set the value of the unit of action. Starting from the origin (at which both values are zero) you get a curve bent downward, due to the dependence of action on the $T^{1/3}$ power. The area under the curve till the present age gives the product (variable value of the unit of action) × (total number of periods past). The *average* value of the unit of action over the entire past age of the universe turns out to be equal to $3/4$ of the *present* unit of action. With the periods of time between ticks proportional to the *concurrent* unit of action, the average period of time we call “second” over the entire past age of the universe can only be equal to the $3/4$ fraction of the present period of the second. In other words, the total *real* age of the universe measured in *present* seconds is equal to the $3/4$ fraction of that so far assumed, *regardless of where we set the “present”*. Today, because we estimate the age of the universe as corresponds to ticks counted over twelve billion years, we *must* conclude that, the *now* present age of the universe, measured in what we today assume to be the “standard” seconds, is

only nine billion years. But certainly, you have *not* seen *any* discussion in the now accepted form of “science” discussing these fundamental questions! Yet, the professors state triumphantly that they already now know what happened as far back ago as only three seconds after the Big Bang!

§153 (a) Teachers appear important far more than their true measure in the eyes adolescents, and professors by the latest in the eyes of sophomores! Older people who got their degrees long ago, but do not continue to make a living by chasing after grants and funds from people paying their money today to get a market advantage tomorrow which the professors dutifully serve, can sit back and examine the enterprise of “Science” with a much colder eye than active professors want cast at them! And such people are no longer easily fooled! Distanced from the gimmicks of the harsh, gross, base market, they weigh even its manners and means, and all those that descent low to sell rotten goods! Some smells *never* leave the memory of clean nostrils! *If* you are *not* one of the crowd, you *do not* need to attend many “conferences” to get to see what *really* goes on in them! Cheap theater, lies passing for truths, claims usurped, highfalutin words intended to gain a hand of “polite” applause by people making their living by what they applaud, these are only the visible parts of this “industry”! The invisible parts are never confessed, nor even alluded to; they are much too indecorous, and can undo lives! The viciousness of the academics *is* worse than that of the clerics, who in moments of relieving the conscience may warn you “to stand well clear of the hatred of the monks”, in Greek: “φεύγε τὸ καλογηρικὸν μῖσος”! You see, it takes one to know one! Brother, *don't* ever again be taken for a ride!

(b) The market, *both this and that side*, is secretly fixed! Both sides attempt to corner the market! The competition is fierce, literally deadly: It is called MONOPOLY, on a small planet, with ever more stomachs to feed, ever greater, insatiable appetites to satisfy, demanding ever more of everything that is supposed to please the *human* senses—except, that is, what *truly* is decent of anthropos! After the Second World War that cost more than a hundred million lives, the Third War was fought with totally other means, so much so that the victors couldn't believe their victory: The shock of the sudden loss of the “Evil Empire” left the victors with the sharply biting hunger of “what do we do now without an

enemy, how do we satiate and justify the habit?!" Because MONOPOLY takes two to be properly "played", we needed a worthy opponent, but none offered himself. Europe had caused two Great Wars, and it risked a third one through her demand that she too be covered, by what in the end turned out to be the *only-five* minute warning, not even enough to make two decent phone calls! It soon dawned on us that the "Evil Empire" would *not* just let be destroyed along with Europe and leave *us* intact! We attempted to devise the "Stars War" plan. We had a Hollywood actor for President. On the screen, all seemed easy. The nation began to spend real money taken from its future! The "Evil Empire" simply did not have, having from its own inception rejected it, this sort of will and financial expertise! So, it capitulated! And as befits the defeated, it gave up huge expanses of territory of its own West to the victors. Now, it attempts to become leaner and meaner, but in fact just one like us! No, for quite some time, it won't do as an enemy. So, we were left with the East Asian Dragon and the Tiger of the Subcontinent! Only they too were still much too weak! We had to help them get stronger so that *we then* set them up as proper opponents! When they began to show nail and tooth, we saw that two and a half billion people brought to our standard of living meant real business, which we simply could *not* let run rampant as does ours, even as it meant at least another billion automobiles added. Excellent for huge profits, catastrophic for the price of oil and the time span until the wells run scorched sand dry! [As for what air we shall breathe the world over, with so much pollution and rising heat (call it temperature), i.e., the *thermal death* inevitably attending the "economic development" of *patently idiot* politicians and financiers on a limited planet, not a sensible word!] So, we attempted to prop up at once both the Far Eastern markets *and* the the price of oil, with all the planet under our tight control! Excuses were made out of gossamer. Countries in between were invaded. To pump up oil and keep it under our control, we need to send down real hot human blood, even if some of it be our own! "Our own" *only* in name, *only* of our poor! That are an embarrassment, even as they man the brigades and constitute fodder! It is to them that the patriotic anthems are sold. The rest are simply watching, wave the flag, and stay determined to play the market! To get the support of the nation we needed a script, with the proper ingredients of eastern

entrepreneurial expertise, unparalleled western ability to make it come alive on screen, and southern "reborn" faith in both beef and "God". The team players were called "Neo-conservatives" (an improbable mixture of *supposed devout* "Christians" and Jews)! Coming also in *equal* mixtures of "Science" and *purported* "Religion": Imagery of the "Shiny City" up on top of the Mountain, "Jerusalem", Armageddon, hellfire, gore and mayhem; and fittingly to crown it all with the horns of the Devil on its head, the image of the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center coming to crush down in the Inferno! The whole show was directed as nothing before Hollywood had ever attempted! Cameras *were pre-set to record the coming* catastrophe! That, simply, could not stay hidden! Themselves the pictures *do tell* where and how the cameras stood! On the platter was the needed excuse served! Proclaiming the appearance of the "New Evil Empire" caused the calling to arms the "Crusaders"; and in totally fitting response the "Jihad"! That the Holy God is profaned does *not* matter a bit! *He is ours, but not that we worship Him, but that He serve us!* See how the world wide priesthood of *all three* monotheistic religions protested! More idiotic observers the world had *not* seen before! Fittingly has the marriage of "Science" and "Religion" been blessed in the temple called the New York Stock Exchange.

(c) The names "Science" and "Religion" as today are used by the marketeers of ideas *are* phony, but still useful remnants of a past almost forgotten! The New York Times of November 21, 2006 in its Science Section tells the "Free-for-all debate on Science and Religion" the world *only reads but does not really comprehend*, but *not* because they cannot, but because the actors on the well set up stage are simply *not* persuasive: The venomous antitheistic attack by the principals Steven Weinberg ["the more the universe seems comprehensible the more it also seems pointless", "the world needs to wake up from its long nightmare of religious belief" and "anything that we scientists can do to weaken the hold of religion should be done and may in the end be our greatest contribution to civilization" and calling "religion a crazy old aunt", whom "when she is gone, we may miss"], Richard Dawkins [with his take-no-prisoners approach, calling religious faith "God Delusion" and the education it provides "brainwashing" and "child abuse" and declaring that "[he] won't miss the 'crazy old aunt' not a scrap, not a smidgen"] and their side, and the creationist camp around the Templeton Foundation

on the opposite side once again got on stage and crossed swords, but the marriage *is real, happy and indissoluble*: funds *are* collected, the players *still stage the surrealist play*. So what if the people need *solid* answers no stage side has enough faith in its own bag of tricks by which to pull the needed proof out? And what if the Holy God *is* profaned? Of *course* all these people have nothing to do with the Objective Reality! That's what the people want grasped! But those on the stage simply are *not* equipped to grasp It! And their bags of tricks *are too small* to contain It!

(d) Moreover, Objective Reality has *no* sides! It is one, by its very Nature! Is "Science" dealing in all aspects of physical Nature? No! Because it attempts (and of late by pure invective!) to evade the fundamental question of how the physical Nature (consisting only of things naturally needing causes, and of laws, regulating its components and needing a consistent lawgiver) came about. Is "Religion" dealing in *all* the aspects of God? No! Because it refuses, for the willful intolerance of the priesthood to tackle the issue of *His* self-respecting obligation as a Creator to produce a Creation proving in its constitution its being *His thoroughly cared for* product! At least the so-called "scientists" have this to commend them: They do not split "Science" in factions warring each other! On the contrary, the so-called "religious" are from the beginning divided in three main monotheistic religions and innumerable sub-religions, each insisting that only *its* prayers are heard up in Heaven, because the Holy God likes only *its* stage mannerisms as a spectacle refreshing His eyes from the general picture of the world under His sight, and *its* din as "music" pleasing His ears! As if the Lord cannot read *all* the dark depths of men's minds, hearts, souls! So, my Brother, buy goods *only* selectively, *never* prepackaged! And assemble a collection, *the* Collection that alone makes *true* sense of the Whole!

§154. (a) Begin from the objective and obvious: Look around; find what you regard your most valuable fragile possession: If/when you let it drop on the hard floor, *it is by primordial Law that the catastrophe has been prescribed!* There is *no* relativistic frame of reference from which viewed the catastrophe is not recorded as *real*, in which the catastrophe is not recorded as *such* for never having occurred! That Newton was by Einstein replaced?: An *idiotic* gross lie! And better than by anyone else, it is by the professors of physics indelibly known! All the rest they teach *is* a

conscious parody, taught unconscionably!

(b) Then realize that given an immovable Natural Law, *no* other Natural Law can contradict it! Nature may *not* and is *not* confused solely for the fact that she *never* is called upon to choose between or among mutually contradictory Laws, the inner *strictly rational* structure of which remains invisible to us, yet solely for the fact that *we* (namely our professors) have not recognized (because *they* refuse to do so!) the *basic rationality of her system of Laws!* That's how disorder in Nature is avoided! Confused are only those who throw about mutually incongruent theories and so-called "laws" standing in mutual conflict. This is why professorial theories get into trouble; for the fact that *they* refuse to recognize the natural order described by age-old statements referring (in)directly to it, yet in a manner that is accessible even to people not steeped up in the way of academic expressions! In what other spirit do *you* think was the question "Are grapes gathered from thorns, or figs from thistles?" (Matt. 7, 16)? Solely for *this* failure do still the professors insist on theories of disorder, chance and uncertainty; all of which Nature under the strict application of objective rational Law has never adopted and human language has since long ago already repudiated; which no self-respecting person permits oneself to ignore in the name of some *presumed* "science"! In a not too old article by Carol Kaesuk Yoon published under the title "Is Evolution Truly Random" in the *New York Times*, the admission is made that "scientists have begun ... finding that what they thought were the random vagaries of evolution are not so random at all", after Loren H. Rieseberg of Indiana State University stated that "[t]here is a lot of phenomenal data coming out [to the effect that] there's clearly more to repeatability than we'd suspected a decade ago", whose Group "found evidence that evolution can repeatedly produce the same species", and Richard E. Lenski at Michigan State said that "a lot of studies are finding quite a lot of surprising replicability of evolutionary outcomes". Surprising in the face of the accepted "wisdom" of such as Stephen Jay Gould that "any replay [of history] would lead evolution down a pathway radically different from the road actually taken". Though the view "seems impossible that anything like life on earth today, given how it has been reshaped by accidents large and small could actually re-evolve" [this being a slightly here re-cast statement of C. K Yoon report], *this indeed is phenomenally contradicted* by the findings of the Lenski Group who

back in 1988 set up a dozen of genetically identical populations of *E. coli* bacteria in 12 separate flasks of broth and have since observed their evolutionary fates over more than 30000 bacterial generations, only to discover “what is becoming one of the most striking examples of repeatability yet, [namely that] all 12 populations show the same patterns of improvement in their ability to compete in a bottle and increases in cell size; all 12 have also lost their ability to break down and use the sugar called ribose; and more surprising, many genetic changes underlying these adaptations are very similar [as] every population, for example lost its ability to break down ribose by losing a long stretch of DNA from the same gene”. And some scientists, like Simon Conway Morris of the University of Cambridge who argues “that some features are so adaptive that they are essentially inevitable”, admit that “the evidence for repeatability is rampant”. What other is truly all this than that what is called evolution is *not* at all chancy or random but follows the carefully laid down underlying Laws? When nothing simple exists without the strict Law that supports it, how indeed can it be that the more complex organisms made up of simple things stand without an even more *all-encompassing* Law? There is nothing in the Universe more complex than an advanced (*the* most advanced) living organism! That it reproduces itself with (practically) no mistake (but for causes unknown), this simply *cannot* be accidental! Will the professors at long last find the courage to admit that there is *no* sensible effect without a strict underlying Law, and *no* such a Law without Lawgiver? That *all effects and only effects* do indeed have their causes, and what seems to be only an “accidental” effect, it is so called for *our* ignorance or neglect of its cause?

(c) Or else, *why do they keep it from us, if indeed they can prove it*, that Laws do *indeed* come without Lawgiver? Or do they only attempt to make us forget that *laws need to be responsive to needs*; which a responsible self-respecting Lawgiver *never* forgets, but which they, *in collusion with irresponsible present-day lawmakers* attempt to hide from awareness, in order that *undisciplined minds, by them willfully in that state kept*, miss the responsibility of the irresponsible? How much longer will it be until we *all* see that this *is* blasphemy? Brother, be *not* fooled!

§155. (a) Responsibly looking around in all of Science as it has *always* stood, regardless of our own firm understanding of the significance of what we for so long have been seeing, we find *on-*

ly one Law that truly stands out as a reliable candidate for letting us see through *all* human conventions to the world of objective hard facts. It is the same Law that secures us firmly on Earth, has taken us to the stars and has safely brought us back: Newton's Law of gravitation, traditionally written as $F = Gm_1m_2/r^2$, but still better written as $F = G(m_1/r_1)(m_2/r_2)$. Its simplicity, scope universality *are* arresting. True, to discover it we use rods, clocks and balances. To a surprising degree, the law holds true. Its *perceived* weaknesses are *not* free of *our suppositions and definitions* of rods, clocks and balances: There is *nothing* in objective Nature that demands the separation r to be singular and measured along the Euclidean straight line joining the two masses! This is an *as yet unevaluated assumption we have made*, that may or may not be true, and can definitively be settled by a *separate objective Law* that *alone* determines how the separations are to be measured. [As *every* mass acts as a center of gravitational attraction, in a many-body universe, a test particle starting from the second mass and ending up in the first *cannot but follow a different path* from a test particle moving in the opposite direction, *as both paths depend on the momentary placement of all masses in the universe* as seen from the two main masses considered as centers. This is why the above *is* the correct way of writing down Newton's Law, that *only thus*, i.e., supplemented by this Law of separations recognizes the presence of the *entire* universe in which it operates and makes for a *neutral, completely favor-free, application* of a Law *over the entire universe!*] If our *assumption* of the Euclidean path is not correct [and now, viewed as above from the universal perspective *it cannot* be correct], the perihelia of the planets *will* precess!

(b) Responsibly looking around besides, we must confess that there is nothing in objective Nature that demands that the planet not gain or lose mass as it accelerates (and thus gains energy) or decelerates (and thus loses energy) in its orbit. It is irresponsible to build a whole "science" on the *mere assumption* that there is no correlation between the force acting on a planet and the energy it gains or loses on the one hand and the mass simultaneously gained or lost by it on the other. If $f = dp/dt$ and $p = mv$, *it is an erroneous supposition* that $dp = mdv$ rather than $dp = mdv + vdm$. The former is *no* stronger assertion of the conservation of mass than the latter. Conservation of mass does *not* necessarily mean that every ordinary body conserves its mass regardless of how it

moves, but only that the *universe as a whole conserves its mass!* As the mass of the universe is distributed among a *constant* number of *equal* (for if not equal we still have transfer of mass between) Democritean atoms, or else we have a constant creation and disappearance of Democritean atoms and violation of the constancy of universal mass, then necessarily as energy depends on mass and a planet gains or loses energy, it *also* gains or loses the corresponding mass coming *always* in the form of Democritean atoms, in *each* of which a *unit* of energy (*not yet proven to be constant!*) is invested! Seen in this manner, the acquisition by a body of energy *altogether ceases to be a process of a mysterious cause*, as it involves always the corresponding to it acquisition of mass, in terms of which alone is energy not only defined but is now seen to be also transferred. If energy really is $\epsilon = mc^2$, then even if you assume c to be constant, then necessarily $\delta\epsilon = (\delta m)c^2$, and thus a planet does *not* remain of constant mass. When a planet takes or gives up mass, the principle $\Sigma(m) = \text{constant}$ is *not* violated and the relationship $dp = mdv + vdm$ leads naturally and *independently* of relativity to the very same mass-velocity relationship claimed by relativity, while then also the perihelion of the planet precesses!

(c) On the other hand, considering matters responsibly, we must confess that if Newton's Law were so overloaded with supposition that its objective universal nature was hidden from view, it would be impossible for us to find, *which we do*, that G is universally constant. No human supposition can force the value of G produced from the Cavendish experiment to be identical to that obtained from astronomical observation. The numerical value of G can change with the units of mass, length and time, but it is *not* intervention that produces the *same* value for G in all sorts of experiments when the same units are used; the physical dimensionality of G can *not* be made to vanish! In other words, G constitutes a *hard fact* of Nature, too pervasive, too central, just *utterly* universal to be ignored.

(d) This re-discussion of matters already discussed is meant to show how moral and intellectual responsibility may *not* be separated, because responsibility is either *altogether complete*, or it simply does not exist! And this is *not* confined to matters of Science or of "science" but involves *all* aspects of life; that being ignored offers a secure footing to atheism to invade and erode the complete social structure! Yet, it is by "Churches" and "universi-

ties" that this truly *universal* vision of the world is *deliberately* being ignored and kept hidden, solely because it offends mortally the "establishment"!

§156. (a) An "establishment" that to this age continues to behave as the Cavalleria Rusticana did in the days of old, *stubbornly continuing despite the facts to see the world narrowly* as consisting solely of *its* valley and the surrounding mountains! It obviously was not for nothing that Kitty Ferguson mentions the old oak chair she inherited from her grandparents: Because, closely examined, that old chair ceases to be just only what we all see it to be and becomes a *veritable universe in disguise*: atoms in empty space. And atoms, we all now see, are themselves universes made seemingly of electrons and protons and the swarm of so-called particles of all too dubious existence and presence "discovered" in the machines of high energy physics, *all* of them composed of Democritean atoms. *If* we had a mechanically impossible microscope-telescope of *adjustable yet infinite* resolving power and depth of field, there would be nothing physical we would not see with it; all the way to the deep darkness beyond the frontier. We just do not stop even for only a moment to realize that *everything physical is a veritable celestial body* hanging along with the entire rich company in the void. We all recall the image of Carl Sagan telling us solemnly of the beauty above; which makes the astronomers proud for having the privilege of observing it nightly: In essence, the *brute* power of *disorganized yet needed* Fire! We are fooled by what we see under the microscopes, *all of them of insufficient* resolving power to disclose the far far greater glory of *that same brute* Firepower by Law brought under total control in the *meticulously organized universe within!* The universe consists of about 10^{120} Democritean atoms. One of us weighing 75 kg consists of about 10^{69} such atoms. The entire universe consists of the equivalent of "only" 10^{56} grams of mass. The *organized universes, that for remaining globally uncultivated peasants unconsciously of what they are truly walk on this poor earth as in fact they do, ignore cavalierly the hard physical fact that they themselves are celestial bodies of such beauty and purpose that is nowhere else told in the heavens!* "Purpose?", you will ask! And "Yes!", do I reply!: As that all seeing microscope-telescope is mechanically impossible to produce [and if it weren't, what we would see by the mind would still have to be processed!], why before the Heavens do we insist refusing in

it to process the *complete* picture of the world that we already collect piecemeal? Here we are talking of the Pythagorean “know thyself” brought up to the context of the *entire* Uni-verse! Because, for all we know, *we alone are its sole living and thus sensing it conscience!* Even the atheist scientists, it is over *that* that they consume their lives! Isn’t that a *sufficient first* purpose? So, it is *not* just I/we that demand to have the ultimate answer! It is the *entire* Creation that by us seeks to find its Raison d’ être! *How* then dare the atheists tell the *entire* Creation that “It all is nothing, come from nothing, destined to nothing?” And all this for the *spiteful*, the *vitriolic* unwillingness to accept the offer of *free* choice of Holiness, consciously overlooking which even Nobel laureates *freely* choose to go for *nothing*? Alas! By *such* people are we formed! Look at us, at what we engage, stubbornly ignorant of who we are! “Educated”, even in the very best schools, even by professors who *claim* to have fathomed the heavens, to repeat by rote, unsieved by the intellect within, the lessons *they* surreptitiously branded in *our* soft brains! Which is how “tradition”, *literally of all sorts*, is alas being passed on!

[Nobel laureates of the exact sciences still dare hide behind the *inexactitude* of the theory of evolution and *its* escape behind “development”! They are satisfied to speak of the “chemical bond”, that, e.g., in water sets the two hydrogen atoms at a distance of 0.96×10^{-8} cm from the oxygen atom standing at the apex of an angle of 104.5° , but they have *yet* to produce the *convincing* quantum-theoretical explanation, based on the *exact* disposition in space of the electrons, that *so* bond together the molecule of water. Water makes that bond by far the most plentiful on this planet, and without *that* bond there could have been absolutely no life on earth! Still, they all, atheist physicists, chemists, and biologists speak of evolution and the “development” of the species, but they “forget” to explain how even *that* H₂O bond “developed”! And they show us *only* the *schematic* picture to the double helix of DNA (that is a *flexible* “ladder” spiraling about its axis made up of two polyphosphate backbones held together by side chains of nucleotides forming its “steps”) without a single word of the hard-fact physics based on *Law* that determines the way the electrons are shared by the adjacent atoms that hold together all this complex, but *obviously not in the least spurious* structure! When

all this complexity is held together based on hard Law, and upon cell division the DNA produces on its own *exact* of itself copies *obviously based on Law*, it simply *cannot* be either science or honesty that has the temerity to call the evolution of species simply “development” due to “mistakes” that *are*, however, still subject to the *still unknown* underlying Laws of the bonding of atoms by electrons! “Nucleic acids are as large as, or larger than, the largest protein molecules, with molecular weights ranging into the hundreds or millions. They are as important as, or more important than, proteins to the working of living tissue”⁴⁴. It is they *in toto* that make us *all complete to perfection*, bone for perfect adjoining bone, flesh and variegated tissue, organ for organ, from hair and nail to brain and marrow of bones, all performing *exact* functions—except for the “mistakes” that are *not* mistakes at all but *exactments* due to the confluence of conditions that cause the *misbonding* of atoms, conditions that ought never to have been allowed to pass. Throw your deck of cards to eternity: The story of the *complete* You, whether you regard yourself a natural “success” or a natural “failure”, by the cards shall *never* be told! Nobel laureates still speak of “evolution”, “development”, “chance” and meaninglessness. To the exact extent to which they have resolved to struggle for the passing of this their “message” to the world, they themselves *prove exactly this to be their personal* though ill-conceived *purpose*! The Uni-verse allows this aberration, in due respect of their personal freedom: Even as it means exposing the extent of the gratitude *they* feel towards the *Law* that keeps them alive! For the obvious need that the rest of us learn even from this ultimate negative lesson of blasphemy!]

With which heavily loaded, we simply do not comprehend the unity of the Uni-verse of which *we are the very best parts*, alas by *such* teachers taught how “best” daily to commit ever greater blasphemy!

(b) Tradition of old origin Eastern: King David tells of himself, “Ἴδου γὰρ ἐν ἀνομίαις συνελήφθην, καὶ ἐν ἀμαρτίαις ἐκίσθησέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου” [in exact meaning: “Look at me: In iniquities was the seed

⁴⁴ THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF CHEMISTRY, 3rd Edition, C. A. Hampel & G. G. Hawley, Ed., Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1973, ISBN: 0-442-23095-8, p. 740.

that produced me ejected, and in sins did my mother receive the seed that produced me" (Psalm 51, 5)], in effect laying the blame for *his* iniquities to his parents for from the start having produced him in iniquities and in "sins", whom *he thus* judges, and proceeds to find them guilty! But logically, this reference to his own immediate cause does *not* terminate at it: it goes *all* the way back, from his parents on to the whole Creation and, ultimately, on to the Creator, Whom *he thus orientally* dares address! This generation of Easterners, so "piously" taught, lives on! And they are *not* any more solely of Jewish extraction: The psalm is read in the original Septuagint even during Holy Week in the Greek Orthodox churches! English translations attempt to hide the meaning by blunting the language! Just count the Davids [the *beloved* ones, obviously by their parents first of all!] around the entire world; who, named in honor of the original David, by *thus* returning the favor, permit the profanity to live on and inform our lives! The evil knows all too well where to hit to obtain a kill: At the *heart* of the matter! The blasphemy of Holy God is never greater than when it is purposefully spread to affect the *holy* procreative act, so that it make us all children of sin! *Thus* it is that the "higher" Orthodox and the entire Roman Catholic Christian clergy remain unmarried, to avoid committing the "sin"! Thus it is that women *are still being believed to be a lower specie* and in certain religions are not even allowed within their temples! The belief is *not* confined among men: among women does it spread also, desiring to avoid the "sin": Thus it is that the orders of nuns are also created! But, aren't all "religious" useful? Of course, but they do *not* perform *all* their duties, but only those *they* consider to be their duties!: For it obviously is *not* enough to have monks-priests and nun-teachers!: We need more Christian *citizens*, who properly considering *all* their duties will spread among the general population and by *their constant exemplary presence in all decent walks of life* inform the *entire* society how the *Christians* ought to fulfill their duties, *not just* as thoughtless-unquestioning, *obedient* servants, clerks, plant managers, company directors, but even as *dutiful* intellectuals, research workers, professors, and *parents producing even more Christian the following generation*! Isn't it obvious that by *not* so doing, but solely acting as they traditionally do, *all* these "religious" *are in effect thinning* by this sort of unconscious *selective* breeding the percentage of *true* Christians in the general

population as the generations pass? Without the action here proposed, is it not obvious that the "faith" withers to an ever more pitiful state? Is truly Christian the European or American general social life? That the faithful go weekly to church most certainly *is not enough!* We simply may *not* call ourselves people of God by so *seeming* to "devote" ourselves to God, while we truly devote ourselves to the Mammon *for at least six days every week!* No, I do *not* propose that we spend *all seven* days of the week in church! I propose that we make *churches all our lives, our desks, our thoughts, our total behavior, our researches, our dissatisfaction* with the current modus vivendi et operandi in the world, that clearly *is not* informed of God's everpresence; of else the world *wouldn't* walk as it does, guided by such politicians, presidents, legislators, judges, advisers, generals, financiers, bankers, directors, professors, citizens *and* all other voters!

(c) It is *not* just the "religious", who acting as they do and remaining celibate attempt to elevate themselves from the level of the general populace [who thus freely choose to commit "sin"] to a higher level of "grace", with whom one has to contend, but in addition with all those also who learned their lessons upon *their* knees, even as there have been centuries since! Because, the very same pharisaical arrogance met directly in the story of the *healed blind* ["Ἐν ἁμαρτίαις σὺ ἐγεννήθης ὄλος, καὶ σὺ διδάσκεις ἡμᾶς;"; literally: In sins wast thou entirely first conceived and then born, and now dost thou teach us? (John 9, 34)] has also imbued the branch called Academy, that was first taught upon the knees of the Church during the Middle Ages. *So it is that even I* am now asked how indeed I dare introduce a "new" God, Who has *not* passed the imprimatur of the Church and Academy, who *silently for their total lack of serious* counter-argument still exercise the power to prevent *every new thought that attempts to limit the darkness by letting the Light to spread!* How indeed have I dared forget the lesson the world was taught by *juridically* poisoning Socrates? Well, the "establishment", both "scientific" and "clerical", has indeed lost *though only some* of its teeth, but by no means all of them! By the teeth they still have, outwardly seeming exquisitely polite and cordial, they nevertheless still apply that much greater spitefully biting pressure! For it all too well can, colluding, bury all dissenters alive in silence! By *such* people guided is blasphemy continuing to advance! But the signs *are* now ripe: "As the seed, such the

fruit"; as their long-centuries-old teaching has been, so too the planet can no longer bear us: *Only now* does it just begin to be understood that, for the *unity* of Creation that dutifully expected more from us, in its hot tears (getting continuously hotter by the extra waste heat we produce in our maniacal search for ever more instantaneous material satisfaction of our insatiable appetite for *more matter, not Spirit!*) will this planet slowly simmer us; in order to cleanse itself of the sin committed upon it! In case dull minds still do not get it: *we, thus during long centuries taught*, are the devils that fan the flames of Hell!

(d) War has been called "politics by other means". Conversely, politics, too, *is* no less than war! Having as object the truly big profits of both so-called "Peace"-and-War! In it, the blood of men and ultimately their Spirit *is no* object! The more of them both we waste, the greater do the profits become! The fools we are, we simply do not understand that the *profits* fan ever hotter the flames! No! In this thoroughly dirty business, in which principally the faithful of *all three* monotheistic religions engage, with all others not at all minding giving a hand, *don't* ever believe *any* partaking side! Left, middle and right, obedient citizens, just as also *all* anarchists simply position themselves as best they expect the profits in the market to be disbursed! Their motto is this: "Long live the Hell! May it never freeze!" Only the fools won't ever see that, in the now definitely fast coming End, this wish *shall* be granted them! The Lord and His Justice shall *not* much longer be mocked!

§157. (a) *All* the physical and logical hard facts so far discussed present a horrendous problem for the atheists and blasphemers under *all* pseudonyms in *every* corner, niche and hideout on this blessed but for our acts made pitiful globe: they are challenged to disprove the reasoning and the structure of the universe thus revealed and, by still stronger reasoning, to justify what, in the absence of such stronger reasoning, inevitably show themselves to be *their multiple blunders*. And if they cannot do so, they are challenged to explain *scientifically* how it was possible, purely by chance or its own legislative and executive powers, for the universe so to organize and arrange itself right from the start! And if they cannot do this either, how it is still possible to accept the view that the universe does not need a Creator! The statement that there is out there an infinity of universes (*all* invisible, *except*

this one!) arranging themselves purely by chance in all sorts of ways, one of which is the one here revealed, is *not* Science, that as already discussed *must* be based on *absolutely firm* knowledge, but an *altogether suspect purely religious* belief presented solely in order to counter the *Logical* belief in the Creator of this so-structured universe! This their attempt to escape could *perhaps* stand as an argument if they could just point to us a, say, austere Doric column standing here on earth, *self-made by pure chance*, i.e., *totally without* the intervention of the human mind and hands! The chances of such a happening *must be judged exponentially vastly superior* to those they imply about the universe, since as regards this one column, *all the other requisites are here already, except for the interference of the creating human!* The silence of the atheists is understandable, but so also is their *dishonesty*, demonstrated glaringly by their silence, the two together being the *solid proof they provide of the infallibility of the reasoning here developed on Newton's Law!* That they have the monopoly on so-called "scientific" and popular publications in which they are given ample room to expound volubly, *but not persuasively*, on their views isn't surprising: *all the social forces hiding behind the media are in tacit collusion against the Creator! Their own corruption is so well known to themselves that, in order to hide it from the public, they must shake all belief in Order;* and the best way to begin doing so is none other than *cursing the sacred ground* on which we all stand!: When that is equated to the dirt, waste, filth, excrement and rotting corpses they proudly dare exhibit daily to the world on high-definition living-color screens, in the general effort to "argue" for the total meaninglessness of everything for being a product of chance and nothingness, all the unspeakable crimes, committed right in front of all decent inhabitants of this sorrowful Earth who are *in this manner deliberately* kept speechless and numb, *cannot* be passed as a moral aberration but only as a mere appearance of just another possibility! Do we *all*, powerful *and* powerless, understand that? Nothing gives the militant atheists greater pleasure than *their so-contrived* public "disproof" of God, Whom they do not even condescend to mention by name; and nothing gives those pillars of "learning" and social stature greater chagrin than being found wrong and unable to dispel the charge of their *bottomless indivisible* intellectual *and* moral dishonesty!

(b) But the argument cuts both ways: In the face of the dis-

proof of a young universe, nor can the “creationists” still insist on their old views *and* claim intellectual honesty for themselves! For them the question truly is far more weighty: Are they prepared for the sake of the far far greater good of accepting this *scientifically* proven *creation* of the *Living* Creator God, to sacrifice their own *theologically and scientifically* “(in?)consequential” notion of a young earth [in order to continue offering their public support to the “holiness” of every word, and that all too frequently *mistranslated*, of ancient “holy” writings, now proven erroneous by none other than the creation itself of Holy God] and to stand beside these findings, or will they continue, like those others, to support their earlier own beliefs now shown erroneous? Will they at long last understand that by continuing to hold fast to that notion, they thus elevate to *supreme doctrine their own importance*, even as *it* is being refuted by the creation of God, Whom they thus *only appear* to adore in the stubborn service solely of themselves? Will they at last understand that by so acting, it is the earlier glorification of God on Whose behalf they profess to act that upon the alter *they now consciously* sacrifice, rather than their *only ever so slightly by comparison* *nicked* egos, *nicked* by the *consequential* mistake of believing men’s ancient writings, critically unexamined, to be superior to the *direct in the heavens* writing of the Lord? For, obviously, if they too cannot disprove these here findings, and they too choose to keep silent, they *shall* show that for them, their only slightly *nicked* egos count for far more than those of the atheists!!! If such “believers” and such “scientists” keep silent in the face of such news, how can it be shaken that *in unison do they act* pushing the world ever deeper into the bottomless pit of ever greater moral depravity—for nothing other than what each of them regards of supreme value over and beyond God’s Truth and Justice? When that is done ambilaterally how can we ignore that the end does indeed *fast* come upon us? Of all Holy God’s virtues, only His patience is *not* inexhaustible, as that would mean equating vice to virtue and canceling *His* Holy Justice! How can it by such “believers” be missed that their own responsibility increases far faster than that of the atheists with *every* breath they draw in silent unison with them? For, is it not true that their now *conscious* silence for the sake of their confessed “faith” *will indeed be more blasphemous and direct* than that of the atheists? Was not his ego that counseled Adam to sin?

Who truly thinks can escape the consequences of playing dirty games behind God's Holy Name??? King Solomon's Temple fell because it carried *his* name! The Parthenon and the Temple of Holy Wisdom fell because for the Greeks, too, to empty shells the *heavy* words were reduced! The rest of Christianity has dedicated magnificent Temples to this or that Saint, standing antagonistically against each other, *all* for the *sinful* occupant bishop's sake [and only dull minds may fail to draw the due lesson from these here words!], *not one* directly to the *Sinless* Lord Christ, the *God Himself made Man*, for the sake of Victory over evil even at *our* level! We, having understood nothing, continue to choose evil! Some creationists state that the question of a young universe is secondary! *Not* quite! Indeed, *not* quite! Because even that *is* an *indelible* part of the writing in the heavens! *Nothing* done by God is secondary, everything *has* its place! And we owe it our corresponding to it respect! Neither more, nor less! Well???

(c) Brother, please mind this: I most categorically do *not* mean to put you on the spot, any more than it is incumbent on all us Christians to put each other on the spot for the Glory of God. I do *not* see you or anyone as an enemy, but as a fellow sufferer in this state of being; It shall be the *same* Heaven we shall enjoy, and the *same* hell we shall endure; as God *is* One, and *all* the rest we may choose stands against Him! As a brother and for the Love of God do I fervently hope that than mine *your* faith is greater! So, I *don't* expect you to charge me with "bad manners" for so bluntly stating all these *tastefully bitter* truths! As you well know, *true* politeness and Truth do *not* conflict, and it is *not* a Christian *nor* a *true believer* in God whoever demands that the Truth *not* be told for the sake of what the "world" calls "politeness"!

§158. (a) As it is *not* a legitimate excuse for a scientist [see §117b, pp. 212-3], it is *neither* for a creationist sensible to attempt saying that the above analysis of G, on which *all* this effort was based, though pointing to facts and agreements with independent findings already on record, is nevertheless based on a *pure* coincidence; namely, that the G entering the Law of gravitation as so far "understood" (but, obviously, *not in fact* comprehended!) is in fact "different" from that seen in the light of the present analysis and all that attends it! It is exactly because the atheists understand that such a coincidence *is* impossible *because* the logic of the above analysis *cannot* be refuted, that they consciously

choose to bury this whole effort in silence! It follows that, *even less* may Creationists and believers in God in *any* way suggest that such a central question and *any* coincidence *could* have escaped the attention of God, Whose Wisdom overlooks *nothing*!

(b) *Nor*, of course, is it legitimate to contend that “we theologians and creationists are both scientists and believers, but we are more believers than scientists, and for the sake of the greater good we are forced to take the Bible at its very every word on the belief that it is the Word of God, and so to reject the analysis of G along with all the consequences that attend it”! Religious leaders obviously have it in them to claim that what *they* write down is the Word of God: otherwise, they will simply *not* be believed! But *nobody* has so far claimed that the *entire* Bible in whatever language *is the exact word of the Hand of God*! On the contrary, *all* believers believe that the World *is the exact Creation* of the “Hand” of God! And it is *exactly on this claim alone* that some nonbelievers believe that *as such* is the world *not* perfect enough! *Clearly, all believers and nonbelievers argue about* the understanding that the World *is* His most ancient statement we know! The Old Testament repeatedly states that God had had second thoughts. I leave it to all rational men to decide whether God truly has second thoughts, or such statements only reflect men’s *unconfessed (if at all conscious)* ignorance! The Lord requested that we study the Scriptures (obviously, in order that through them we get to the *Spirit* of God), *not* that we memorize them verbatim word for word, and stick to them all. Indeed, *which human* language can claim infallibility worthy of God? Writings and translations may and *will* differ, as words of men. *Only the Spirit of God is infallible, and only It may not be misconstrued*! For at least our *fear* (if not our love) of God, let us at long last be dutifully serious: *Which* particular text of the Scriptures did God endorse? *Why* did He allow the old Hebrew books to be corrupted and to perish, and the “Translation of the Seventy” to remain intact already for a longer period of time than any original Hebrew text? The text presently used by the Jews is just about only a thousand years old, as *all* earlier documents then in Jewish hands were, *by men, not God*, ordered destroyed! And why do the creationists not take even the New Testament word for word? Why do they not take with *all the weight of Logic* the statement that “In the beginning was the *Logos*”, *not* the *poorly* translated “Word”? Do they deny

that Logos and God *are* the same, or that Logos *precedes* the Creation of heaven and earth? And do they deny that the belief in a young earth is only based on *inference*? Indeed, *where* does the Bible state that we owe allegiance to this *inference*, more so in fact than to *direct* statements, such as those about the Logos??? So, it is *not every* single word in the Bible (and especially in the Old Testament), *nor* every inference out of context to which we owe our allegiance, but the *central meaning* of it, that *God is both Logos and Truth*; never forgetting that Christ Himself said that He came in order that the Scriptures be fulfilled (ἵνα ἡ Γραφή πληρωθῆ: be completed and perfected), even as He left a crucial part of fulfilling to be done by the Holy Spirit, that *would* remind us of *every* Truth; obviously, as *we would gradually grow in It!!!* And *how* indeed can at all be asserted that, given the imperfection of human speech, even the Bible is capable of superior TheoLogy than is the *direct* writing of God Himself in the heavens, which is the World itself that *He* created and “saw it was good”? God *cannot* have given man *two* TheoLogies, let alone two contradictory ones, that of the Bible and that of the World *He* created, and *He* made to speak of Him, *as that is contrary to the general absolute Logical necessity that no two objective laws, quantities, qualities and even theologies pertaining to the same subject-matter can both exist that are mutually exclusive or in any sense contradictory to each other*; as in such a case those (be they the objective Nature or even men) called to obey those contradictory laws even TheoLogies *would be lost in disorder and chaos* for not knowing which of these two to follow!

§159. (a) Do *you* then, my Friend, think that for *minor, secondary, doubtful* elements relating *solely* to human pride, the Creationists, the TheoLogians, the Churches and the Religions are still well justified *even at this late hour of general immorality and the now daily satanically designed and executed hecatombs of believers of all three monotheistic religions of the World in the Middle East and Africa*, to keep silent on this issue, thereby conceding the field, the battle, the entire war of Good vs. evil to the atheists??? If today Christianity, despite its *said* belief in a *wholly perfect* God, is being ridiculed on account of the transparently *unChrist-ian* private and public behavior of most so-called “Christians” from the “Heads” of their Churches on down, not daring for their *obvious absence of true Faith*, to call to account themselves, those in high

public offices, and each other for the absence from our lives of God's vision of *moral propriety* on Earth, can the creationists from every faith everywhere in the world *add* to that ridicule *their own intellectual* impropriety that shall *not* be lesser than that of the atheists, if they themselves hold to views that imply God to have been even ever so slightly imperfect in His *total and integral* consideration of His Plan of Creation? Would that not *add* to the general blasphemy? My own great *yet failed* efforts, among the atheist scientists since 1985 to see these matters publicly discussed and acknowledged for their *obvious scientific and moral value*, must have left no doubt in their minds that I also have made similar failed attempts in the direction of both Creationists and the Churches! Given the atheist scientists' own inability to disprove the basic reasoning, they know that the absence of universal public discussion of this central matter is solely due to the failure of the Creationists and the Churches to force the issue into the public domain, that can only be due to disinterest, fear, pride and the absence of true faith on the side of both those two camps, that alone prevent them from using this uniquely powerful weapon against atheism. The atheists already know the power of this weapon. So, not only do they rejoice at this exhibition of faithlessness of those two other camps, by they also despise them for it! Yet, they are *not* about to make too public their scorn and rejoicing, as that would give *them, too*, away! The present communication, my Reader, absolves *you* of culpability, for I acknowledge my failure to obtain better results sooner! But from the moment you read this, *should you too choose silence*, you too shall become just as responsible [and indeed all the more so for the great length and detail of this present effort] for this conspiracy of silence—unless, that is, you Brother, *disprove* my reasoning! This is why did I earlier say that I hope *your* Faith than mine is greater, so that *it* guide you through to see my mistakes, *if* I have committed any mistakes! For if not, this is nothing other than proof irrefutable that in this now exposed *long since firmly established oriental bazaar*, all sellers, in general tacit collusion involving and those who choose not to object, sell to the still innocent remaining buyers intellectual goods that *are known to be rotten!* As *all* the sellers in the bazaar make a *huge* profit, *not* one of them shall willingly ever confess that *this whole market is indeed fixed!*

(b) If the questions are horrible, as indeed they are, it is only because our times, too, *are* so horrible! What defense shall we

present to Christ, the Lord Judge, for our present faithlessness? Mind you, Brother, these are *not* questions over which I myself have not agonized for long, long years! It is in this that the Christian differs from the non-Christian: He has chosen to live this Divine Agony, that asks of him to put God ahead of self. But only *thus*, by succeeding in exactly this, does the life of the Christian become a joy above all others, even as he is being battered on all sides. The first Christians were indeed heroic figures, and justly saintly for their heroism. In the last Days, the Christians shall be called upon, *are* already being called upon, to be even more heroic, for the times *are* already worse and promise to worsen still more. Shall we for the fear of the enemy throw away the shields, that is, Christ Himself, the Creator, even as we claim faith in Him, and are already known to the atheists for our faithlessness that alone has prevented us, to the extent we could do so, from forcing the matter into the public domain? As of a Brother in the Faith must I beg you: By your greater Faith show me wrong; or else *do no longer* keep silent!

28

DETERMINISM
AND
FREEDOM

§160. The true impact of the theory of evolution cannot be felt until it is realized that the theory was *only the first and weakest*, conscious yet covert pseudo-scientific effort to subvert determinism as the possible product of Design. The vehemence with which the theory is being defended even by atheist students of the exact sciences despite its inexactitude is indicative of their full appreciation of its contribution to their overall cause. If they let it fall, their other atheistic theories are certain to follow! It is *not* by simple general oversight that has “mysteriously” struck *all* atheist scientists that, unquestioning, they swallow, e.g., Dawkins’ wily effort to defend evolutionary theory by including on p. 16 of his *The Blind Watchmaker* the details of the eye and of the retina (the latter down to a single cell), that on p. 17 he accompanies with the statements that the human body consists of about 10 trillion cells, and that on “eat[ing] a steak you are shredding the equivalent of more than 100 billion copies of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*”, in order that he then proceed to “explain” how all that was due solely to “CHANCE”, followed by “SINGLE-STEP AND CUMULATIVE SELECTION”, and then finished off by “DEVELOPMENT”! The human optical system *would all be for naught* if it did not correctly connect to the brain to which the *entire* body connects! *All that supposedly for no purpose at all!* Would *they all* agree that the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (and thus, by their own admission a *far smaller* project) was composed by some “analogous” process with absolutely no purpose in sight? The theory of evolution was only

the first covert effort to subvert the belief in the existence of the Designer setting down the *full details* of determinism! Today, we make so much of "human life and health"! Whatever for, if it be for just nothing?

§161. The theory of relativity was the second "success" of the very same conscious effort to subvert determinism and discredit its Creator. Still, when it first appeared, the theory attracted, as it still does retain some thoroughly improbable supporters even among the theists!: The pre-relativistic materialists had insisted that absolute determinism delimits the freedom of Man to act and thus be fully responsible for all his acts as a moral entity. A predetermined world in which, according to *stupid* "theologians", human beings are predestined to be saved or doomed, as some in the Catholic Church so foolishly asserted, is a world permitting no room for freedom, and thus neither for dignity, either for Man or even for God, Who thus has only created marionettes! Those among the theists who for supposedly theological reasons saw Man as an intrinsically indivisible entity in which the division of body and Spirit is purely linguistic and in reality nonexistent, were, as it could be expected, uneasy with Laplacian determinism, so akin they thought to predestination. All those people welcomed the theory of relativity as a liberator from determinism, which they thought oppressive. The very same category of people, ever ready to believe foolish and wily pseudo-scientific assertions, rejoicing welcomed even more enthusiastically the third notorious atheistic theory of the century, the theory of *probabilistic* quantum mechanics, that *supposedly* "restored" freedom by putting the locking nails to the coffin of classical Laplacian determinism.

§162. Such improbable supporters have perhaps been more impedimental than *well informed* theists have been instrumental to the proper scientific and philosophical evaluation of these theories, and they have done more damage to the cause of Truth than the atheists themselves! The thesis of the indivisibility of the bodily-spiritual nature of Man predates, it is only fair to point out, even Spinoza [whom Einstein acknowledged as his teacher]. It is even possible that he too was influenced by it. It goes back to the *grossly misunderstood* doctrines of the resurrection of Christ and the dead. It only seeks to justify, *ex post facto* as it were, those so misunderstood doctrines. Since the early Christian Fathers,

many Christians have seen in that doctrine the eventual deification, by the power of the Grace of God, even of the matter that makes up the human bodies [and thus of all matter]! Traditional, and even highly regarded, theologians and mystics, as well as innumerable sentimentalists who have *thought* there is “value” in the eventual salvation of all matter [thought “fallen” through *our* sins, as we over *long* centuries are still being taught, as if sin were the product *only or also* of *unthinking* matter, rather than only of our *undisciplined* Spirit, that *so* remains weak, *is ever so ready* to pass on to others *its* blame, and *so grossly fails* to see how the *Holy* God could *not* possibly charge the *innocent* but ultimately spiritually useless matter of sin], ignorant of science and the *full factual* philosophical, theological and scientific implications of Creation, have badly confused the *fundamentally different* natures of Spirit and matter, of which *both* the Reality we all know consists!

§163. God *created* the world, but in creating it, He also *invented* it out of *not* preexisting materials. God *is* Spirit. The created world of physical reality is *not* Spirit but *matter* (the gravitational constant, mass, its age and space in which those others exist develop and are being sensed). As such, the created world is *naturally uniquely antithetical, i.e., totally foreign* to the *totally other* Nature of the Spirit. In creating the world, God thus demonstrated His *absolute* control even over things *totally different* from His own purely Spiritual Essence. Matter is *not*, by its own nature inimical to the Spirit, but its obedient (*yet in a sense, fully “understanding”* the orders and their implications for itself), but ethically, morally and spiritually *unconscious and uncomprehending* servant. The Spirit that exists in the world, as we cannot fail to recognize both in us humans, and in the *speaking* eyes, “voices” and behavior of the *trainable* animals, *was also created*, but was and is *in addition to matter, not of or from it!* *Only* in reference to the Spirit in us are we in God’s image and likeness! *Freedom applies solely to the moral character of the Spirit, and thus is in addition to the determinism that only characterizes the inanimate Nature!* True, our freedom is *not* absolute but delimited by the material circumstances of the created Nature; but proportionally delimited, too, is *our* responsibility, or else God *would* be unjust! These two come together: We do *not* deserve absolute freedom, because *we do not, nor can we*, carry absolute responsibility! We are too weak *and unwise* for *that* burden! (Just imagine how we litter the space

around the Earth *with the same obscene abandon* with which we litter the streets!) But morally, it is hard to see in what more a still greater freedom could (had we had it) consist, given our present ethical status. *Nothing* we can imagine as humans has morally been denied us! Our human nature partakes of *both* realities the physical *and* the spiritual, as *no* other species that we know of or indeed can imagine, apart from the indescribable monsters coming out of the *terminally sick* minds in charge of Hollywood and similar places, that are mere caricatures solely of themselves! It is only by our physical nature that our freedom inescapably is being curtailed as indeed is the freedom of every physical entity that cannot but remain naturally obedient to the Law that is proper to the physical Nature. By our spiritual nature we remain totally free, far far beyond even our wildest dreams, that Hollywood and the politicians that are guided by it do alas constantly bring into being: If we do not fully appreciate the *fact* of this dual statement, it is only because we take *undivided* freedom for granted, *that is contrary to the dual nature of Reality*, that for our intellectual immaturity we fail to see as *it is*. The *undivided* freedom that we seek is the ultimate form of compulsion: once we realize that we cannot do otherwise than our basest instincts dictate! It is exactly for our being *moral (not just only physical)* entities also that we have been spared of that compulsion! And in it is for our spiritual immaturity that we keep on asking for still more “freedom”, staying ignorant of the extent our *true freedom has already been given*: that within Reason-Logos we *indeed have it all!*: Being totally free to descent even to hell! Being totally free to ascent to even to Heaven! What we fail to see, abusing the language, is that Freedom is *not* without *its appropriate* cost! Being Free does not mean that there is no charge due! We are *not* “free” to mess up with the facts of Truth and Reality, to mix up unwisely what by their nature *must* remain unmixed! Such so-called “freedom”, in exact language *license*, the Holy God has denied even Himself! We *must* know the length of our bed in which we sleep! We may *not* spread our legs beyond its lower limit!

§164. It is equally hard to see what *moral* obligation must God recognize as having Himself vis-à-vis created entities such as protons and electrons, that are *not* spiritual but only material; and why He should feel obligated to preserve them too [indeed in *what presumably steady* state of theirs, given the *unsteadiness* of

their physical nature by which they partake in the expansion of the physical Universe?] as His eternal companions [even *after they have fulfilled* the office assigned to them!] I am *not* saying that He may not extend His Grace even to them, in His own way. Who am I to fathom the depths of God's Complete Grace, or delimit Him in any way? What we may only assert, fully without hint of profanity or disgrace is that God is *never* unreasonable! But to assert consciously or unconsciously the salvation of inanimate nature as co-equal to the Spirit in us, that alone is in God's image and likeness, and so to color our Philosophy, Science, and TheoLogy, goes *beyond, impermissibly beyond*, the call of our duty as *reasoning moral* entities. If deification of all matter is thus to be asserted as a supposedly Logical requisite for the assertion of the doctrine of the Lord's Resurrection, it makes it *almost if not totally impossible* to see the value of the struggle against sin; without which struggle, Holiness becomes meaningless! That both sinners and righteous shall be saved solely for being bodily made up of electrons and protons, rather than judged according to the moral weight of their deeds stretches imagination!: Electrons and protons are constantly in the natural for them physical state of "hell": the physical universe constantly goes through untold fire and cold to make our physical home! Hell retains its meaning solely for the Spirit that chooses depravity!

§165. The no less important doctrinal belief in the eternal punishment of the unrepentant poses an *equally very thorny* problem for matter: My body constantly exchanges protons and electrons with the environment. By *what* graces or faults of theirs should those *innocent of moral consequences* follow *me* to Heaven or hell? *How* can it be said which of them should be deified and which "devilified", which employed in the singing of hymns, and which in the gnashing of teeth!? True Deification is one thing! Salvation *is* another! Everlastingness (whether of the righteous or of the sinners) *is yet* another! In Christian parlance, "deification" stands only for *salvation*, and it can only mean the *enjoyment of the company* of God, *not the absorption and complete assimilation* (especially of matter!) in the Eternal Spiritual Essence of God; because in that case, He too changes, and in a way that permits the *Logically impossible mixing of the unmixable essence* of the Spirit of God and the essence of matter created *minus* Spirit; as, otherwise, we speak *surreptitiously only* of Pantheism! There may

be no question: The “theologians”, *ignorant of their ignorance*, have *not* thought matters thoroughly through: Vastly more is here confused than the inability to tell apart lemons and apples! The rest of us owe them nothing compared to what we all owe directly the Lord! Everlastingness can be granted even to inanimate, soulless entities, should they be useful to some *particular* purpose, should such purpose exist, which they can serve as physical entities; but this *does not and cannot carry any moral metaphysical connotation!* But for the resurrected to be re-instituted to (regain and henceforth retain) their physical bodies, fully as those bodies were before their physical death (though only somehow “transformed” in some manner and state unspecified) in order to be returned to a life not much unlike the present—this smacks of *delayed* transmigration, a varied but *still old Asiatic* belief! This *cannot* be a Christian doctrine of afterlife! Afterlife, in order to be worthy at all, must involve fully *only* the Spirit: It *cannot* be transmigration as asiatically understood, but *transfiguration!* This is a *new*, uniquely Christian term, still not understood fully! Transfiguration, passing into another figure, uses terms known to humans, to “describe” a state *unknown* to humans, for which we *lack* descriptive words! The resurrected being transfigured *shed* their previous physical nature and are altered into a *new, no longer physical* nature! How do you convey this change, except by means of Divine Economy, using human words to describe the Holy? The Spirit in you is *immortal!* Trust It; and *save yourself all that trouble!* Otherwise, you shall get mired into the quagmire of the *impossible* “things” of this “spiritualization” matter! The Lord told us *absolutely nothing* of the sort the later “theologians” undertook to “explain”. He only spoke of the Kingdom of God being *at hand, being immediate, no longer to be awaited!* His Suffering and Resurrection, His body turning to light and His Spirit separating from Its *temporary* fleshy home, truly were the *ultimate* Transfiguration. All the rest, we have it on the basis of *obscure* statements made up of *uncertain* words! Asians undertook to describe states of being of which they literally knew *absolutely not one* thing, either about the matter, or about the Spirit! While the Greeks had already for centuries understood the Elysium as the Field of Philosophical, i.e., *purely Spiritual* endeavor and action!

§166. The Christian *must* learn to trust God to do what is best in *His* own eyes! This means that we *must* adopt an attitude

about matters beyond our experience and understanding that will *not* delimit the Wisdom and Power of God by *any* sort of illogicality! The doctrine of Resurrection *had* to involve the change of the body, but *only in order to be seen, as it had to, by our material eyes!* This does *not* necessarily mean that the body became Spirit, nor indeed the reverse! When matter is nothing other than Democritean atoms [and Creation remains the simplest *only if it involves them!*], or in other words, the *finest by definition form of physical light*, the body did *not* really experience a fundamental transformation of its very nature, but only of its *form!* The freedom of the Lord to do what He must, namely, *the best and noblest, is thus fully preserved!* After Judgment, the Spirit goes *Its* way, and matter its own! But as Judgment inevitably means the end of things as we know them now, what then becomes superfluous *cannot* be considered survivable!

§167. This is a subject admittedly most difficult and profound. I am compelled to discuss it in some detail, and I certainly have only merely touched it,

(a) in order not merely to assert it without the least explanation as attempted by the “theologians”, but solely in order to dispel the *supposed* incompatibility of determinism and moral freedom, that are by no means at all incompatible: The Laplacian determinism is applicable to the world of matter; but solely for the *fact* that matter is subject to Law that is *not* its product by its *master!* The Spiritual determinism applies not only to Man but also to God, for the *fact* that God being Perfect and Holy *cannot* bypass Justice, that determines the Sacred Order of *all* things! While moral freedom, applicable solely to the world of the Spirit, *only mistakenly* is believed to exist when determinism is removed; and

(b) in order to help cut the tie with which some creationists have bonded themselves to the profoundly atheistic and pseudoscientific theories of relativity and the current probabilistic quantum mechanics.

§168. Let me repeat it: Freedom does *not* belong in the world of matter but *only* of the Spirit! Protons and electrons are *not* free but firmly bound under the Natural Law they *cannot* disobey. *Only moral entities are free to obey or disobey the Moral Law*, that is here to *guide, not to determine; to impel, not to compel.* There is this *hard* fact: Freedom is *not* license. Perversion *may not* be excused as due to some natural inconsequential defect, that by some hard

“luck”, God set upon our genes! The content of the Moral Law *is determined*, or else it would *not* be a Law! Our acts are *not*! We are free to act as we please. But we seek *license* rather than Freedom when we demand that the Moral Law be erased in the name of our *supposed unlimited* freedom! When we do that, we demand that we be delivered from all *Responsibility* for our acts! The hard fact is that, there is no Freedom unless there is *content* in the Moral Law, for otherwise *how* can we say that we are indeed free? Free of *what*? To do *what*, when *doing is not even defined unless it is delimited*? Free to choose *what* as our destiny? Rejecting Heaven or hell as destinations nonexistent, we are left to “choose” nonexistence! This certainly lightens the guilt of the guilty, be they professors, politicians, or criminals—to the extent they thus can put their consciences to some restless sleep! But is this freedom of choice? When you *cannot on your own choose to exist or not to exist*, despite *all* your statements or even a successful suicidal act, you belong in *another* world, and it is *there* that you must make an *honorable* stand! Thou art *not* a worm, but a Man! So, honor at least thy grand name! Be at last then a *Man*! Accept the Responsibility that befits thy station!

§169. Further progress in Philosophy and Science *cannot* be made until *after* we dispel the fears we have on this point. We *must assert both Moral Determinism and our Freedom, as both go together!!* Only this *seemingly* dual position is Logical, as *only so* is the world made complete! To assert, or even to be fearful of, the opposite is to fall into the trap of atheism, pantheism, materialism and finally nihilism: Which all choose to be blind to the Presence of the Spirit!

29

FINAL THOUGHTS AND EPILOGUE

§170. (a) We have finally come, after quite some distance, to the end of this exposition. It pays to take a final view: Having argued for the unity of the *uni*-verse in which we live, we still need to comprehend our position from yet another perspective: For all we know, none than us in the uni-verse is more intelligent, and from none in it do we expect any help, yet masters of it, quite clearly, we are not. Still below us, here on earth, stands the globe itself, and all the creatures on it! Some eighteen years ago, raking leaves on the lawn, I was favored by a little male cat, who took it upon himself to trust me and make his home with us. He developed to be quite a character: headstrong, independent, demanding, obviously needing love yet always on *his* own terms, *never* entangling himself in our feet; when sick, showing his need *always* with dignity; quite old now, he cries *only* when *very* sick, and we do not miss how embarrassed he feels, which he clearly shows, when he is inconvenienced by sickness. With his very thick coat of long hair, last summer he almost died of heatstroke, and was saved only by a close haircut, that revealed how really small he was inside the rich plumage. Fluffy recovered, but he is getting on as best he can, as we all are. To him, *we are* Gods! And he expects of *us* to tend *him*! A *faithful* four-legged picture of us in the face of the *real* God! We are resolved: As long as the Lord above suffers *us*, we may *not* give up suffering him! After all, we humans *are* closer to *him*, rather than *Him*! If *He* tolerates us, we may *not* abandon an old cat that has *only us* literally to look up to!

(b) So are we caught up in the middle! And taught as Fluffy chooses to teach us: We may *not* prove lesser than *he* expects of us! Which makes you think how *deeply* the Lord must have taken it upon Himself *not* to prove lesser than we *would* think of Him seeing Him standing on the uppermost rung of Perfection! Cats *are* proud animals They plead, but they also know when to turn their back when they think you ignore their pleading! The more they expect of you, all the more determined do they turn their back when they interpret as a personal insult your *seeming* neglect!: *Faithful* four-legged pictures of us standing before the *real* Lord God! But, surely, we *can* reason better than cats do!

§171. (a) Honestly, who would not love God if He instantly satisfied our every whim? *Not for nothing* did the Jews welcome the Lord Christ upon His final entrance into Jerusalem: They were *convinced* given His entire performance that indeed *He was* the Messiah! So, *had* He done what *they* expected of Him, *they all would have become Christian; absolutely no question* about it! But not only did He not perform as/what they expected; He moreover upset the tables of the sellers and money changers in the Temple! My cat's turning his back on me is absolutely nothing compared to the rejection of God by those whose whims He fails to satisfy! My cat cannot raise me on my cross. For two thousand years already, we all keep on crucifying God for not performing as we still keep on expecting of Him! Christ cleared the Temple of all traders; and they crucified Him. He then gave them some forty more years, to which He added another some sixty; ample for them to consider what they kept on doing inside the Temple. To terminate the blasphemy, He allowed that the Temple be destroyed as we all too well know! But we *all* still have *not* learned the lesson!

(b) Two more monotheistic religions have since sprung out of Judaism! Let us all at long last stop shedding blood in the name of God, Whom we all continue to regard *our* servant! We certainly have more "brains" than does Fluffy! The constant wars in the Middle East during the last sixty long years, involving the "faithful" of *all three* monotheistic religions, is nothing short of a performance of marketeers literally making a daily killing by the hundreds no longer of animals but of men in the most profane chase of profit the world ever saw, all under the *tacit approval and blessing*, or else *they first would have raised "hell"*, of the priesthood

of *all three* monotheistic religions! The placid faces with the *forked* smiles that are tirelessly exercised before private mirrors on how to deliver *false* words of soothing that dripping poison dress the ever unquenched hatred cunningly taught by the men at the religious pinnacles of the world as *only they* know how to make it appear for virtue, all these can no longer hide the all too brutal truth of the matter that translates into “legitimate” profit of tens of billions of dollars and euros per year for untold corporations, that eventually percolates down to make a “better” life for their wily followers! Most naturally, *not for them all*—or else the “better” life would *not* be as good for all those who split among themselves la crème de la crème!

(c) Let us all dare see the brutal reality we have created: The Second World War devolved *immediately* into the Third. The debate was not about the “need” for it but about the strategy and the means. An arms race began and the players bluffed even beyond their means. Naturally, the weaker player abandoned the race when the final bluff was called. The victor was then sincerely shocked: It is *not* comfortable suddenly to be found with your main industry, that till then was the war, without a customer! The pressure “had” to continue until *all* nations accepted the victor’s dictation. That *included* the Hollywood products, that *for the sake of profit* spread all over the globe the “American Dream”. Had that dream remained an *internal* affair funded by *internal* sweat, tears and blood, the peoples of the world would unquestionably have reacted in a more sane manner. The trouble began with the exportation of that dream and the pressure upon local governments to fund in all conceivable manner the *Americans’* Dream; which some of the rest took *minus* the sweat, tears and blood its realization meant! This is when and how the peoples began disliking the Americans—except such local people as could follow that Dream at the superadded expense of their own compatriot citizens thus becoming poorer still! At least comparatively, even if not in absolute terms! That’s how the local leftist uprisings sprouted: It simply is *not* safe policy to show the poor how you *waste* wealth; and it becomes positively dangerous for the exhibitionist when even a small part of it is taken from off their skins! To create greater corporate profits, the jobs were expected, but the foreign workers, though thus gaining more than before, saw themselves falling ever farther behind the thus ever faster

forward racing Dream. And *naturally* those left jobless at home moved to the political left and formed terrorist bands. When upheavals such as the Second World War creates *this* final outcome, the victor *must* see his victory as a *sacred trust* from Above; *not* as a license to loot the world for himself, or to lead the world to a never ceasing ever more prodigal way of life! The world *is much too small and much too unable to withstand the complete consequences* of an ever advancing American Dream turned Universal! Not only can we not fuel five or six billion American cars, and these at the American pace of constant replacement along with everything else that accompanies this way of conduct, but we shall literally suffocate in the world smog and the rising heat and humidity. World air conditioning *is* an impossibility: thermodynamics *forbids* it! This sort of “sustainable development”, or however else it is called, is an *obvious dangerous lie*, but the professors, making *extra salaries* as “advisers”, simply are *not* about to tell the world! So, they choose to tell the world that other *still greater lie* of “nothingness”!: It *is* a world pleaser! This generation of professors will be long dead when the full consequences of their false teachings hit us all on the head, the lungs and the heart! The motto “let tomorrow mind *its* business” is *no* longer wise: we are almost upon the *absolute limit of means*, and the world may *not* be led to struggle about the possession of the means that will keep *only the few* in their safe extravagant luxury! If the victor refuses to consider along these lines the problem, he is *not* up to the weight of the Globe loading his shoulders: He is *not* Atlas! But of all the peoples, it is *he*, exactly for being the victor, that must also correctly teach both himself and the rest and lead the way!

§172. (a) So, let us all be absolutely sincere as these brutal times demand: Those who *claim* unbelief in God only do so for not having their *every* whim, *including blank license*, instantly satisfied! It is in *retaliation* that they, feeling insulted, call God non-existent! The cats *are* as faithful as four-legged pictures can be of us standing before the *real* God up Above! But only when *we* too choose to think with our *bellies*, as cats do! But for thinking other than about the bellies, God has endowed us with a far more suitable device: *Not* our brain, but our *mind*, our intellect, our whole *διάνοια*, *that is here to encompass the Whole*, if only we two-legged ones dare look up and consider the Whole, *not* just the ground from which our noses *are set safely distant*! Just consider the order:

Forehead on top, to be closest to the Logos above; then *only below it* set is the nose, to sniff not only the lighter essences dutifully escaping to higher elevation, but also the most useful to us heavy ethereal substance with which as salt from the Spirit we ought to sprinkle our lives to make them truly worth living; and then *underneath it* the mouth—but not just in order that we as animals graze the ground, but in order that we, having put all we gather together, express our *well* considered evaluation of the Whole!

(b) Rather than doing all this, those who attack God start thinking from their feet! And as they inhabit well-heeled shoes, by which they are raised by about an inch off the ground, they only mind *their comfort in them* and *their “needs”, manufactured* to keep them in keeping with that “higher” elevation! It is *such unneeded “needs”* that God refuses to satisfy, as they keep the wearers most distant from Him! No! God is *not* for the sake His egotism jealous, but *solely for our sake and safety*; wishing *us, before we come to the end of the road*, to understand full well what all this business we call the World is truly about: *Not* the lavish debauchery in which the prodigals waste lives and riches during the very last night before the sun never rises! Which, alas, *truly is* what those preach who teach the *meaninglessness* as the “meaning”; be they professors, be even they holders of prizes such as the Nobel; without the slightest puff of demur from their tacit forked tongued fellow-walkers in pseudo-religious slippers sharing the other half of the power exercised over the souls of men willfully divided into camps determined to fight it out till death! The “business” of the World is *Holiness! Nothing less! God’s Holiness! Not men’s so-called “holiness”! Nor so-called scholarly “eminence”!*

§173. (a) Alas, standing against *It*, we worldly “saints” and “scientists” and *supposedly dutiful “citizens”* having, the ignorant fools, *consciously separated God from Logos*, have chosen to usurp even God’s Holy Objective and turn *it* to “business”, to a *dual* profession, the one half *ostensibly* never stopping “worshiping” Him, the other half *openly* never stopping profaning Him—*both* at the expense of *every* foolish *obedient* buyer! For *naked, yet well dressed* power; for the strongest all-controlling empire; for the *empty* applause of worshiping ignoramuses believing mere glow-worms to be *the “illuminati”*; and last but certainly first, as *it* today buys the rest, for no other than *money!* Imagine: *such* is today the “education” the “masses” receive! Some even demand to have

it for free, believing that there is or should be anything at all today or ever given for free! Forgetting the *eternal* "quid pro quo"! "Forgetting" that, *only at best*, does the cost reflect the quality, that *as you pay, such you receive*! Expecting to get true Quality both from those *supposedly* "theologically praying" (in effect *only murmuring indecipherable incantations*) in order to *lull the souls they need to stay in sin*, as also from those *supposedly* "scientifically laboring" (in effect *only scribbling altogether dubious equations*) in order to justify the enterprising intellects that keep oppressing those souls; *all of whom together* comprise the camp that truly disdain the Intellect, calling Him *nothing*!

(b) Surely, it does *not* need brains to understand that you do *not* pack the churches when you call the faithful only to offer Glory and Thanks: You pack them *and the coffers* to overflowing when you keep them in *fear*!: It is *not* out of faith alone that the very rich are also the great philanthropists, donators, benefactors and patrons. The Lord only knows what part the *fear* dictates! *More* than is given is gathered through overcharging! *Nor* does it need brains to understand that the system of "Justice" (from law-making to defending, to adjudicating, to policing, to imprisoning, and to all ancillary social services) *vitaly needs the criminal* just in order to stay in business!: *That's* why the laws are *deliberately* made complex *and* conflicting, in constant need of the experts to show you how to channel yourself through, or at least how to obtain a narrow escape! *That's* why we now have those so-called "independent commissions" supposedly protecting the so-called "personal data", among which principal *are* the transgressions, fully proportional to the positions from which they were committed! The big criminals *must* be protected, their social status *must* remain intact, in order that the lawful citizens be *again* grandly transgressed, the police fill their allotted quota of arrests, the lawyers have customers, and the courthouses never collect dust, wiped off by dresses and trousers! Paying the *due* respect to the Intellect eliminates *all this truly wasteful* "business"! But we, true "professionals", certainly do *not* want that! People *naturally knowing and keeping from within their Spirit* God's Law are certainly "antisocial"!: Just look at the "social upheaval" they would cause if ever they came to be the great majority! Especially *they must* be misled! *That's* why God *and* Logos are told to be total strangers. *That's* why *both the Churches and Academia* haugh-

tily ignore Heraclitus', Socrates' and Plato's teaching regarding the Logos, and the former even have the temerity to profane Him calling Him simply the "Word"! Of the billions calling Him the "Word", please Brother tell me, *what truly do they make of it?*

§174. (a) *Once and for all, all educated citizens must understand that all games are being played on our backs! Especially the game, which is what they have made of it, who have taken it upon themselves to represent to us the Biblical, not the political, Right and Left! Not all that shines, especially today, is gold! Not everything especially today called "progress" is true progress! Most of it is regress, or at best rewarmed tasteless matter, having once been food! Nor everything come to us from the past as "tradition" is worth keeping. Tradition and dim scattered disorganized memories and remembrances of the past were all people had during the long centuries of darkness. Unexamined were those branded into the consciences of the people. It is close to necrophilia still to attempt to retain "alive" what duly belongs among matters buried for ever! Tradition is worth keeping only if it continues to enrich the Spirit of Man, that keeps on spurring him ever higher, toward Holiness! And Holiness cannot be attained without considering all the lessons the passing time keeps on amassing on what must become our ever more critical Spirit; which only after the most critical examination must determine what truly fits and is worth keeping! That adds meaning to meaning! So, nothing is truly meaningless; if, that is, we also determine to learn even from our mistakes, yet solely in order to commit ever fewer of them! Without this process that alone is true progress, if we keep on learning nothing at all even from pain, we most certainly do not deserve better, but continuing punishment! Anything less would be unjust!*

(b) This sounds cruel to say; yet more cruel to read! But, *you* Brother, please tell me what it is *you* propose we do when even pain does not teach us! Do we throw those refusing to learn in a cell and let them rot there in their pitiful misery? Is *that* humane? Or do we, in the name of "humanism", let them roam free and ravage society? Isn't that even more *inhumane*? Or, rather, do we punish them, but *not* inhumanely, in order to jerk their Spirit back into Action? Those on the Left please consider: If *adding meaning to meaning* that alone enriches the Spirit and spurs us to Action, that we simply call Him Logos and Intellect, is not from God, *where does it come from? Only* indifference regarding the

consequences and total abandonment to the belief of a *not* coming Future come not from God! Which is the position *they* advance! But just as even they cannot deny that still exist people that indeed care for Meaning, ultimately leading to Holiness, about which by definition only God *truly* cares, can they deny that it is exactly because they insist on fighting *Him* that they stand against Meaning and those that still seek It? *Unquestionably, there is Meaning!* Even the meaninglessness *they* attempt to pass on *is* a meaning, though meant to be the *exact antithesis* to Meaning! Indeed, God cares! Which is why despite our transgressions that *almost* touch Seventh Heaven He has *not* yet tired of us! But beware: the moment He does, by definition *that is* the End! That He has not yet given us up means that He still expects of us to make *good* use of the now *short* time remaining!

(c) Both the Biblical Right and Left *must* understand this: We do *not* make good use of the time if we continue to swallow stale food critically unexamined! They *both must* understand what it is they all agree on, and where their roads part, mainly on account of the *traditional* Biblical Right! For it is *they* that, *consciously* dropping the Greek Ideal, adopted the *oriental* position that God and Logos do not stand as One! It was *only later, and as a reaction*, that the Biblical Left rejected the belief in the existence of God and discovered "Reason" as His opposition that purportedly banishes Him to the Tartarus! Had there not been the split between God and Logos introduced by the *traditional* Biblical Right, the Left could *not* have found the ledge on which it established its *totally false* footing! This *must* at long last be digested as *the truly nutritious food it really is* by the people finally choosing to stand on the *correct* Right. Meaning that, *not* all "Tradition" is sacred! How else, and how much longer do we all think that the Holy God can expect us to revert to the *Ideal* Tradition, *if* that is not what He wants us to do, now that with the passing of time and the ever faster fading memory we come that much faster to losing it altogether? We said it once, and we shall repeat it: The Holy God's patience *most definitely is not* inexhaustible. And those on the Right, who *supposedly* had it once right, are all the more truly responsible for the loss of the *Ideal* Tradition, that we all lost for *their* first rejecting it as the Great Greeks had already perfected it, and for *their* later tiring to care for it as our *only true* Treasure! "Tradition" is *not* well tendered when left among the thorns and

weeds! It needs clearing and refreshing the ground, it thirsts for water and it needs fertilizer! *Old ideas need new questions to help them get rid of the barnacles*; otherwise, the ship gets overloaded, its speed slows, the engines sputter exhausted and they finally die! He is *not* a good Traditionalist whoever refuses to deliver his valued old ideas to the fresh air! Mildew is not bad only for paper, linen and wool; it is even worse for ideas that are not exercised in the morning's fresh air and the sun's warm rays!

§175. (a) So here stand I, in the crossfire between the two factions fighting it to the death! And I challenge them both, shaming them both! How dare I? Solely by the Grace of God! Alas! For the reasons given already, the weight falls more on those on the Right. They may only continue to think as orientals rather than Greeks *if they, first, prove* that I am wrong attempting to reunite in the consciousness of men the grandest of all Ideas that ever crossed the Mind of Men: the Idea that God and Logos *are* but One! And *if they, second, prove* that God without Logos *is* superior to *the* God-Logos! Those on the Left must in turn show that their intelligence, and to the extent that they are even prouder of it, indeed came from nothing and to it it shall return! And *if so, why* at all do they keep on fighting, *what* can then be for them the meaning of *their* struggle?! Simply the *also nonexistent* honor of totally meaningless arms? Hardly worth *their* self-called *even less than vegetable*, for it too is then meaningless, peace! Gentlemen on both sides: Kindly honor yourselves! *All* of you show me wrong! Or else, throw down your rusty, altogether misfiring arms and join me in the middle! Surely, your bottomless pride that leads you to shoot down each other *with all the fury but not the least grace of sophomores* can no longer pretend to be valueless in the face of by far the most important question before us!

(b) The proud men on both sides, those of the religions and churches and those of "science" and the atheist camp, rather than humbly admit while alive what is now revealed to be the unshakable knowledge of Truth that has always stood right before us but had so far remained unseen for the immeasurable pride of just all these men, refusing to consider the *natural, not manmade*, simplicity and elegance of the physical Reality established by the Absolute Rationality that includes Perfection and Holiness, are fully determined to take it with them to their graves! This is what I, standing in the middle, *must* conclude after more than twenty

consecutive years of effort devoted to pleading them all to see their duty before God and Man. The years pass and one cannot say how much time he still has to continue the fight. One must prepare to make his exit, leaving behind his bequest. The outstanding great question is whether those *alas now few* who continue to state belief in God and in Reason and Science will finally find the heart to *force* the issue to the attention of the entire world. This is why I pray they find the Faith that is still needed, still greater than I commanded, *both to refute all that in these findings must be refuted on account of error unseen, and to become the champions of all that cannot be shaken*. I no longer am in the "loop". In fact I *never* was! Faith in Logos and Science allows *no* compromises! Entering and staying in the "loop" means *never* stopping to compromise for naked power! What has been here refuted is none other than the foul statements issuing from the mouths of the dragon, the beast and the false prophet calling the world to war against the Almighty! The refutation *is the defeat* of the forces of Darkness and Falsehood. In its utter silliness does the silly world think that that war will be fought by both sides with manmade weapons! Such are only the weapons of Falsehood. The *real* war is conducted *only* in Spirit, where *all* values lie, as also do the reward and the punishment. Saying more is unneeded. The Spirit of God will lead to the rest.

§176. (a) So are we led to recall Dawkins's "argument": As the *complete* works of Shakespeare *are themselves dwarfed* letter for chemical atom even by the amoeba, *so is* the number of combinations available to those letters dwarfed by the number of combinations available to the chemical atoms to form the amoeba, *if* those atoms are packed without a guiding Law (see §75k, p. 122), despite all of Richard Dawkins's *utterly false* "arguments"; the accolades heaped upon him by wily commentators notwithstanding! Because, biological evolution *cannot start except from the packing of atoms, and they from the packing of subatomic particles all the way down to the Democritean atoms; and all these* Richard Dawkins has *not* seen it fit to consider! But *no* biologist or other so-called "scientist" is enough of a *scientist* who propounds an "argument" against Logos and Law while ignoring the underlying chemistry and the still deeper lying physics! How many so-called "generations" *without a preconceived end result to aim at* manipulated in computers, and how many *real* combinations of atoms (and, be-

fore those, of still smaller particles) here on Earth, given no Law, would it have taken to obtain the smallest living organism out of *each* of the immediately lower state of being, all the way down to the Democritean atoms? It is by their own desperately half-cooked "arguments" that the evolutionists are embarrassed!

(b) But the argument is still far from being complete: What is far more embarrassing is the *fact* that the evolutionists *and* Dawkins *ignore* that, as scientists, they are *duty and honor bound to think things fully through to, and then back out from, the deepest possible level* from which their scheme could possibly have developed! Can Dawkins or someone else produce an *equal "feat"* of dove from hat in respect of the *vastly more unlikely* probabilities of producing *out of nothing at all the specific Laws demonstrated above that control our universe?* I.e., *not just only as mere mathematical entities, but also as factual operative Laws out there, as they are needed in order fully to control our universe?* Both these under the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity? *Is it not obvious that even the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity itself cannot exist without all laws needed (and as needed intertwined even for it to exist) being there; without even one missing or being in excess, and without even one being other than it truly is?* To understand what all this truly means take an example from the *visible level of laws!* Take Newton's law of gravitation! See that it belongs to the *already simplified* [as the masses are considered having exponents equal to 1] category of laws expressed by

$$F = G(m_1/r_1^x)(m_2/r_2^x), \quad (50)$$

where x can have *any value at all, not only whole but also fractional, not only positive but also negative* (with a proper adjustment of G)! To *each* such value of x a *separate universe* corresponds! A *true infinity* of universes! How each of them would be or look need *not* concern us! What *need* concern us is that, without Logos and solely by chance, *if* that be the operating principle, *none of them all is a priori excluded!* Only to the *exact* value of $x = +1$ does *this complete* universe correspond! *Before* anything that is ever existed, and *if* also God did not exist, *how* does Dawkins & Co. think that *that category of Law and that exact value of +1* were chosen? And by *whom?* Science means *absolutely nothing*, unless it means *Complete Knowledge!* So, *how* do "scientists" state that *all those universes, all except this one never seen, "are"* nevertheless out there and are all definitely physical; but we, *supposedly confused lesser minds*

think solely of this particular one simply because we belong in it? How can this be at all Science rather than a *yet other religious* faith, *far worse than all presented so far, concocted in absolute desperation*? As we have seen regarding *this amazingly beautiful Universe*, the physical-natural laws are *not* properties of matter, but *what holds matter together that makes it have the properties we observe it possesses!* Matter in this *entire universe*, Newton's G, time, and the Law, have *not* always been! Before Hubble, people were excused to think otherwise. *No longer!* The *uni*-verse that gravitates *also* expands! Under Laws now shown to act as do the two faces of the same one coin! *Dawkins and all like-minded people are not excused when they still choose to remain willfully "unsuspecting" of the effect of that cardinal fact upon their "theory of evolution by natural selection", that is worthless unless it is complete right from the start, right from the zero instant of the Big Bang!* Within *zero time* did the world come into physical-natural being, matter *and* the Laws it obeys, that alone make it have the properties it exhibits! Is Dawkins willing to play his entire game of combinatorics in *zero time*? Calculation shows that there exist out there some about 5.891×10^{120} fundamental particles/photons, but an *exact* number! *Why and how that exact number?* I *cannot* help regarding *any* scientist supposed to be dealing in fundamentals *not a serious scientist when he chooses to remain "unsuspecting" of the cardinal fundamentals!* Again, please note that it is not *I* that cannot help thinking so! Rather, it is the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity that *cannot help making me think* in these terms!

(c) A demanding mistress? A *compelling* mistress! And by far the most beautiful ever!: The Judaic theology dealt *only* in the transactions of Man with his God and established a *quid pro quo* Covenant, that still remains alas central in all monotheistic religions that to this day have failed to see the God-Man relationship as one of *consenting intimate* spiritual friendship seeking to become *union*; it did *not* dream of examining God's own nature. The *falsely* called "idolatrous" TheoLogy of the Greeks attempted to examine the various *distinct* faculties of God: *So*, it spoke principally of Zeus (genit.: Διός, another expression of Θεός, > Deus) father of the "lesser" Gods and of Men; and of Goddess Athena (= Ἡ Ἐοῦ Νόησις, that is God's Augmentative *Complete Faculty of Mind*, born *fully grown* out the head of Zeus), and of God Apollo (the God of Light, Enlightenment and Divine Inspira-

tion, Who was worshiped by all peoples not only the Greeks at Delphi and guided Socrates). After entire centuries of development, the Christians spoke of the "Holy Trinity" (the "Father", the "Son" and the "Holy Spirit"). Which are only *human* expressions for the conception of what most definitely is *not* the "mystery" it is said to be of the One Complete-Perfect God, collecting into one the three *distinct* faculties of Logos that are Reasoning (the Father"), Expression (the "Son") and Inspiration (the "Holy Spirit") to perform *only* Good and *incessantly* seek Holiness! Standing before These, what disposition may dare demand to be called noble that chooses the nihilism of complete meaninglessness??? Brother, *dare to weigh* the gravitas!

§177. (a) So, what is the *very worst* case that believers *and* non-believers, we all, *are compelled* to think of? Special creation by species means that God after creating each species started all over again to create the next one, from soil and His saliva! Which He then had to make *fit* in the world! And then all over again! But we are *not* talking of a tailor here, making suits to fit! Nor does God make species and individual organisms in series, fitting them one at a time, like a tailor fitting suits in series, one at a time! However much such individual God's time-consuming attention would satisfy our micronoiac arrogance: "Hey look, God is fitting *me* now!" Such production is *not* economical in the highest possible sense of the term, nor particularly, if at all, wise! Wise producers do *not* produce a substratum of existence and only then see what, if anything, fits! Truly wise producers *see through the whole set of considerations necessary to their final objective* and make *that whole* fit together right from the beginning! We do *not* make our *best science* when we think of the Creator and His creation *even in slightly lesser* terms! To make a long story short, the very worst case then is that *each individual organism (belonging in a species) that ever existed, exists, will exist, was made to fit an exact, unique to it, particular, numerical solution of an exact, unique, particular quantum mechanical equation (in the newest sense indicated earlier); one such equation per species and particular to it; all considered from the beginning in the form each was designed to take, commensurate with the function each was designed to play, when each was needed to perform that function, while a clock would be marking out the time each would come into being, in the most God-economical manner, out of preexisting organisms, and the simplest of them out of preexist-*

ing inorganic matter, and it out of the Big Bang, when all was set to go in space and time, as it had been predesigned to develop towards its final objective! If this sounds simply fantastic in the extreme, why should it still do so when, now, science discovers that *out even of a tiny bit of tissue a whole organism can be reconstructed?* What other does this demonstrate than the *fact that even each piece of tissue belongs in a specific quantum-mechanical solution of matter arranged according to Design, within which solution even that bit of tissue finds finally its exact fitting place?* Does Dawkins and all like-him-minded people still object to Design? Without such an exact sort of Design, how do *they* propose the bit of tissue reproduces the whole organism, and finds its place within all that whole? With Schiller and Beethoven, one is tempted to cry out aloud

“For God’s sake,
for Truth’s sake,
for *our own* sake,

O Freunde, *nicht mehr* diese Töne!”

(b) Does it sound fantastic that there are *exact, natural, living, physico-mathematical quantum-mechanical solutions* out there, namely, *none other than us*, of such complexity as to be endowed with self-and-environment-awareness as to ask the *ultimate questions about the exact Nature of Being?* Both Churches and atheists, first the former and only then the latter, all of them stuck in their ossified dogmas about the nature of man, *have rejected and continue to reject* the idea of the *independent, at least as far as man is concerned, existence of the Spirit and matter!* The Churches accept the purity of the Spirit only as regards God and His Angels. The atheists reject the independent existence of the Spirit altogether, and consider the Spirit of man as a physically unexaminable cryptononphysical consequence of the vastly complex operations of matter that makes him up. But now look: Even as they deny the Pure Spirit in us, in me, you, themselves, it is *matter, their materialist matter, no other than the rocks themselves, that rise up to hit them on the head and speak to them*, that endowed with self-and-environment-awareness asks *through us* the Great Questions! And the answers it gets point to the Ἀ-λήθεια, the *Unforgettable Truth* that *God alone, the Ultimate Pure Spirit alone, that is [this being the ultimate ontological is] in His own exclusive right!* While we, *all the rest, down to the fundamental photon, exist only by His Grace! Created self-and-environment-awareness, finally advancing to the lev-*

el of being able to *consider and judge even the purely spiritual fundamentals of Being*, and to home in to the Creator Spirit that made it! *Who is anyone else* who judges *his* the temerarious right to demand that *He* not be written as *the only He*, but simply as another mere "he"; or else, *he*, ill-bred brat, will *not, not, not*, give *his* permission for a book *proving* the existence of the Holy God to be published? What exactly do the atheists think they materially are, other than *just such* a solution? Is it then that the *only* thing they, the (according to *them*) *dirt* of this earth, still deny is none other than *their own, Designer*, cursing the Father who brought us here, but *not* in order that we may curse Him; while the stars above and the photons everywhere *sing only His praises and breathe only His Fire*? For one last time, *how else* without Him did all that is come into being? Can the atheists of *all hues*, dressed in a sheep's infinite kindness *that is not, at long last rationally* tell us, dispelling *all* arguments here presented accusing them of dastardly blasphemy with the full crushing weight of this *functioning* universe? Or will they continue with their *puerily obstinate* silence that only exhibits exposing it their "science's" shallowness? When they visit "another" world (*as when some of them visited* the Soviet Union at the peak of the Cold War), do *they* think, on seeing that world's laboratories, that *nobody* designed them, that they came into being alone? How, then, without a far far more exact Design did we, *all humans*, come here; each one *manly to present, argue and, if he can, protect and defend his explanation of all that exists, along with the propriety of his doings* in the presence of all that exists? *Even if we are nothing more than it, we at least are walking, talking, breathing thinking quantum-mechanical solutions of a particular fully working Design!*

§178. Dear Reader-Brother:

(a) Consider: I made this presentation as short as my powers of complete clarity would allow, given all the fronts that I had to fight against in the effort of proving that Truth, fearing nothing, *contains no mystery! As certainly as the natural world shows its Design and center, it ipso facto proves its Creator!* If ever the scientists find the courage *honestly* to review the problems here presented, they shall be very hard pressed to dispel the main arguments here presented. You will ask, "but can all this be true?" Consider whether at all *someone* could in the *short* period of 12 years (between 1974 and 1985) produce first the proof and then the sup-

porting main argumentation (as this was the sequence of development), since made stronger and clearer still as here presented, *if the product of his efforts were at all false!* What do *you* think rather is with God: Falsehood or Truth? Since only the Truth is with Him, ergo, the falsehood, that people also call “devil”, is *not!* How then do *you* think the devil would even *dream of tempting* a man to *prove the existence of God from within this world;* from which only *he* could possibly lose? *No!* I am *not* claiming superlative genius! If *I* could show all this, then a *great* number of other people *could too—if they attacked the problem with all due respect to the visible suggestive detail!* I only found *what already was there!* I have *not invented a thing!* This is the Truth! What *you* will do with it, I shall leave it to you!

(b) And then ask: Can *the opposition* show all here said false, playing the blank card of definite meaninglessness? If they cannot, with Homer, adapted to *this* situation, one is tempted to cry out aloud:

Ἔσσειτ' αἴσιμον, κάλλιστον, νόστιμον ἡμᾶρ
ὅτ' ἂν ποτ' ὀλώλη Κύριος πᾶν ἱερέϊον ψεύδους!

(There shall be the inescapable best-ever homecoming day
when the Lord shall wish to destroy
every priesthood of falsehood!)

Dies irae Dei is right upon us!

The day of pseudoscience and pseudotheology *has* now set!

**INDEX
OF
ARTICLES, PARTS, EQUATIONS
AND FOOTNOTES**

	Chapter 1	§22	33	Chapter 7	
§1	9	<u>F/N 7</u>	34	§37	59
§2	9			§38	60
§3	10	Chapter 5			
§4	10	§23	35	Chapter 8	
§5	11	<u>F/N 8</u>	35-6	§39	63
§6	12	§24	36	§40	65
<u>F/N 1</u>	13-4	§25(a)	37	§41	65
		§25(b)	38		
	Chapter 2	§25(c)	38	Chapter 9	
§7	15	§26	39	§42	69
<u>F/N 2</u>	15	§27(a)	40	§43	69
§8	16	<u>EQ 1-5</u>	40	§44	71
<u>F/N 3</u>	16	§27(b)	41		
<u>F/N 4</u>	16	§28	41	Chapter 10	
§9	17	<u>F/N 9</u>	41	§45	72
§10	19	§29(a)	42	<u>F/N 11</u>	72-3
§11	20	§29(b)	43	§46(a)	73
<u>F/N 5</u>	20	§29(c)	44	§46(b)	73
<u>F/N 6</u>	20	§29(d)	44	§46(c)	74
§12	21	§30	45	§47(a)	76
§13	21	§31	46	§47(b)	76
§14	22			§48(a)	77
§15	22	Chapter 6		<u>F/N 12</u>	77-8
§16	24	§32	47	§48(b)	79
§17	25	§32(a)	47	§48(c)	80
		§32(b)	48	§48(d)	81
		§32(c)	49		
	Chapter 3	§32(d)	50	Chapter 11	
§18(a)	26	§33	52	§49	82
§18(b)	27	§34	52	<u>F/N 13</u>	83-4
§18(c)	27	§35	54	§50(a)	85
§19	29	§36	55	§50(a/i-iii)	85
§20	30	<u>F/N 10</u>	56	§50(b)	85
	Chapter 4			§51	86
§21	32			§52	86

§53	87	§76	123	§97	158
§54	87	§77	125	<u>EQ 7-8</u>	160
§55	89	<u>F/N 17</u>	125	§98	160
§56(a)	90	§78	126	Blank	
§56(b)	90	§79(a)	127	Chapter 20	
Blank		<u>F/N 18</u>	127	§99	162
Chapter 12		§79(b)	128	§100	163
§57	92	§79(c)	129	§101	164
§58	93	§79(c-i)	129	<u>F/N 24</u>	164
§59	94	<u>F/N 19</u>	129	<u>F/N 25</u>	165
§60	94	<u>F/N 20</u>	131	§102	166
<u>F/N 14</u>	95-6	<u>F/N 20</u>	131	§103	167
§61	96	§80(a)	132	§104(a)	168
§62	97	§80(b)	133	§104(a)	168
Blank		§80(c-d)	135	§105(a)	171
Chapter 13		§81(a)	136	§105(b-c)	172
§63	99	§81(b)	137	§105(d)	173
<u>F/N 15</u>	100-1	§82	137	<u>F/N 26</u>	173
§64	102	Blank		<u>F/N 27</u>	174
§65	103	Chapter 16		§105(e)	175
Blank		§83	140	§105(f)	176
Chapter 14		§84	141	<u>EQ. 9-11</u>	176
§66	106	§85	141	<u>F/N 28</u>	176
§67	106	§85(a-c)	142	<u>EQ. 12-14</u>	177
§68	107	§86	142	<u>EQ. 15-16-16a</u>	178
§69	109	§87	143	§106	178
Blank		<u>F/N 21</u>	143	§107	178
Chapter 15		Blank		<u>F/N 29</u>	178
§70	111	Chapter 17		<u>F/N 30</u>	179
§71	112	§89	146	§108(a)	180
§72	112	§89(a)	146	§108(b)	181
§72(a-b)	112	<u>F/N 22</u>	147	§108(c)	182
§72(c)	113	§89(a/i-ii)	148	<u>F/N 31</u>	183
§73	114	§89(a/iii)	149	§108(d)	184
§74	114	Blank		§108(e)	185
§74(a-d)	115	Chapter 18		Blank	
§74(e-j)	116	§90	151	Chapter 21	
§74(k-l)	117	§91	151	§109	186
§75	117	<u>EQ 6(a-c)</u>	152	§110	187
§75(a)	117	§92	153	Blank	
§75(b-d)	118	<u>F/N 23</u>	153	§110(a)	187
<u>F/N 16</u>	118	§93	154	<u>EQ. 17(a-b)</u>	187
§75(e-f)	119	§94	154	<u>F/N 32</u>	187
§75(g-h)	120	§95	155	§110(b-c)	188
§75(i-j)	121	Blank		§111(a)	189
§75(k-o)	122	Chapter 19		<u>EQ. 18-19</u>	190
§75(p)	123	§96	157	<u>EQ. 20</u>	191

<u>F/N 33</u>	191	§124	236	<u>F/N 40</u>	278
§111(b-d)	192	§125(a)	237	§140(a-b)	278
§111(e)	193	§125(b)	238	<u>F/N 41</u>	279
§112(a)	193	<u>F/N 37</u>	239	§140(c)	279
§112(b-c)	194	§125(c)	240	§141	280
§112(d)	195	<u>F/N 38</u>	240	<u>F/N 42</u>	281
§112(e)	196	§125(d)	241	§142	282
<u>F/N 34</u>	196-7	§126	241	§143(a)	283
§112(f)	197	§127(a)	242	<u>F/N 43</u>	283
<u>F/N 35</u>	199-201	<u>EQ. 38-40</u>	243	§143(b)	284
§113	201	§127(b-c)	243	§144(a-b)	285
<u>F/N 36</u>	202	128(a)	244	§145	285
§114(a-b)	203	§128(a/i-v)	244		
§114(c-d)	204	§128(a/vi-ix)	245	Chapter 26	
		§128(b)	246	§146(ab)	288
Chapter 22		§128(b/i-vii)	246	§146(c)	289
§115(a)	207	§128(b/viii-ix)	247	§147(a)	289
§115(b)	208	§128(c)	247	§147(b)	293
§115(c)	209	§129(a)	248	§147(c)	294
§116	210	<u>EQ. 41</u>	248	§147(d)	295
§117(a-b)	212	<u>EQ. 42-47</u>	249	§148(a)	295
<u>EQ. 21</u>	212	§129(b)	249	§148(b)	297
§117(c)	214	<u>EQ. 48-51</u>	250	§148(c)	297
<u>EQ. 22-23</u>	214	§130(a-c)	251	§149(a)	298
§117(d)	214			§149(b)	301
§118	215	Chapter 24		§150	301
§119(a)	217	§131	253		
<u>EQ. 24-35</u>	217	§132	255	Chapter 27	
<u>EQ. 36</u>	218	§133	256	§151	304
§119(b)	218	§134(a-b)	258	§152(a)	305
<u>EQ. 37</u>	218	§134(c)	261	§152(b)	306
§119(c)	218	§134(d)	262	§152(c)	306
§119(d)	219	§135(a)	264	§153(a-b)	308
§119(e)	220	§135(b)	265	§153(c)	310
§119(f)	221	§135(c)	266	§153(d)	311
		135(d)	267	§154(a)	311
Chapter 23		§135(e)	268	§154(b)	312
§120(a)	224	§135(f)	269	§154(c)	313
§120(b)	225	§135(g-h)	271	§155(a)	313
§120(c)	226	§135(i)	273	§155(b)	314
§121(a-b)	227	§136	274	§155(c-d)	315
§122(a)	230			§156(a)	316
§121(c)	229	Chapter 25		<u>F/N 44</u>	318
§122(b)	231	§137	275	§156(b)	318
§123(a)	231	§138	276	§156(c)	320
§123(b)	232	§139	277	§156(d)	321
§123(c)	235	<u>F/N 39</u>	278	§157(a)	321

+

+

§157(b)	322	§165	333	§173(a)	341
§157(c)	324	§166	333	§173(b)	342
§158(a)	324	§167(a-b)	335	§174(a-b)	343
§158(b)	325	§168	335	§174(c)	344
§159(a)	326	§169	336	§175(a-b)	345
§159(b)	327			§176(a)	346
				§176(b)	347
				<u>EQ. 50</u>	347
Chapter 28		Chapter 29			
§160	329	§170(a)	337	§176(c)	348
§161	330	§170(b)	338	§177(a)	349
§162	330	§171(a-b)	338	§177(b)	350
§163	331	§171(c)	339	§178(a)	351
§164	332	§172(a)	340	§178(b)	352
		§172(b)	341		

+

+

GENERAL INDEX

(Bold references indicate extensive discussion)

- Absolute Wisdom:
 —is *not* found in the particularity of separate creations, but in the *singularity of Creation under a single Law, that brings about all the riches of forms!* 264-5
- Action at a distance:
 —mediated by the totality of all diffuse light 231
- Action (least):
 comes in exact whole-number units directly from the physical-natural system of the world, not the arbitrary human assumption/invention! 245
- Age of Deception
 —“Faith” and “Atheism” during it:
 —while only the second wins, the first “tolerantly”-*idiotically* smiles 203
 —now we know even its magnitude, that is also needed before the Age of Revelation! 223
- Agnosticism:
 —and the question of source of admirable virtues 52
- Agnostics questioned 53
- Aristotelian Logic:
 —*forbids an infinite regress of intelligent causes of supernatural Intelligent Causes! One such is all that is needed: exactly There does all this search logically end!* 139
- American Dream:
 —and the unconfessed impossibility of turning it universal 339-40
 —in the face of which, the professors spread the lesson of “nothingness” that continues to create profits for some, along with ever more world terror and blood shed 340
 —the victor cannot as Atlas carry the weight of the world, nor teach the world the lesson he still has not learned himself 340
- Anima-soul
 —and the question of death 291-2
- Asiatic ideas that abhorred the Greeks having the souls dwelling in Elysium and debating matters of the Pure Spirit 292
 —the power of God and the resurrection of rotten sinful bodies 292
 —the syncretism of Christianity carried the day *for the love of the flesh*, that it dressed with “spirituality” that is *ontologically foreign* to it! 292
 —no “Christian” can give you a *Logical* argument;
 —the Lord *is pure Spirit*, in *that* sense only are we in His image and likeness,
 —this idea the Greek loves, the still *Asian* “Christian” abhors 292
- Anthropic and human:
 things *not* equivalent: 289
 —“dust to dust”: the ancient *Biblical* Western Asian *axiomatic* statement of nihilism 289
 —as man returns to dust, Holiness, the ultimate form of Up, is out of the question, for both him *and* God! 290
 —telling apart “human” and “mens” 289
 “Anthropic principle”
 — an attempt to *reverse* cause and effect 258
- Asians, Greeks and Christians
 —the former undertook to describe states of being of which they literally knew nothing, both about matter, and Spirit
 —those in the middle spoke of Elysium:
 —Field of Philosophical, i.e., *purely Spiritual* endeavor and action 334
 —the latter must learn to trust the Lord to do what is best in His eyes, adopt-

- ing a view that will not delimit the Wisdom and Power of God by *any* sort of illogicality 334-5
- Atheism:
- and the question of world’s scientific investigability in the absence of the Creating Logos 202
 - its method of subverting society: most evident in the USA 45-6
 - proof of how little we have understood of the implications of God and Man 46
 - “scientific”:
 - a squarely dishonest proposition 202
 - sworn to dishonesty 87
- Atheist “scientists”:
- disregard completely the *clearly intellectual* processes underlying the *natural* Laws that apply *independently* of human mental activities, that *as Laws are not, cannot be, products of thoughtless processes* 256
 - operate outside the constraints of Reason 257
- Atheistic “science”:
- cannot tolerate a definite objective world and devises schemes to deny it! 257
 - recognizes no purposive objective substratum 257
 - suppresses *indisputable* findings demolishing atheism 257
- Atheists:
- designing experiments in a said “undesigned” world simply profane Reality 80
 - do *not* allow serious discussion 98
 - strictly there is none:
 - it depends on the name you give Him 304
- Atheists and blasphemers under *all* pseudonyms
- challenged by the physical and Logical hard facts
 - either to disprove the reasoning and the structure of the universe thus revealed; or to explain *their multiple blunders*
 - or else, to show scientifically, how it was possible, purely by chance or its own legislative and executive powers, for the universe so to organize and arrange itself right from the start; or to show how it is still Logically possible that the universe does not need a Creator 321
 - the monopoly they have on so-called “scientific” and popular media isn’t surprising: *all* the social forces behind the media *are in tacit collusion against the Creator!* 322
 - their corruption is so well known to themselves that in order to hide it from the public they must shake all belief in Order; and the best way to begin doing so is none other than cursing the sacred ground on which we all stand* 322
 - when the sacred ground on which we all stand is equated to the dirt, waste, filth, excrement and rotting corpses they proudly dare exhibit daily to the world on high definition living-color screens, in the general effort to “argue” for the total meaninglessness of everything for being a product of chance and nothingness, all the unspeakable crimes, committed right in front of all decent inhabitants of this sorrowful Earth, who are *in this manner deliberately* kept speechless and numb, *cannot* be passed as a moral aberration but only as a mere appearance of just another possibility! 322
 - the statement that there is out there an infinity of universes, *all invisible except this one*, arranging themselves purely by chance, one of which is the one here revealed, is *not* Science that *must* be based on *absolutely firm* knowledge, but an *altogether suspect purely religious* belief, designed to counter the now *inescapable Logical conclusion* that creation based on non-self-conflicting Law requires a *Logical Creator* 321-2
 - what are the chances of an austere Doric column standing here on earth, *self-made by pure chance?* 322
 - their silence is understandable, but so also is their *dishonesty*, demonstrated glaringly by their silence, the two together being the *solid proof they provide of the infallibility of the reasoning here developed on Newton’s Law!* 322
 - nothing gives the militant atheists greater pleasure than *their contrived* public “disproof” of God, Whom they do not even condescend to mention by name;

- and nothing gives those pillars of “learning” and social stature greater chagrin than being found wrong and unable to dispel the charge of their *bottomless indivisible* intellectual and moral dishonesty! 322
- Atheists and the Truth:
 - the former demanding that the latter be not told 351
 - by their own admission being the dirt of the earth, dare deny and curse *their own Designer-Father* who brought us here, but *not* in order that we profane Him; but join the stars above and the photons everywhere *that universally sing only His praises and breathe only His Fire* 351
- Atoms:
 - are *not* dipoles or multipoles 232
- Axioms (see also under Gödel’s procedure examined):
 - cease to be human opinions once recognized to be parts of what we too see to be the structure of Logos that refers even to us for the fact that it is *we* that are in His image and likeness, and *not* He in ours 297
 - if irrational properly belong in a lunatic asylum! 280-1
- Beethoven, L. van 350
- Beethoven’s *Ninth*:
 - demand*s its own “metamusical” source called Beethoven 126
- Belief in other universes:
 - a *religious* “belief” concocted in absolute desperation 348
- Beliefs:
 - unworthy and doubtful if not based on Reason 76-7
- Believers:
 - it *cannot* by true believers be missed that their own responsibility increases far faster than that of the atheists with *every* breath they draw in silent unison with them! 323
 - who thinks can escape playing dirty games behind God’s Holy Name?
 - by his ego led was Adam to sin!
 - King Solomon’s Temple fell because it carried *his* name!
 - the Parthenon and the Temple of Holy Wisdom fell because for the Greeks, too, to empty shells the *heavy* words were reduced!
 - the rest of Christianity has dedicated magnificent Temples to this or that Saint, standing antagonistically against each other, *all* for the *sinful* occupant bishop’s sake!
 - not one* Temple *anywhere* has directly been offered to the *Sinless* Lord Christ, the *God Himself made Man*, for the sake of Victory over evil even at *our* level! 323-4
- “Believers” and “scientists” in the face of the proof of God’s existence
 - if they all keep silent it shall not be shaken that *in unison they act* pushing the world ever deeper into ever greater moral depravity, for nothing other than what each of them regards of supreme value over and beyond God’s Truth and Justice! 323
 - when that is done ambilaterally it *cannot* be ignored that the End does *indeed fast* come upon us!: for of all Holy God’s virtues, only His patience is *not* inexhaustible, as that would mean equating vice to virtue and canceling *His* Holy Justice! 323
- Bible:
 - its language and interpretation under Logic 112 et seq.
- Biblical age of Creation 32
- Biblical Flood:
 - problems with 77-9
- Biblical Right and Left!
 - especially today, *not* everything is true progress, nor everything come to us from the past is worth keeping 343
 - must* understand that we do *not* make good use of the time if we continue to swallow stale food critically unexamined 344
 - must* understand what it is they all agree on, and where their roads part, mainly on account of the *traditional* Biblical Right that *consciously* dropped the Greek Ideal that God and Logos do stand indivisibly as One! 344
 - necrophilia attempts to retain “alive” what duly belongs among matters buried for ever! 343
 - tradition is worth keeping only if it continues to enrich the Spirit of

- Man, that keeps on spurring him ever higher, toward Holiness! 343
- standing in the crossfire, and the distinct duty of each 345
 - so, were it not for that position of the Right, the idea that Reason stands against God would never have come into being 344
 - therefore, *not* all “Tradition” is sacred, and the return to God’s Ideal demands other than the “traditional” means 344
- Biblical theological criteria:
- the fallacy of setting them at the top 72 et seq. 72 F/note
- Bohr, N. 233, 286
- Brain is *not* mind
- Einstein’s brain was sliced, *not* his mind 305
- Britten, Roy J. 129-31
- Bronowski, J. 278
- Brouwer, L. E. J. (intuitionist school) 277
- Calorimeters and energy measurement 94
- Carter, Jimmy:
- how he once referred to the state of the Union, and the present true state of the world 9-10
- Cats, we and God:
- we are like the former when we think with our bellies, but the latter endowed us with the mind in order to *encompass the Whole*, if only we two-legged ones dare look up and consider It, *not* just the ground from which our noses are *set safely distant!* 340
- Cerberus:
- how he collects his toll 62
- Certainty and uncertainty:
- and the Most Elegant Design Principle that *cannot miss any detail* 240
 - former *never* built on the latter, unless a law *is* a law underneath that bases the latter on the former and reconverts back to certainty the *seeming* uncertainty! 237
 - and how the specialists stand before them and the civil and criminal Law 237
- Challenging established Authority 26
- Chemical atom:
- bridging the subatomic and superatomic components of matter is *not* unaffected by the universal expansion, which has *not* been considered as an integral part of quantum theory 243-4
 - its correct structure:
 - demolishes the *forced* belief in the nonexistence of “hidden parameters” 245
 - each electron has *one* quantum number 246
 - electrons surround the nucleus as concentric onion-like spherical shells vibrating in unison 244, 246
 - obtained *without any* adjustments, contrary to the work of Hylleraas 247
 - rather than assuming it, it shows the action of the oscillator to come in whole units 244-5
 - reproduces the Balmer series, the Rydberg constant, the wave number 244
 - reveals the action to be a *natural* property of the oscillator, and its unit to be the same as found in the black-body radiation and the photoelectric phenomenon 245
 - shows that the Planck constant need *not* be introduced a priori 244
 - shows the *rate of change of the polar moment of inertia of the spherical oscillator to have the dimensions of action* 244
 - the energy levels producing the spectral lines are *not* those of the singular electrons but of the *entire ensemble* of electrons! 246
- Christ 13, 26, 29, 39, 41, 44
- Christ, Christians and Holiness:
- He constitutes the center of world history and attention:
 - so, their debate about His Nature is fundamental
 - thus, no other life is better* than the one that *unites but does not confuse* the natures of God and Man in the *common* search for Ultimate Holiness! 273
 - “Christian” belief in God and the Creed:
 - fashioned after the Asiatic belief, ignores all the proper attributes of His Perfection and Holiness 298
 - the Holy Trinity expresses the Perfection of the *One* Ultimate Personhood 300

- the ontology of the Holy God is not “details”, but *the* most essential crux! 299
- the ontology of the Trinity, and the need to have a clear understanding of the God in Whom we believe 299
- Christian Church:
 - teaches Faith foreign to Logos 39-40
 - unguidable by Reason, commits the unpardonable sin *consciously yet wrongly choosing to stand against* the Logos 18-20
- Church, A. 278
- Church and Academy:
 - at the knees of the former nurtured the latter, there it learned the manners of *not* letting more Light dissolve the still thick darkness 320
 - have I forgotten the lesson the world was taught by *juridically* poisoning Socrates?
 - the “establishment”, “scientific” and “clerical”, has indeed lost *though only some* of its teeth!; by those they still have, outwardly seeming exquisitely polite and cordial, they nevertheless still apply that much greater spitefully biting pressure!; for it all too well can, colluding, bury all dissenters alive in silence!; by *such* people guided is blasphemy continuing to advance 320
 - the fruit takes after the seed:
 - that’s why the planet can no longer bear us! in its hot tears will it slowly simmer us! in order to cleanse itself of the sin committed upon it! do dull minds still not get it?: *we, thus during long centuries taught*, are the devils that fan the flames of Hell! 321
- Church and the Scientific Community, duly notified did *not* react 251
 - according to the measure of their “Faith” in what they both say they believe! 251
- Church of Christ:
 - its unpardonable splitting 28
- Churches and Religions:
 - for loving matter, the flesh, and the power they through them exercise, have failed to lead the world *the* Way the Spirit suggests 293
 - watching idiotically as very democratically, degreed imbeciles lead the world to war, bloodshed and mayhem, and in pursuit of profit propose that we *bury* the carbon dioxide we produce (so that we avoid the “greenhouse effect”, the antechamber of living hell), as we continue to waste prodigally the wealth of the planet and the oxygen we breathe, that by cutting down the forests we do not allow it to be regenerated; thus also destroying the ozone shield that protects us 293
 - while by the Scriptures, they suggest that “the Lord makes fools of those He wants to destroy”, thus always trying to refer the blame constantly on Up! 293
- Churches sanction games of chance! 80
- Civilization, global
 - and the courage to face the most prickly questions 268
- Classical science’s stations:
 - Newton’s dynamics and gravitation, conservation of energy, Darwin’s natural selection, 71
- “Closure” of space:
 - can only refer to its ordinary three-dimensional character, and *would* involve reversal of the Hubble findings 175
- Conceptions and “things” out there 67
- Contention: kinds of:
 - friendly*: an *honest* effort *without bitterness or animosity* to declare the *best*, and
 - inimical*: a *dishonest* effort for absolute supremacy and annihilation of the opponent 203
- Copenhagen interpretation:
 - rejecting incomprehension forces us to look for a reason 233
- Coulomb Law 249
- Creation:
 - options to choose from regarding its nature 224
- Creation by Design:
 - the function of Law in 81
- Creation by specie and *Designed Specific General Creation*:
 - casually looked at, the latter *looks like* (is interpreted as) being of the form of the former! 113
- Creation of the world:
 - and the confusion of dividing issues and people about it 112-4
 - and the judgment of God and men

- 76
- its exact nature remains uncomprehended 112
 - Biblical and other conceptions of 73
 - despite seeming complexity, God's Wisdom admits of a *single and simple* answer 76
 - General:
 - the *only* one possible:
 - how it can be recognized as the product of Divine Wisdom 73
 - Special:
 - requirements for and associated problems 73 et seq.
 - Creation Science:
 - an introductory statement that has yet to be made 75
 - borrows heavily from atheistic science 74-5
 - fallacies of 35 et seq.
 - reason for 35
 - Creationism:
 - meaningless if not a *total* commitment in a *rational* Personal God 43
 - must* revise its strategy 87
 - some of its arguments are improper 43
 - Creationists:
 - believing in a young universe are challenged, too:
 - some of them say that the question of a young universe is secondary!
 - it is not!: because even that *is* an *indelible* part of the writing in the heavens!; *nothing* done by God is secondary, everything *has* its place!; and we owe it our corresponding to it respect! 324
 - distrusting themselves, join the atheists! 221
 - their belief in a young earth is based on inference
 - how is allegiance to it superior to that due to Logos? 326
 - will they for the greater glory of God abandon their erroneous beliefs, or will they not, just for pride, thus also blaspheming the Lord by Whose Hand the Law was written in the heavens? 322-3
 - Current activities:
 - disrespectful of Man propaganda and *thus* blasphemy of the Lord! 287
 - and the duty of all still truly alive to examine the abyss in themselves 287
 - Darkness of the Abyss:
 - the *free* choice of eyes and minds shut tight! 206
 - Darwin, C. R. 41
 - did *not* discuss the *deeper* causes of evolution 112
 - the milieu and the Galapagos expedition 123
 - Dawkins, R. 114, 286, 329, 350 (see also Aristotelian Logic)
 - a polemical antitheist *abusing* the underlying Logic 127 et seq.
 - deliberately* gives common words *other than standard* meaning 132
 - his computer model and *deliberate obfuscations* exposed to view 132 et seq.
 - his *false* and *the correct* "life argument": as life *precedes* intelligence but *cannot* go back to before the Big Bang, the Natural Law that has since applied, requiring Intelligence and *It* Life, points to a *Real Living Intelligence already present before* the Natural world came into being! 138-9
 - how he *fixed* the program, yet failed to admit this *fixing* as equivalent to a law! 136
 - ignoring all the underlying physics 346-8
 - and the probabilities of producing out of nothing even the law controlling the physics 347
 - supported by atheist "scientists" equates the human body to ten trillion copies of the Encyclopaedia Britannica", and proceeds to attribute it to the action of "CHANCE", followed by "SINGLE-STEP AND CUMULATIVE SELECTION" and finished off by "DEVELOPMENT", yet fails to learn from the lesson of the sheer impossibility that the Encyclopaedia could be due to just such a process! 329
 - Dawkins, R. & Co. 259, 265
 - Democracy:
 - the old and the new:
 - the latter's connection to lies 9-10
 - Democritean atom:
 - (see also under Light) 95-6, 249
 - the *massive* fundamental photon 147
 - its mass: about 10^{-65} g 231
 - its size: that of the universe 231
 - and application of universal law 96
 - and the effect upon it of universal expansion 149

- ignoring this, Newtonian mechanical calculations err! 149
- light, too, *is* thus subject to cosmological retardation 149
- naturally* follows a *curved* path passing by massive bodies 149
- under the present velocity of light, the universe could *not* have come out of the original singularity! 149
- Democritean atoms:
 - are they making up the universe by chance? 41 F/note
- Democritus 211, 224
- Demos and Democracy:10 et seq.
 - and calling to account the men at the top 11
 - and the *TheoLogical* General Commonwealth 11
- Design:
 - always driven by a rational purpose 225
- Detail:
 - always* does the Master reveal 240
- Determinism:
 - and (*moral*) Freedom: 329, 335
 - their supposed incompatibility dispelled 335
 - Laplacian determinism applies to matter for the *fact* that matter is subject to Law that is *not* its product by its *master* 335
 - Spiritual determinism applies to Man and God, for the *fact* that God being Perfect and Holy *cannot* bypass Justice, that determines the Sacred Order of *all* things 335
 - attacked in the wake of the pseudo theological doctrines of the indivisibility in man of body and Spirit, and of predestination limiting the dignity of God and man 330
 - the effort to subvert it as a possible product of Design began with the advent of the theory of evolution, being the first covert effort (then more overtly followed by relativity and the current quantum mechanics) to subvert the belief in the existence of the Designer setting down the *full details* of determinism 329-30
 - proven by the support the theory receives from atheist “scientists” 329
 - the effort to understand the proper action of determinism and the proper evaluation of these theories has been undermined by improbable confused thinkers who more than honest atheists have done more damage to the cause of Truth 330
 - by their *grossly misunderstood* doctrines of the Resurrection of Christ and of the dead 330
 - leading to the eventual deification by the Grace of God of the human body and thus of all matter, erroneously thought as the source of our falling from grace 331
- Determinism vs. relativism:
 - Laplacian determinism “had” to be undercut 144-5
- Dimensional analysis:
 - when the need for it arose 204
- Dimensions (physical) and their use and abuse 209
- Dirac, P. 239-41, 249
- Doppler shift 184
- East and West:
 - never* successfully married 17-8
- Easter time:
 - not* accidentally is the deadly poison poured:
 - the people must be distracted from the lesson of Holiness taught from on the Cross by the Judge and Owner of the vineyard 303
 - as not much more is left to be done, the final gavel is about to fall 303
- Eddington, Sir A. S. 57, 164
 - despite his fears, distinguished the subjective from the objective view of the physical universe 274
 - distinguishes the subjective and objective elements of the world, choosing for *fear* to discuss only the former! 254-5
 - stigmatized the fallacy of relativity 143
- Educated citizens:
 - what today is that they *must* understand 343
- Einstein A.: 49, 80, 91, 93, 141-4, 153, 157, 168, 181-3, 186-7, 189, 192-4, 204-5, 221, 254, 257, 274, 286, 330
 - a constant density of matter *is* contrary to the Hubble finding under constant total mass 174
 - about God 88
 - “All is relative”:
 - a lemma of relativity theory 142

- and his box and rope thought experiment that *ignored* the outside world 167
- and the Michelson-Morley experiment: problems 153
- and the *true* question of clocks and rigid rods **178 et seq.**
- as read by a rationalist cynic 56
- attempted to appropriate the Hubble findings as yet another “prediction” 183-4
- attributing expansion to Friedman *avoided* direct expression of own opinion 175
- avoided drawing direct attention to his assumptions 170
- bequeathed his brain to science, and we have learned that, it too, revealed itself to be just ordinary! 36 F / note, 260-1
- both* atheist and determinist! 97
- by his “philosophy” guided to commit his blunders 221
- chose the “*psychologically natural path*”, which his Reader is called to discover 142
- despite his theories, unable to tell whether the world is finite or infinite 167
- example of an atheist *not* blaspheming God 33
- excused the inability of the theory to supply all the needed ten (or eleven) equations for the “complete solution of the problem of motion” on the freedom of the student to supply *his* additional three (or four) equations! 175-6
- favored psychology 50
- his blunders regarding special relativity:
 - which is the less devastating? 202
- his discussion of universal expansion did *not* consider the question of how the average density of matter in it stays constant 182
- his general theory as sectioned by himself 171
 - where in it the telling principles hide 172
- his psychological anxieties: due to Israel’s contention with *the Personal God* 203
(see also below: his unsolved ...)
- his real reasons and intentions 57-8
- his *true greatest blunder* was starting his entire relativistic speculations 216
- his *true* greatest error 191, 192
- his unsolved psychological problem:
 - the Personal Lawgiver God 185
- reversed the physical and Logical order of cause and effect and *confused the ordinary* gravitational field with the “field of the vacuum” that *he* called “gravitational” also! 169-70
- the extraction of Newton’s law from the relativistic considerations *ignored* the required dimensional compatibility 176-8
- the real probabilities of *only some* of his assumptions 58
- the *real* reason for his introduction of the cosmological constant 181
- the requirement of general covariance contradicts the obvious conflict between the rope-box idea and the universal spherically symmetrical gravitational field that *cannot* be transformed away 172-3
- the 1916 definition of the geodetic line and the 1917 c consideration of the cosmological constant *are* contrary to universal expansion, later said to have been “predicted” by the 1916 paper! 173-4
- Einstein and Bohr parting ways 238-9
- Einstein-deSitter solution:
 - mathematically similar but applicable to a universe of *vanishingly small* mass expanding with an *ever increasing* velocity 218
- Einstein, Russell 209
- Electrical charge:
 - mass, and the constants are not further analyzable 249
 - seeking to resolve its mystery 248
 - electron and positron must differ by some reversal in the arrangement of their masses, the physical dimensionalities of $\epsilon(+e)^2$ and $\epsilon(-e)^2$ being identical to $G(m_e)^2$ 248
 - their force of attraction brings them, from (practical) infinity to the distance r_0 , of annihilation under production of energy $(\epsilon e^2)/r_0 = h\nu = hc/\lambda = 1\ 0215201\ \text{Mev}$ 248
- unavoidable the effect of the detailed micro-structure of matter 249
- Einsteinian indeterminacy 15, 50
- Electron:

- as a hollow spherical shell, contains its mass and charge 242
- has *determinable* operational characteristics **245 et seq.**
- has *positive* energy at each state 245
 - added energy pulls the atom together and it ionizes from a radius *close* to that of the so-called ground state, *not* from an *embarrassing* infinite radius, fully in keeping with the picture of the whole world 245-6
- is a fully classical* harmonic spherical oscillator! 245
- its geometrical and operational characteristics combine into a factor [having a unique value for each state and element] multiplying the known expression for the energy at each state 245
- the exact disposition-and-motion of one or more electrons around the nucleus constitutes the mechanical structure of the atom 242
- the nucleus-electrons interactions must to a lesser degree affect their separate internal structures, while to a greater degree must relate to the structure of the atom as a whole 242
- transits smoothly as the amplitudes of oscillations of adjacent states overlap spatially 245
- Electrons in all atoms:
 - as their arrangement is singularly ordinal, Nature is shown to “know” how to place itself in order, thus also greatly simplifying the energy-level diagrams 247
 - at ionization, the energy divides between the ionizing electron and the *remaining* ensemble, whose energy fits *exactly* the resulting configuration, thus providing a *seamless* transition from the neutral atom to the resulting ions 247
 - far from ionization, all *have equal* energies 246
 - near ionization, the *inside* electron acquires the higher quantum number and energy 246
- Empire building:
 - its foundation 27
- Energy:
 - and the unification of forces 99
 - forms of 99
 - kinetic energy total: depends on observer’s position 101
 - thermodynamic view of: all constant, some unavailable 93
- Energy and mass conservation 94-5
- Energy conservation principle 140
- Epimenidean paradox:
 - its latest pseudo-scientific version: —Gödel’s procedure 284
 - never* perplexed the Greeks:
 - by its *biting humor* reminded of the duty *never* to overlook self-contradiction 279
 - today’s thinkers regard it very nearly as a perplexing *intrinsic* defect of formal logic! 279
- “Ether”:
 - no other than the very present diffuse light itself 231
- European and American general social life:
 - is it Christian enough? 320
- Evolution:
 - (see also under Theory of evolution)
 - according to a *not yet sensed* need: absolutely illogical 116
 - advocates a *hidden inferior god* 118
 - and devolution:
 - their *equal* chances under purposelessness are *not* seen 116
 - and morphogenesis and ontogenesis 118
 - and the choice of criteria 118
 - and the rate of mutation 118
 - and the reversal of the *logical* ontological connection of causes and effects 117
 - and the social effect (turned into a cause) on the theory 119
 - as “law of the fittest” cancels all scruples 40
 - atheistic and theistic:
 - distinguished by their differences 79-81
 - based on chance *is a lie* 38-9
 - by mutation:
 - the problems of theory in the face of the *absent evidence that would support it* 115
 - how it ought to be faced and compared to Gauss’ laws 49
 - license to exploit the “less fit” 42
 - maintains much of the present social structure 42
 - “philosophy” of barbarism masqueraded as civilization 42
 - the atheists’ “weapon” of *bad* “logic” 39
 - the *cultural effect* may have decided

- the form of the theory and the search for the "missing links" 120-1
- the shame of teaching it and letting be taught as at present 41
- Evolutionists:
—freeloaders in a *system* of order 117
- Evolving nature:
—does she, too, act in "mysterious ways"? 121
- Expanding universe:
—had *zero* initial volume! 149-50
—its main other initial and developing properties 150
- Experimental facts and *metaphysical* faith in Logos 17, 20
- Experimental verification:
—*whimsical* the approach to it 93
- Faith:
—in Logos and Science allows *no* compromises, and is still needed to dispel unbelief 346
—in Reason:
—is *not* Religion, but Duty to oneself!; we are *not* all insane, some are only misguided!; we are *not* resigned to alms from God, Who in His Holiness did *not* seek to make passive beggars of us, but *active* seekers of *that same* Holiness, seeing it to be *our Duty to ourselves to earn our Way* 286
—in the defeat of the forces of Darkness and Falsehood 346
—in the Scriptures and in science 33
—its ultimate definition 290
- Faith and Logos:
—the problem of *common* understanding in their absence 290
- Faith, life, salvation 86
- Falsehood:
—of God's "unprovability" 47
—neglects His ontology and attends to His "existence" 47
—on it "scientists" and "theologians" meet 47-8
—*heavy* its implications 48
—based on the theories of evolution as understood, of relativity replacing the Designer and of quantum mechanics establishing chance, all leading to "meaninglessness" 48 **et seq.**
- Falsehood or Truth:
—which rather is with God? 352
—since only Truth, ergo Falsehood, that people call also the "devil" is *not!* 352
—the "devil" *cannot even dream of tempting* a man to prove the existence of God from within this world; from which only he can possibly lose 352
- Falsehoods:
—believed about the Scriptures 32 **et seq.**
—by whom and how they now are spread 30
—their source and mold 26 **et seq.**
- Falsification of atheism:
—method of 82 **et seq.**
- Fear and Faith in Logos 30
- Ferguson, K. 52-4, 59, 232, 316
—and arguing against the established "authorities" 20-1, 23
—and the Principle of Mathematical & Logical Consistency and Simplicity 66
—her grandparents' old oak chair *is a veritable universe in disguise* of atoms in empty space, themselves composed of Democritean atoms 316
—"Truth also seeks us" 251
—we just do not yet see that *everything physical is a veritable celestial body* hanging along with the entire rich company in the void 316
- Feyerabend, P. K. 16, 187
- FitzGerald, G. F., 151, 205
—contraction 151-3
—contrary to special relativity 153
—its relativistic explanation is wrong! 191
—the *true* contraction proves the presence of the objective Natural Law 153
—exposes *all* relativistic considerations 154
—exposes the deliberate silence of (not only openly *atheist*) scientists since 1985 155
—exposes the *questionable* honesty of professors 156
- Ford, J. 59
- Fossil record
—free of "thalidomide" findings 41
- Freedom:
—and the inalienable rights of Heaven 294
—and the Moral Law:
—the former is absent when the latter has no content 336
—given us by God, may *not in any way infringe* upon the freedom of others

- 294
- its spiritual form:
 - applying solely to the Spirit, is independent of, distinct from, and *in addition* to the *other* determinism that is a feature of the inanimate Nature 331
 - having *its own* determinants, *only mistakenly* is believed to continue to exist solely as a result of the removal of *physical* determinism 335
 - ours indeed is delimited by the circumstances of the created Nature; but so, too, is *our* responsibility, or else, God *would* be unjust 331
 - we do *not* deserve absolute freedom, because *we do not, nor can we*, carry absolute responsibility, being too weak and unwise for that burden! 331
 - had we had more of it, it is hard to see in what more we could use it given our present ethical status: as nothing we can imagine has morally been denied us, we partake of *both* realities, physical *and* spiritual, creating even imaginable monsters, caricatures solely of *terminally sick* minds functioning in government, corporate “think tanks”, Hollywood, and similar places 332
 - split as is the divided-dual nature of Reality, seeking undivided freedom, we aim at serving solely our *basest* instincts, *not* the *purpose* of being
 - yet even that has *not* been denied us!: we already descent deep into hell!
 - denied us is only the mixing of Heaven and hell, that is no longer freedom but license, that the Holy God has denied even Himself! 332
- Friedman, A 174-5, 181, 182
- Gauss, K. F.
- and the law of chance 40, 237
- General Theory of Everything 162
- and the hunger for meaning by the very people who, denying God, call the world meaningless, while they attempt to place themselves in *His* place! 163
- Geniuses facing the statistics 58
- Glory of God:
- and the choice between hard facts and the Bible 325
 - and the correct manner of facing the great questions 324
 - as we all face the *same* Heaven and hell the *tastefully bitter* truths must bluntly be stated, as *true* politeness and Truth *never* conflict, contrary to what the “world” thinks 324
 - arguing that this here whole debate based on the Newtonian G is due to a mere coincidence is *not* legitimate 324
 - because the atheists understand that such a coincidence *is* impossible that they consciously choose to bury this whole effort in silence 324-5
 - so *even less* may believers suggest that such a central question and *any* coincidence *could* have escaped the attention of God! 325
- God:
- Absolute Reality and Logical Consistence 66 **et seq.**
 - all* conceive Him as a *He*-Person 62
 - and His own moral responsibility toward preservation of created entities such as protons and electrons:
 - for these, “hell” is the constant state of being as they make up our physical home
 - Hell has meaning for the Spirit that chooses depravity!
 - “theological” doctrines may *not* hide behind these hard facts! 333
 - and matter:
 - the latter is *not* inimical to Him, but remains His servant 331
 - though ethically, morally and spiritually *unconscious and uncomprehending* His eventual purpose, it nevertheless “understands” and obediently serves His orders and their implications for itself 331
 - and our way of thinking of Him 65 and praying that we understand Him, as *we*, by *our* choice of guides, brought ourselves to the edge of the abyss 23
 - and pantheism
 - seen under the question of “deification” of matter 333
 - and the Creator’s materials and “way”, shown by *His* Laws 64
 - and the fallacious way of “science”

- 64-5
 - and the hard choice of creation at its best standing before us and deserving our respect 349-50
 - and the laws of nature, that are *not* intrinsic properties of matter 64
 - and the respect of opinion 84
 - and unbelief: as reaction to not having our *every* whim, including *blank license*, instantly satisfied 340
 - and φῶς, light, the lightest thing speeding the fastest, Θεός, θέω, Godspeed, intertwine least and greatest 34
 - as the highest Logical category of Being *cannot* have a *yet higher* reference, 71
 - as Zeus: the most solid *He-Person* ever conceived, 62
 - being pure Spirit:
 - He *both* created *and* invented the world out of the *not* preexisting materials known as the gravitational constant, mass, its age and space in terms of which all material bodies are being described 331
 - so, not only are God's and the world's natures totally different, but *He* has total control even of things *different* from His purely Spiritual Essence 331
 - does *not* hide, nor is He afraid of anyone 63
 - does *not* throw about laws, mindless of the outcome 203
 - employs the most economical means toward that purpose, which allow for "miracles" 63
 - finished works, forgetfulness and design 64
 - has a *purpose* in Mind 63
 - His capacity of ἐκφράζεσθαι is stated as the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, the Demiurge, the Lord Jesus Christ dressed not in Glory, but only in Holiness, and even that we could *not* stand to see! 301
 - His economy forbids *all* licentiousness 65
 - His existence:
 - proven by Reason and Science truly confounds the atheists 89-90
 - His Logic, our common sense and the fallacies about Him 64 and things superfluous and unneeded 64
 - His patience is *not* inexhaustible 344
 - His purpose and man's power 90
 - how thinking of Him simplifies things 63
 - in what Logical-scientific proof His being could/would possibly be established? 252
 - the "Scientific Establishment" *refuses* to face the problem! 252
 - more in the mind of scientists than of the clergy, but both sides do not evaluate the problem correctly 54-5
 - our theories and the Reality out there 66
 - positively profaned when depicted as "throwing dice" 79-80
 - praying that we understand Him has yet to begin 18
 - profaned by all who believe the system of laws haphazard 204
 - profaning Him *is* the true terror 91
 - rationally made the world secure: 23
 - the proper conception of Him can no longer be *a priori*/axiomatic, it must only be *a posteriori* of all that Logos concludes to be needed 301
 - the source of all Reality except of sin 44
 - the touchstone that secures the genuineness 64
 - we* wrapped Him in mystery 18
 - when seen and why "unseen" 90
 - wrong* the belief that He cannot be proven 18, (proof 33)
- God and chance:
- He underwrites the Laws.
 - it underwrites nothing at all 38
- God and Logic:
- and His unfalsifiability 85
- God and Man:
- best understood as Spirits and Persons:
 - even religions do *not* comprehend fully this part of Truth 35-6
- God and the Old Testament:
- despite all statements there, God *never* has had second thoughts 325
 - the request that we study the Scriptures intended us to get to the *Spirit* of God, *not* to memorize verbatim without getting to It every word! 325
 - words of men *will* differ, the Spirit of God is *infallible* and It may *not* be *misconstrued* 325

- God, His plan of creation and the *proof* of His existence:
 —and the now *suspect* silence of *all* Religions and Churches in the face of the terrible daily bloodshed 326
 —proof and disproof
 —and the assessment of guilt for the failure and the silence 327
 —if disproof be not given, the long since firmly established oriental bazaar of *rotten* intellectual goods shall be shown to have been fixed by *general tacit collusion!* 327
 —in this state are we to prepare our defense, especially those called Christians, called more than all others to live the Divine Agony of giving God all is due Him 328
 —today ridiculed and blasphemed by *all* atheists, “believers” and “faiths”, for their not daring to face the facts 327
 God, the Septuagint and the corruption of older Hebrew texts 325
 God, the world and our standing in it:
 —he hates the lavish debauchery of the prodigals wasting lives and riches during the last night before the sun never rises 341
 —we miss the hard fact that the “business” of the World is *nothing* less than *God’s Holiness!*; *not* men’s so-called “holiness”, *nor* so-called scholarly “eminence”! 341
 God-Logos
 —and His love of Perfection 26-7
 —and the created world 65
 —and Truth 29
 —miracles, power, rationality 32-3
 —*never* commits mistakes and improprieties 34
 —respects even the sinful;
 never dictates, only suggests 33
 —substantive, not uncertain 26
 —the full weight of the term 35
 —the highest possible category of Being 68
 —the scientific proof of His being 33
 “God” called Nothing:
 —insults and negates the entire civilization, the entire meaning of Spirit 305
 Gödel, K. 276 et seq., 286, 288
 Gödel and Co.:
 —*ignoring the inescapable qualitative facts* and dazed by the infinitude of natural numbers attributed the blame for their *logically expected negative finding* to a *supposed* shortcoming of the language, rather than to the logical impropriety of their game itself! 282
 Gödel and Tarski theorems:
 —products of the times in which they appeared (in light of the failure of the ‘schools’, and the advent of relativity, quantum mechanics and the uncertainty principle, that all attacked the ancient belief in Logic having the world unshakable for being constructed on Laws that do *not* contradict each other!) 278-9
 Gödel’s procedure or “Gödelization”:
 280 et seq.
 —a highly axiomatic series of remarkable *contrived* arbitrary finite steps of its own, possessing *neither a priori justification of its axioms, nor independent proof of its findings* (as do ordinary theories that eventually gain acceptance), that has in fact been *swallowed, though with difficulty yet with resignation*, for the extra “support” it provides to the entire set of “scientific facts” that supposedly permit doubt on right and wrong; here and there; now, future and past; certainty and uncertainty, even about Truth and falsehood, and Good and evil 282-3
 —evaluated and found to contradict itself 284
 —his “arithmetizing”, i.e., converting non-arithmetic elements of the mind and language to numbers is so *totally an arbitrary* operation that it *cannot* be rigorously be tolerated 280
 —how do we dare give *arithmetical* values to such elements? 280
 —as arithmetical operations produce only numbers, how do we rationally convert those numbers back to *non*-arithmetical elements of thought and speech, that clearly refer not just only to numbers but also, through the use of numbers, to vastly foreign fields, such as those of logic, physics, philosophy, and even TheoLogY? 280
 —intrinsically flawed and scientifically worthless 285
 —under “Gödelization”, one *cannot* possibly find it impossible to set down a number standing for the

- meaning "I am not a number":
would that negate all arithmetic?
281-2
- under "Gödelization", qualities converted to fixed quantities here produce a certain sense, there a totally other—or, mostly, sheer nonsense!
282
 - where would "Gödelization" of such as poems, sonnets, stories, novels, treatises too, the contents of entire libraries too, lead? 282
 - so, the fate of Gödel's (first) "incompleteness theorem" *was* preordained! 282
- Gödel's theorems' consequences:
- correctly did P. K. Feyerabend attack scientists for inventing fuzzy theories, A. Einstein been in gross error, in vain does S. Hawking attempt to invent and found a believable theory of everything, and we all fatuously believe in everything we have ever thought we know about the world!
279-80
 - so too *must all* believers in God be upset, *mainly for their own standing inactive* on hearing that there is any thing fuzzy in the Mind of God! 280
 - so, too, the question: are we all the rest mere charlatans, or Gödel alone and those that admire him for his findings? 280
- Gould, Stephen Jay 312
- Gravitational constant:
- its fundamentality not understood, only dimly is its presence acknowledged 222
- Gravitational field 100
- Einstein's view of 100 & F/ note
- Great Schism of the Church:
- solid* proof of *inadequate* understanding of God
 - all due proper deep thought resolves all debates and conflicts: the seeming incongruences vanish when the Lord God is *not* three separate Persons, each incomplete without the other two, but only One Person, Perfect and Complete in Himself 300
- Greece today:
- a nakedly representative specimen of the more prudish world 12
- Greeks:
- taught lessons immortal.
 - we rather* make violent Hollywoodian scenarios of their struggles, *not* debates following their *συζητήσεις, common researches of the One Truth!*
286
 - misguided *not* by scientists, but the so-called "theologians" of West Asian origin who drove the *impious* wedge right down the middle between what can only be called *their* "faith" in God and the *correct* Faith in the one *indivisible* God-Logos 286-7
- Greek terms:
- abused by scientists 255
- Harrison, E. 206
- Hawking, S. 20, 52-3, 103, 162, 196, 286
- uses imaginary numbers to avoid the necessity of the Creator 55-6
- Hawking, S., & Co.:
- admit the breakdown of relativity* during the earliest stages of the universe 158
 - challenged to surpass the Newtonian findings 219
- Heaven:
- denying It its due *shall accrue fair punishment proportional and greater than any usual offense!* 293
 - its interests *must* be protected even by the prohibition of establishing a law for escaping just punishment on the grounds that society may not touch a criminal because the moral Law *supposedly indiscriminately* prohibits killing 294
 - this is *not exacting* retaliation on the "eye for an eye" principle, established as a *constant reminder against enacting a crime deserving such retribution; not* as a general right to demand exact retribution, under the *supposed* cover of moral Law 294
 - the right to demand retribution is a measure of the hardness of heart that demands it!; religions *and* their servants have failed to see things in this light!; so has it been that so much "religious" hatred is brutally lashing us!
294
- Heat:
- reverse flow of it and the second law 99
- Heisenberg, W. 51, 278, 286
- Heisenberg uncertainty principle:

- and the law of least action 227
- denies both the existence of the center of the universe as the point of zero total momentum, unquestioned under the law of momentum, *and* the then also exact velocity c_0 with which, at $T = 0$, the universe started expanding 229
- denies the unquestioned fact that the universe reacts with *total* knowledge to the action of *any one* body within it, on account of which fact alone we are able to measure the inertial mass of a body and find it equal to its gravitational mass! 229
- forbidding even the last iota and dot to be out of place, comes into conflict with Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity! 229-30
- ignores the physical package named quantum of matter, energy, volume and *thus also* of action 227
- requires the *certain* Planck constant! 227
- runs into problems in the beginning even as regards the total momentum 229
- Heisenbergian indeterminacy 15
- Heraclitus 13, 15
- Hidden parameters:
 - their existence denied for the fact that admitting them would introduce the existence of a *philosophically uncomfortable* Rational Law at a much deeper level! 238
- High position and power:
 - means proportionally higher responsibility to lead justly, not just only by mere empty word, but by the living example 294
 - not making it trying and impossible for others to lead their peaceful lives in justice and in pursuit of a place in Heaven 294
- Hilbert, D. (axiomatic school) 277
- Hill, F. L. 187
- Hitler, A. 267, 273
- having *not* been a nihilist is *unfairly* attacked by self-confessed nihilists as by Weinberg 271
- Holiness:
 - among *Christians* the whole debate has been about how we are to understand the union in Holiness of God and The Good Man in a *seeming* single person called Jesus Christ! 272
 - and God's personal presence in the war of Good against evil
 - from which He neither could be absent, nor appear in all His Glory 271-2
 - and the life-supporting universe: *are* utterly meaningful even if only one Saint ever appears in it, especially when all others, despite the rich gifts showered *not* by chance, choose to call themselves and the universe utterly meaningless! 273
 - cannot* be attained without considering *all* the lessons the passing of time keeps on amassing in our ever more critical Spirit; 343
 - which only after the most critical examination must determine what truly fits, *is* worth keeping, *adds meaning to meaning!* 343
 - conquers the Heavens 303
 - by hard labor, worked hands, a strong *dedicated* mind, and a heart broad enough to embrace them 303
 - in the war of Good against evil, *only freely* can The Good Man choose to stay sinless 272
 - is* unattainable without the *possibility* of evil, *that only we bring into being by choosing it* over Holiness 269
 - nothing less than it is a purpose proper for the *Holy* God *and* the self-respecting man endowed with a healthy intellect 271
 - the atheists *cannot* accept either the proposition of Holiness coming out of nothing, or that the material universe is Its presentation!; that's why they insist on the universe being meaningless 272
 - they *know* that Holiness is *not* meaningless! Therefore, a Good Man *can neither appear nor rise to Holiness in the absence of God!* So, the opposition to God imposes the opposition to the Good Man also!; that's why the atheists will have nothing to do with Jesus Christ! 272
 - the human flesh *is* the proper dress the Holy God *had* to choose to make Himself visible to us all, to deliver His Lesson 272
 - the world would *not* be better with out the *possibility* of Holiness, that *alone requires the objective existence of*

- the possibility* of its opposite! 269
- those rejecting It choose the abyss 303
 - and starting from the environs of Jerusalem, they have already begun to turn the world into ashes:
 - the just reward of insanity! 303
 - Holy Apostolic See of Rome
 - and the claim of Petrine succession 26
 - Holy Logos:
 - presetting *all* values 91
 - Holy Perfection:
 - impossible without the potentiality of evil 44
 - “Holy Scriptures” and God’s Logos 72 F/note
 - Holy Trinity 3-4
 - and the “mystery” that is *not* of the One Complete-Perfect God collecting into one the three *distinct* faculties of Logos: the Reasoning, the Expression, and the Inspiration, seeking *incessantly only* Good and Holiness 349
 - Homer: paraphrased 352
 - Hoyle, F. 54
 - making *false* representations of the heliocentric and geocentric systems in a textbook **196-7 F/note**
 - Hubble, E. P. 174-5, 181, 306, 348
 - his findings and the cosmological conservation of momentum establish an immobile absolute center where expansion began, at which all momentum vectors *always* sum up to zero. This point *is* the center of a preferred system of reference in which all events *are* spatially and temporally ordered. This *refutes* relativity 184-5
 - Human activity:
 - its seamless spectrum intoned by the presence of God and Man 46
 - Human freedom:
 - requires* the presence of choice between sanctity and evil 44
 - Human languages:
 - none by itself capable of describing God 35 et seq.
 - Human reason:
 - innately superior to the sensory equipment 256
 - the duty arising therefrom 25
 - must* delimit the certainty
 - inside* the bounds of our limited sensory equipment 257
 - Human “scientific” knowledge, for insisting, by selective subjectivism, on including in “science” only what the atheist physicists deem proper, *is* basically incomplete and even outright false 274
 - “Humanism” facing cruelty and the stubborn refusal to learn 343
 - and the duty to jerk the Spirit back into Action 343
 - do we reject the Spirit of Action?
 - if not from God, where is it from? 343
 - only* indifference as to the consequences of a definitely coming Future, on the belief that nothing is coming, comes not from God 343-4
 - since still exist people that truly care for Meaning ultimately leading to Holiness, about which by definition only God *truly* cares, can *anybody* deny that it is exactly because they stand against God that some stand against Meaning? 344
 - unquestionably, even the meaninglessness some choose *is* a meaning, meant to deny the Meaning 344
 - Humility:
 - by whom it ought to be taught 41
 - Hulse-Taylor pulsar, 57
 - Hylleraas, E. A. 233
 - Ideas:
 - how the most dangerous ones are presented **11-12**
 - “objects” in a mind, *even if not ours*;
 - of the first and second kind 67
 - those out there, in the Mind of God 68
 - Image and likeness:
 - the Asiatic confusion 290
 - Irrationality and Rationality foolishly equated! 52
 - Jesus Christ:(see also Holiness):
 - if only a God, why do we reject His Way? 272
 - if only a man, why do the Jews not honor Him more than *all* others? 272
 - which raises the question of whether a Good Man can rise to Holiness in the absence of God 272
 - that Holiness came out of nothing *is by definition far far*

- more demanding* than that the material universe came out of nothing 272
- the entrance into Jerusalem:
 - the expectation of it vs. the fact 302
 - Jews and the Crucified:
 - the crimes of “Christians” may *not* be charged to Him! 268
 - why do they want even His name erased? 268
 - unless they show Him evil, they attack *Holiness*, in Him made visible 268
 - Jews[and we all in their position] vs. Jesus Christ 302-3
 - another* gift did they expect:
 - instead, the example of Holiness was offered! 303
 - unsuitable for the lazy, the soft-handed, the weak-minded, the narrow-hearted 303
 - Judaism:
 - the only recognized source of monotheism 203
 - Israel: Jacob’s contention with God 203
 - so too, the source of world atheism 203
 - Kaesuk Yoon, Carol 312
 - King David:
 - orientally passing on the blame of his own sinfulness to his parents, and from them on up to the Creator he addresses! 319
 - the blasphemy of Holy God is never greater than when it is purposefully spread to affect the *holy* procreative act, so that it make us all children of sin 319
 - which is why the “higher” Orthodox and the entire Catholic Christian clergy remain unmarried and persuade even the nuns to avoid committing the “sin”! 319
 - but aren’t all the “religious” useful? but isn’t even more useful to have more Christian *citizens* spread among the general population and by *their constant exemplary presence in all decent* walks of life inform the *entire* society how the *Christians* ought to fulfill their duties, *including that of producing even more Christian the following generation?*; isn’t it obvious that by acting as they traditionally do, they *are in effect thinning* by this sort of unconscious selective breeding the percentage of *true* Christians in the general population as the generations pass? 319-20
 - Kingdom of God:
 - the reality of its having come the Churches *refuse* to consider 292
 - having as a Logical consequence that we since live the Day of Judgment, and misbehave *as we are being judged* 292
 - Knowledge and Faith:
 - on the narrow ledge over the abyss and the duty of professors and Churchmen **23-4**
 - Kronecker, L.
 - “integers were created by God, all else is man-made” 284
 - Laplacian determinism 140
 - Law:
 - its presence central in the proof of the existence of God 89
 - and the silence of the brokers of power over us 89
 - Natural and man-made:
 - different 92 et seq.
 - not identical 97
 - where to look for the former 97
 - of separations 165 F/note
 - Law and chance:
 - mutually exclusive 131
 - Law and the Universe:
 - former additional to the physical properties of the latter 222
 - Law on the constitution of matter:
 - asking and settling *all the crucial detailed questions* 140
 - Law supporting the universe:
 - may *not* come into self-contained antinomy 296
 - thus introducing the question of its absolute Logical origin 296
 - unquestionably both physical and mathematical 296
 - Laws:
 - are *never* products of chance 203
 - System of:
 - disdained due to incomprehension of the *fact* that it is *not* haphazard 204
 - Laws of Gravitation and Separation of bodies 212
 - Laws of Nature: underlying:

- are not nature's properties 221
- what truly is their source? 222-3
 - the question *can* be decided, and *thus also* the question of God! 223
 - compels us to search for their source, *absent* in the physical universe, yet *not* mysterious, being *the* Logos, the *perfect* A and Ω 251-2
- Laymen:
 - the ordinary ones:
 - simply "believe", coming to new ideas by hearsay alone 83
 - the pious ones:
 - coming to new ideas *mixed fourth hand* 83
- Le Verrier, U. 161
- Least action unit
 - and the Democritean atom 211
 - and the "uncertainty principle" 211
- Leibnitz, G. W. 211
- Length:
 - not* a fundamental but a *derived* dimension 222
 - the question of its constancy 96
- Lenski, Richard E. 312
- Life:
 - and the deep-seated order of the physical world the professors ignore 109
 - characterizes not just only the flesh, but principally the Spirit 35-6
 - under local conditions 41
- Life evinces as its source *not* chance, but a Grand Design conceived in a Mind guided by Logos 41
- Light:
 - emission from a continuously moving source forms a *series of fronts, each having its own center* 192-3
 - exposes all theories of re-collapse 217
 - expression of its velocity 217
 - and the so-called "Hubble time" 217
 - its character and properties *are hard* facts of nature 189
 - its *correct* treatment under Newtonian gravitation *matches* the observed facts! 179
 - its dual nature resolved:
 - at every point in space, there is mass corresponding to the total energy in it, but it requires time to react, decided by the unit of action 231
 - its front and the state of motion of its origin 189
 - its front *cannot* be observed 216
 - its *true* center of emission and the light front 188
 - limits our observations 216-7
 - still regarded as Newton's corpuscles and Young's waves 71
 - the constancy of its velocity an arbitrary human supposition intrinsically contrary to Newton's Law and the physical and cosmological evidence 219
 - the first broadcast of the expanding universe 216
 - transparency and opaqueness 231
- Light and energy:
 - problems of 99
- Light and matter:
 - their ultimate constitution 219
- Lindley, D. 20, 57
- Logic:
 - if it is only a figment, there is no right and wrong, but only the power and the pleasure of the most heinous villain! 280
 - unless *you are him*, it is natural that you take an *immediate* interest! 280
- Logic, philosophy, science & theology in ancient and present Athens 83
 - F/note
 - today *not* interacting 83
- Logical and Mathematical Simplicity Principle 146
 - present in the Ultimate Mental Process 168
- Logos:
 - a general presentation of its meaning 13-4 **F/note**
 - absurd to deny its *independent of us* existence and operation 297
 - alone* closes the Gates to the Abyss 86
 - and experimental facts 17
 - and its *balanced* physical support 17
 - and the *oriental* Faith of Church in God 18
 - cannot* produce a "science" that rejects Him 16
 - Heraclitus and St. John 13-4 **F/note**
 - in the mouths of the blasphemers, He becomes empty words 303
 - ought to be obeyed even in the axiomatic establishment of Religion 296
 - possessing neither antinomies nor based on them *is necessarily* otherworldly, yet not imprisoned in its own world nor self-imprisoned 297

- the kind and limits of His power:
 - all remaining power is unquestionably raw! 298
- today denied 15
- unknowingly we all trust Him, or else, *both* belief *and* unbelief in God would be hopeless 297
- without Him, Religion becomes irReligion 303
- Logos and God:
 - are* the same and *precede* the creation of heaven and earth 326
 - the “scientists” *cannot* propose a resolution superior to that offered here 298
 - the “theologians” must thus tell us whether they prefer in *il*Logical , or a *perfectly* Logical God 298
- Logos and Theology:
 - examined as befits our *anthropic*, no longer “*human*” nature 289
 - its various aspects, forms, byproducts 295
- Logos, head, nose, mouth:
 - consider the order in which they are set, in order to make sense of the whole 341
- Lorentz, H. A. 187
 - his idea of the electron as a hollow sphere 242
- Lorentz transformations:
 - and the relativity of space and time 193-4
 - the true and so-called ones 187, **190 et seq.**, 202
- Lynch, A. 164
- Lyttleton, R. A. 16, 60

- Man:
 - revealed by the perfection he assigns to his God! 126
 - the only known *natural, living*, physico-mathematical quantum-mechanical solution endowed with sufficient self-and-environment-awareness as to ask the *ultimate questions* about the exact Nature of Being 350
 - and the ossified dogmas about the nature of man of Churches and atheists 350
- Man and ape:
 - mostly of *similar* matter, yet only he former asks *the* questions! 108
- Man’s *duality*
 - as of *distinct* flesh and Spirit rejected by religions seeing the two as one, *and* by “science” rejecting the Spirit 37-8
- Masoretic text 290
- Mass:
 - its natural unit:
 - the Democritean atom 95
- Mass-energy conservation:
 - a weapon against the Personal God - Logos also sitting as Judge 141
- Material universe:
 - by the fact that it *shows* its Design and center, it ipso facto *proves* its Creator 351
- Materialists:
 - self-exposed by the company they keep 108
 - though only *man-*, *not ape-like*, yet *betray* their spirituality! 108
- Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity 213, 222-3, 241, 347-8
 - a compelling and by far the most beautiful mistress ever 348
 - while the Judaic theology dealt *solely* in the transactions of man with his God on a *quid pro quo* Covenant that alas still informs all monotheistic religions, she alone seeks to make the Man-God relationship understood as a *union of consenting intimate spiritual friendship* 348
 - and the “idolatrous” TheoLogY of the Greeks 348
 - does not* mince words, numbers, significance 251
 - is given only lip service 219
 - is *integral, not differential* 66
 - sweeps clear the floor of twentieth century “science” 216
 - the Most Elegant Design under it makes perfect the order of Nature, completely demolishing the “philosophy” under the current “scientific” beliefs 247
 - the *true* and the lame 226
 - unites in a single scheme the micro- and the macro-world 244 (see also under Atom, Chemical Atom and Electron)
- Mathematics
 - and their proper place in reasoning **275 et seq.**
 - how the Greeks respected it as an inseparable part of Logic and attributed it directly to God 275
 - its “theological” neglect is part of *Jewish-oriental* tradition 275
 - part of the *perfect and complete*

- intellectual attributes of the *Personal Deity* 275
- when neglected as a part of our Logical Faith and delivered to the enemy, God *is* profaned 276
 - without it, Christianity has become Jewish and oriental 276
- Matter:
- and none other than even the rocks themselves, *created* self-and-environment-awareness, finally advancing to the level of Man becoming finally able to *consider and judge even the purely spiritual fundamentals of Being*, ask the Great Questions, and home in to the Creator Spirit that made it 350-1
 - receiving the Answer, the only *Unforgettable Truth*, that God alone, the *Ultimate Pure Spirit alone, truly ontologically is*, by His own right: while all the rest exist *solely by His Grace* 350
- Matter and energy:
- believed* to be the same, are *not*, 93
- Matter and energy problems:
- their solution **146 et seq.**
- Matter, micro-structure and universal quantities 250
- Maupertuis, P. L. M. de 211
- Men:
- come here so that each *manly present, argue and, if he can, protect and defend his explanation of all that exists, along with the propriety of his doings* in the presence of all else that is 351
- Michelson, A.A and Morley, E. W. 100
- Michelson-Morley experiment 71, 191, 219, 220
- a two-dimensional analogue of a three-dimensional instrument 151-2
 - and its “resolution” by relativity **204 et seq.**
 - problems with **151 et seq.**
 - three major ones were the mistakes committed 151-2
- Mind:
- and the spiritual *necessity* of the *possibility* of evil 27
 - and the unfathomable God 27
 - uncontrolled by Logos: is controlled by fear 27
- Missing mass quandary resolved 218
- Monotheistic religions:
- and their continued studied profanities passing for virtue as human blood translates to profits in the markets of the world 339
 - their believers must take due note of the Essence of Perfect God and *immediately* cease all warring 300
 - or else, they expose their *malicious and evil* intent! 300
- Moral entities and responsibility:
- the latter is intrinsic to their nature and it *cannot* be shed off! 336
- Moral Law and human acts:
- the former is determined, or else, it would not be a Law, in order *only* to guide and to impel,
 - so, the latter are *not* predetermined neither at all are we compelled 335-6
- Moral standards:
- how they owe to be kept under Logos 30
- Morality and mortality:
- belief in God ~~must~~ include Logical standards for the former and a compelling reason for the latter 295
- Morris H. M. & Parker ?? (Inst. for Creation Research)
- and creation science 43, 72, 74, 79, 81
 - erroneous their creationist view of thermodynamics 92-3
 - their creationism an aprioristic alternative model of origin s82
- Morris, Simon Conway 313
- Mortality:
- does *not* bestow an obligation to attempt extending this life beyond the limit to which it is useful to the purpose for which it was given us 295
 - suggests that the “good life” is *not* the very highest good
 - only the *honest* pursuit of Holiness is! 293
- Most Elegant Design Principle:
- equivalent to absolute Determinism 240-1
- Motion in elliptical grooves 178
- Motion in the universe and the three-body problem 165 F/note
- Music of the Celestial Spheres:
- calls for other ears! 126
- Mutation rate:
- least or optimum? arguments for 118-9
- Mutations:
- and the confusion of *specie development and new specie generation* 135
 - are they true microscopic physical

- states or only an *elaborate mental construct*? 120
- as viewed by outsiders and insiders 119
- Nature’s still unknown method of eliminating the harmful ones drastically affects our conclusions 120-1
- of *perfect* organisms:
 - are they possible, and where are the in-between links? 122
- the vast majority of them admitted as harmful 118
- Natural Fact and human invention 97
 - only the former by Nature or by God, 97
- Natural Law:
 - contrary* to *all* claims of chance, uncertainty, indeterminacy, doubt, and *every* kind of muddled thinking 97
 - determination of its source results in removal of doubt 70
 - how the “authorities” today receive it 21-2
- Natural World:
 - as God’s creation is subject to a fully deterministic, non-redundant, non self-conflicting Least Set of Laws not permitting uncertainty 98
- Nature:
 - allows a *clear classical* picture to be had of the micro-world: 246
 - this suffices to overthrow the current form of quantum theory 246
 - is most certainly of only one kind for all, and united under certainty! 236-7
 - shown to obey objective physical-natural Laws cognizant of the sequence of the cardinal numbers! 245
- Nature’s main details:
 - whether set pantheistically or by God *are* fully knowable 97
 - atheists deny *both* options 97
- Needs:
 - intellectual and spiritual;
 - by whom they are not met 13-4
- Negative and imaginary numbers:
 - in mathematics and physics, 55
- New York Public Library 196
- Newton, I. 100, 204, 222, 240, 348
- Newton and Einstein:
 - the latter *adapted* to the former, yet claimed the former subject to *his* findings! 101
- Newton by Einstein replaced?
 - an *idiotic* gross lie! 311
 - when on falling, fragile goods break, no relativity can restore them to wholeness! 311
 - given an immovable Natural Law, *no* other Natural Law contradicts it:
 - Nature is *not* confused for the *fact* that she *never* is asked to choose among contradictory Laws:
 - whose inner *strictly rational* structure remains invisible solely for the fact that our professors *refuse* to recognize the *basic rationality* of her system of Laws 312
- Newton’s Law of gravitation:
 - and the parallel of Mona Lisa 207-8
 - having *no* limit of applicability, only reliable candidate for letting us see through *all* human conventions 313-4
 - its proper consideration and the parallel of protecting society from its guards 208
 - operates *completely favor-free* by containing hidden in itself the *totally separate* law of separations 314
 - significance of **207 et seq.**
 - ties best with the Law of conservation of *universal* mass, *not* just of some select bodies and accounts for phenomena *supposedly* described by relativity, *without* recourse to it and its weaknesses 314-5
- Newtonian gravitation:
 - a *natural hard fact* **199 et F/note**
 - and the separation of bodies:
 - problems with **157 et seq.** (see also: Separation of bodies)
 - has *no* distance limit! 180
 - its correct formulation 160
 - the failure to determine the source of its purported inaccuracy 157-8
 - sets *new* demands on our understanding of the world, which the “experts” *refuse* to admit! 206
- Nihilist “Scientists”:
 - challenged to show rational both their reasoning that man is the next step up from the ape, *and* the leap from the ape to thinking of from photon to God and all things/ideas in between 36 F/note
 - disdain* the distance from the ape to Aristarchus’ heliocentricity,

- Beethoven's *Ninth*,
 Byzantine Vespers' *Φῶς ἱλαρόν*,
 da Vinci's *Gioconda*,
 Dante's *Divine Comedy*,
 El Greco's *The Grand Inquisitor*,
 Handel's *Messiah*,
 Hindus' *Upanishads*,
 Homer's epics,
 Kepler's *Laws*,
 Newton's *Laws*,
 Plato's *Republic*,
 Pythagoras's *Theorem*,
 Shakespeare's *Sonnets*,
 Schubert's *Winterreise*,
 Sophocles' *Antigone*,
 V. Williams's *Lark Ascending*,
36 F/note
 Nobel laureates:
 —confused about religion 199
 —do they deserve the "God" they
 worship? 201
 Nobel prize award:
 —accepted by atheist-nihilists defines
 the worst unrecognized
 schizophrenia 254
 Nordstrom D.
 —[Editor, *PHYSICAL REVIEW*, D] 195
Nothing is truly meaningless:
 [both meanings meant]:
 —when we learn nothing even from
 our pain, we truly deserve punish-
 ment, as anything less *would be un-*
Just 343
 Nuclear particles and the problem of
 mass and energy 103-5
 Nucleus and electron internal
 structure still unresolved 242
 —charges on a rotating spherical shell
 produce an electromagnetic moment
half as great as that by an equal size
 total charge revolving in an orbit of
 equal diameter, thus classically
 accounting for the half-spin
 quantum numbers 242
 —electron: a never collapsing spherical
 elastic harmonically vibrating spring
 balances the electrostatic Coulomb
 force, and all other internal and
 external forces 242-3
 —a concept of operations bridging
 the superatomic and subatomic
 structure of matter *is needed* for
 ensuring the unity of the two and of
 the whole physical world, yet has so
 far been ignored 243
 Numbers in themselves:
 —purely mental constructs, needed
 to understand the rest of the world
 277
 Oakes, Ed. T., S. J, 269
 Objective hard facts vs. man-made
 theories 201
 Objective Natural Law and moral
 responsibility **304 et seq.**
 Objective Reality:
 —being One, has *no* sides! 311
 —"religion" refuses to tackle the
 issue of God's self-respecting obli-
 gation to install in His own Crea-
 tion the *solid* proof of its being
His thoroughly cared for product!
 311
 —"science" evades the fundamental
 question of how Nature (made of
 things needing causes, and of
 laws regulating its components
 and themselves needing a consis-
 tent lawgiver) came about 311
 —compels us *never* to buy prepackaged
 opinions, but only those that alone
 make *true* sense of the Whole 311
 Opinions and persons:
 —silly persons respect more the
 former! 84
 Original sin
 —and the differential treatment of
 men and the serpent 27
 Particles of matter:
 —and the problem of action at a
 distance and "bonding particles"
 230-1
 —the question of their mass and size
 is *not* discussed 230
 —there is an inverse universal
 relationship relationship of particle
 mass and geometrical size 230-1
 Penzias and Hohenberg
 —[AT&T Bell Labs] 195
 People of *soft* "faith":
 —belonging to both camps, dispense
 broad smiles to all 255
 Persons are *not* physical and the faces
 are only masks 304
 Philosophers:
 ancient and present:
 —their different method of thinking
 225-6
 Philosophy:
 —always seeks a *rational* purpose 225
 Philosophy and Science:
 —can only advance after we dispel the
 fear of true Freedom, that is the

- other side of Moral Determinism:
 - of which coin the world is made complete! 336
 - learn of each other *second* hand 83
 - theology is informed *third* hand 83
- Physical science:
 - has flatly failed to show the universe possessing of its own the needed mathematical and Logical characters 296
- Physical scientists:
 - do *not* examine *all* possibilities about the world's source, but attempt to straight-jacket *both the world and its source* by their theories 203
 - how the wise examine the evidence 203
- Physical world:
 - Hubble's findings *stirred* the murky waters 257
 - its definite beginning irritates the atheists 257
 - why Einstein chose to pretend to have learned nothing by the black backdrop of the sky at night! 257
- "Physical world":
 - the *fiction* had in the *skewed minds* of "physicists" 258
 - ghastly* Picassoesque pictures of *sick* souls, *pretending to be living!* 258
- Physics:
 - its proper meaning *is* very badly confused 255-6
- Physics and Theology:
 - highly intertwined 304
- Planck, M. 211, 227
- Planck anarchy 139
- Planck constant: 236
 - a *variable, not a true* constant? 227-9
 - problems at the beginning 227
- Planck length and time, 261-5
- in the context of the expanding unit-verse 137
- Plato:
 - forewarned us to *preconsider all consequences, obvious and hidden of every statement* 91, 278
 - his *always standing* challenge 213
 - in the *Timaeus* tells how the wreath is won 62
 - knew* that even time too had been created 80
- Plonski, (Mrs.)
 - [Employee (?), *PHYSICAL REVIEW*] 194
- Politics and War:
 - each is its opposite by other means 321
- on them both, *both* the blood *and* the spirit of people is no object! 321
- the profits fan ever hotter the flames 321
- the Lord and His Justice shall not much longer be mocked 321
- Pontius Pilate and the Temple priests 302
- Pope John Paul II 28
- Popper, K. 170
- Popper, K. R. 226
- Positronium:
 - failure to detect its expected characteristic double emission spectral lines 250
- Power:
 - how it is being enforced 29
 - if all belongs in a single Being, would *you* rather prefer Him Reasonable or *un*Reasonable, loving, truthful and just, or according to their opposites? 298
 - the struggle for it divided even the churches 28-9
- Pre-Copernicanism:
 - set one man at the center of the universe, and its far worse modern metastasis 258
- Pre-Copernicanism and relativity compared 166
 - and Einstein's invention of psychological satisfaction of all observers to regard themselves central 166
- Present theories:
 - suspicious their purpose, ground and origin 47
- Pride and arrogance of practitioners:
 - divided faith and science 87
- Principle of Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity:
 - applied to the theory of evolution 126
- Professorial teachings and the question of keeping (standard) time 306-8
- Professors:
 - first insult themselves and *then* their audiences 305
 - undeterred proffer falsehoods 257-8
 - why do they keep secret that no Law comes without Lawgiver? Do they intend to make forget that *laws need to be responsive to needs*; that no responsible self-respecting Lawgiver ever forgets, but that they *colluding with irresponsible present-day law-*

- makers* want hidden, in order that *undisciplined minds, by them willfully in that state kept*, miss the responsibility of the irresponsible? But isn't that blasphemy? 313
- will they at long last find the courage to say that there is *no* sensible effect without a strict underlying Law, and *no* such a Law without Lawgiver? 313
 - and that *all* effects and *only* effects have causes, and that "accidental" effects are so called for *our* ignorance or neglect of the causes? 313
- Professors and Nobel laureates:
- branding "tradition", now that of atheistic evolution, on soft brains 317
 - carefully neglecting to explain the chemical and physical prerequisites of biological structures 317-8
 - the story of themselves as natural "successes" or "failures" shall *never* be told by throwing their deck of cards to eternity 318
 - their struggle to pass the "message" of nothingness to the world *includes*, alas, their personal agony to reduce to nothing even themselves!; what a misconceived purpose for laureates!; exposing the extent of the gratitude *they* feel towards the *Law* that keeps them alive, and the Law-giver Who respects their freedom to choose and blaspheme! 318
- Professors and speakers:
- they split words, and cut and kill consciences and only then also bodies 305-6
- Ptolemy, Claudius 163
- Ptolemy, Copernicus, Newton, Einstein and the relativists:
- reviewing and ~~refusing~~ to review old theories 195
- Punishment and retribution:
- the ancient Greek and the modern example 295
 - no accident that the Greeks did not allow lashing a citizen, and never established an executioner 295
 - see how Socrates was punished 295
- Purpose:
- through the Pythagorean imperative of "know thyself" [brought up to the context of the *entire* Uni-verse (since *we* alone, for all we know, *are its sole living and thus sensing it conscience*)] becoming a *universal* demand for Holiness of the entire Creation, the atheists *consciously* choose to reject 316-7
- Purposelessness and nihilism:
- "scientifically" introduced 15
- Quantum mechanics:
- and the variables hidden beneath 51
 - the step beyond relativity to total irrationality 50-1
- Quantum theory:
- founded on:
 - Planck's work on the black body radiation 231
 - Einstein's work on the photoelectric phenomenon 231
 - Rutherford's conception of the atom, contrary to the facts 231
 - Bohr's early quantum theory of the hydrogen atom, contrary to the facts 231
- Quantum theory, "new":
- objections to it 233 et seq.
 - the electron ionizes from an infinite radius of revolution of around the nucleus 233
 - the motion of electrons in the atom becomes an exactly unsolvable many-body problem that implies a defect of Nature 233-4
 - electron cloud "seen" in "probability space" 234
 - "orbitals" (probability density lobes) mostly limitedly spaced 234
 - electrons and trajectory analogies 234-5
 - quantum mechanics *refuse* to tell how the electron jumps from place to place [suggesting the Star Trek superior!] 235
 - supporting it, Heisenberg suggested treating the electron as a mere mathematical concept and introduced the "uncertainty principle", *thus misconstruing the least action law!* 235-6
- Quintessence:
- its *double* ancient meaning is now disdained! 128
- Rationalist cynic:
- judging "scientific" theories and developments 47, 49, 52-8, 59
- Reality:

- being rational *never* deceives
- and admits *definitive* answers 22
- includes human freedom 44
- its essential duality 292
- Reality and the mathematicians:
 - is the former intrinsically resolvable as a matter of its own ontology? or rather, the latter, be they even of the first class, subject to error? 285
 - the logical consequences of facing the dilemma 285
- Reason vs. Biblical Cosmogony 72
- Reasoning
 - and its ultimate consequences
 - and the **either/or** choice 69
 - and the objective evidence of the Laws out there 69
- Relativity
 - and determinism 49
 - and release from responsibility 50
 - introducing *absolute license* of force against Reason and Logos 50
- Relativity principles:
 - inseparable* the “scientific” and the philosophical (see also under Eddington, A. S., Einstein, A.) 143
- Relativity theory:
 - and the question of approximation but to *what*? 180
 - as a weapon of atheism 141
 - effort to present it a principle of invariance 143-44
 - General::
 - convenient, for all who fear the Absolute 168
 - faulty logic of **162 et seq.**
 - from its inception fails the test of global generality 168
 - how it becomes natural law has *not* been explained! 178
 - never* addressed the issue of the *real* effect of the entire universe on *every single photon* in it! 181
 - never* explained *how* the velocity of light is kept generally constant! 180
 - never* produced a *general* Law for the motion of light far or near heavy bodies, all the way to the limits of the Universe! 181
 - Special:
 - blunders and conspiracies 202
 - human failure typically passed on to Nature and to God 186
 - its conclusions desired before it was invented 186
 - some faults of classical determinism gradually realized 186
- the “*all is relative*” its unavoidable lemma 142
- undermining the Absolute* by the relative 144
- Religion:
 - has *not* held *high the Light*, nor illuminated *every* aspect of our lives, stating *solid* the Faith in Logos 21
 - yet sets the most important example 30
- Religion and Science::
 - facing the questions of the world, the former closer to the ground point of Logic 59
 - separate yet forming a unity, choose to stand opposing each other 60-1
- Religions:
 - they all had a physical, *not* a metaphysical start, and from that start must they all be examined 296
 - and the Law:
 - that supports the foundations first of physics and then of religion 296
- Religious leaders and the Word of God:
 - which hand wrote it best 325
- Responsibility moral and intellectual:
 - may *not* be separated, as it is either *altogether complete*, or else it simply does not exist 315
 - this truly *universal* vision of the world, for offending mortally the “establishment”, is *deliberately* being ignored and kept hidden by *both* “Churches” and “universities”! 315-6
- Resurrection of Christ:
 - had* to involve the change of the body, but *only in order to be seen by our material eyes!*; this does *not* mean that the body became Spirit, nor indeed the reverse!; when matter is nothing other than Democritean atoms [and Creation is the simplest *only if it involves them*, or in other words, the *finest by definition form of physical light*], His body did *not* experience a fundamental transformation of its true nature, but only of its apparent to us *form!*; the freedom of the Lord to do what He must, namely, *the best and noblest, was/is* thus fully preserved!; after Judgment, the Spirit goes *Its way*, and matter its own!; but as Judgment inevitably means the end of things as we know them

- now, what then becomes superfluous *cannot* be considered survivable! 335
- Richard J,
—provided the numerical dress to the ancient Epimenidean paradox, on which dress Gödel fashioned the “proof” of his theorems 279
- Rieseberg, Loren H. 312
- Russell, B. 188, 204
—and the question of “who created the Creator” 70
—attempted to prove (by general agreement *unsuccessfully!*) that $1 + 1 = 2$, forgetting the *definition* $2 = 1 + 1$ 285
- Russell, B. (logistic school) 277
- Rutherford-Bohr conception of the atom 241
- Sagan, C. 286, 316
“Saints”, “scientists”, “citizens”:
—*consciously* choosing to separate God from Logos, by canceling His Holy Objective, turning *It* into “business”!
—*their* one half keeps on “worshiping” Him, as the other keeps on profaning Him
—*both* at the expense of *every* foolish obedient buyer 341
—for *naked* power, the strongest all-controlling empire, the *empty* applause of worshipping ignoramuses believing mere glow-worms to be the “illuminati”; and last but certainly first, as *it* today buys the rest, for no other than *money!* 341
—*such* is today the “education” the “masses” receive, demanded by some to be had for free; forgetting the *eternal* “quid pro quo” 341-2
—consciously disdaining the Intellect-Logos, calling Him *nothing* 342
—just look at the “social upheaval” respect of Logos would cause! 342
—churches and their coffers: *not* for offering Glory and Thanks, but for favors and fear alone do they get packed 342
—haughtily ignore Heraclitus’, Socrates’ and Plato’s teaching regarding the Logos, calling Him the “Word”
—do please tell: what do the many today make of it? 342-3
—Justice (the system of)
—in utter need of the petty criminal, as for the great transgressors we have the independent commissions protecting their personal data 342
- Schiller, H. C. F. von 350
- Schwarzschild, K. 161
- Schwarzschild radius:
—here found applicable to the entire expanding *Uni*-verse 218
- Schrödinger, E. 239
- Schrödinger wave-function: 233
—deals *not* in real things but in *probabilities*, the verification of which is impossible 234
- Sciama, D. W. 183, 219
—on Eddington’s 1919 measurements 164
—on the uselessness of “soft” theories 165
- Science:
—a deadly “game” involving the good name and honor of scientists, the integrity of Nature, but also the integrity and honor of the Holy God Logos Himself 251
—does *not look deep* in the world, confines itself to producing theories 21
—done correctly *only together with correct* Philosophy and TheoLogy 90
—its current *unconfessed* practical method of “advancing” knowledge 196
—means absolutely nothing, if not *Complete* Knowledge 347
- Science and theology:
—*atheistically* separated 44
—mishandled by creationists and the pious 44
- Science and TheoLogy:
—answering whether their mixing is proper 288
—demand committing one’s very soul 22
—impasse only *apparent* 22
—spiritual essence: common and inalienably personal; such that all may offer the best they can 289
- “Science” and “Theology”:
—fight over man’s *misconceived* nature 36-7
- Science-related News Media:
—Press Release to, dated April 21, 1987, and how the world is *not* being informed 197-8
- Scientific Community:

- its reaction since 1985 to the inescapable hard facts under the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity 251
- Scientific examination *stops* at the physical universe 70
- Scientist:
 - cannot be serious while refusing to consider the cardinal fundamentals 348
- Scientist:: creationist, or atheist?:
 - only the former if truly objective is capable of completing his duty 253
 - the latter, scared of objectivity, does not see that the human body is most lay a *perfect* solution of the most complex known quantum-mechanical problem, that *cannot* be a constant product of chance 253
- Scientists:
 - their responsibilities while thinking through the consequences of existence and their actions 226
- Scientists and God 59
- “Scientists”:
 - *deliberately* keep on “confusing” mind and brain 260
- Scriptures:
 - of *men said* “inspired”, and words *not* pegged on Logos 21
 - questioned by such as Adam’s age, and the story of Babel 33-4
 - their fulfillment 326
 - given the imperfection of the human word, not even the Bible is capable of a TheoLogy superior to that *directly* written by God Himself in the heavens 326
 - God *cannot* have given us *two* contradictory TheoLogies 326
 - written as best it was possible still contain hidden blasphemies 33-4
- Separation of physical bodies:
 - along which path are they to be considered? 159
 - neglected by general relativity 161
- Sin:
 - enters Reality *solely by our choice* of action 44
- Sirens:
 - those who lure to the abyss, 286
- Socrates:
 - obedient* to Apollo only sought to cast God’s Light to the souls of men, to the point of teaching them even how to give up their lives as *free, erect/ correct, standing up* citizens believing in righteousness 270
- Socrates and Plato:
 - not* mystics but *Logicians* 62
 - show the point from which the search can continue 21
- Sophomore pride and the unseemly determination of proud old men to take to their graves the Truth they *cannot* shake 345
- Spacetime 100
- Spinoza, B. 260, 330
 - and the depersonification of God 141
- Spirit and matter:
 - ontologically distinct stay separate 292
 - the Lord’s Resurrection settled the matter for ever 292
 - the wonders following His Resurrection explained 292
- Spirit in the world:
 - only* in reference to the Spirit are we in God’s image and likeness! 331
 - that we *cannot* fail to recognize it in both humans *and* the *speaking* eyes, “voices” and behavior of the *trainable* animals: was also created, in addition to matter, *not of or from it* 331
 - thus, the part of it we see hidden in Nature’s Laws is indeed solely God’s own 331
- St. Andrew 28
- St. Augustine’s theory of “just war” now advanced to the stage of “preventive” war 42
- St. Luke 28
- St. Paul 28, 33
- St. Peter 26, 27, 28
- Statistics of order and the Planck time interval 110
- Stern, K. 163 (also on p. 126)
- Tact, tactlessness, curiosity and Faith in *Rationality and Meaningfulness* on the ledge above the abyss 24-5
- Tarski, A. 276 et seq., 286, 288
- Tarski’s theorem discussed:
 - searching for Truth is hard, but *not* hopeless
 - the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity of the world based on the Most Elegant Design is *not* shaken 286
- Teaching and “conferencing” more coldly examined 308
- Teaching of “Science” and “Religion” in the *current practical real* way and

- profiting from it 308-10-
 —and “believing” in God told to serve *Us!* 310
 —how the debate is staged up 310-1
- Telescopes and microscopes:
 —the former tell of the *seeming disorganized yet needed brute power* of heavenly Fire
 —the latter tell of the far greater glory of *that same Firepower by Law brought under total control in the meticulously organized universe within us!*
- those observing through them:
 —globally uncultivated peasants failing to see themselves as such universes,
 —ignoring cavalierly the hard physical fact that they themselves are celestial bodies of otherwise untold beauty and thus *necessarily also* of primordially set purpose 316
- “Theologians”,
ignorant of their ignorance of the true state of matter, speak of the resurrection of physical bodies (though only somehow “transformed”) in a way that smacks of *delayed* transmigration, a varied but *still old Asiatic* belief! this *cannot* be a *Christian doctrine* of afterlife! 334
- transmigration and Transfiguration:
 —the latter, a uniquely *Christian* term, still not understood fully, is passing into another state, *unknown* to humans, described in human words *uncertain* of their suitability for use in the description! **334 et seq.**
 —the resurrected, being transfigured, *shed* their previous physical nature and are altered into a *new, no longer physical* nature!: the Lord spoke only of the Kingdom of God being *at hand, immediate, no longer to be awaited!* His Suffering and Resurrection, His body turning to light and His Spirit separating from Its *temporary* fleshy home, truly were the *ultimate* Transfiguration! 334
- “Theologians” and “creationists”
 —despite claims of respect for the biblical text, still do *not* take in its *full* weight that “in the beginning was the *Logos*”, *not* what *they* misunderstand as the “Word” 325
- Theological Dualism:
 —ancient Western Asian, only later manifested as Manichaeism 291
 —temptation in the light of Logos 291
- TheoLogical reasoning:
 —and the religious authorities’ reliance on *external* thinkers interested in *other* matters 82-3
 —its state today 82
- “Theology”:
 —at best a collection of men’s *opinions* 88
 —*commercial*, and where it leads **84**
- TheoLogY
 —of the Greeks:
 —*falsely* called “idolatrous” 348
 tells of the Lord as HE IS! 88
- Theoretical arithmetic **276 at seq.**
 —and the *unsuccessful* formal twentieth century study of its foundations 277
 —due to our *still incomplete* understanding of the *quantitative mental* nature of numbers and our *faulty* appraisal of them within the far wider qualitative universe of the mind, and of how qualities and quantities relate rationally 277
- human axioms *cannot* in themselves examine their own veracity 278
 —but this does *not* assert that Truth and falsehood cannot be told apart 278
 —the faultless proof comes from the *entire* universe of facts, in which *no instance* can be cited as contradicting it, that relates to Plato’s warning about consequences of statements made 278
- precise formal language means no other than a *human* axiomatic formalism 278
 —necessarily uses clearly non-arithmetical connective particles 277
- Theories:
 —and their acceptance 97
 —*invented, not* discovered 163
 —*not* better than their assumptions and our wasted efforts 65 et seq.
- Theories of science:
 —how they get started and are being manhandled 111
 —ignore the true meaning of *universe* 111
- Theories, principles and hypotheses:
 —“science” today rejects their proper consideration 199

- Theorists and claims of “proof” 52-3
- Theory of evolution:
 (see also under Evolution)
 —and the cultural milieu 123
 —and the real world 111 et seq.
 —Divine Economy and the Purpose of Creation 106 et seq.
 —if correct, the fossil record *is* the record mostly of failures! 121
 —looks more like a façade of *licensed viciously operating immorality!* 122
 —stigmatized by materialist atheism 106 et seq.
 —understood as it only *can* stand, yet taught and practiced as a lever of social demolition 124
- Theory of quantum mechanics:
 —a most peculiar collection of *fundamentally illogical* ideas 227
 —and the *deeper issues* of existence and Logic 224
 —and the particles of matter:
 —the question of their mass and size is *not* discussed 230
 —does *not* connect the Planck Law of Least Action to the “principle of uncertainty” 227
 —*no* link to the ancient Democritean atomic theory, the *first* quantum theory 224
 —problems of and their resolution **224 et seq.**
- Thermal death 93
- Thermodynamics:
 —*axiomatic*, *not* necessarily true 94
- Thermodynamics and cosmology:
 —not yet united 93
- Time:
 —its quantization logically unacceptable 227
 —its reversal and current theories of past states of the universe 102-3
 —physical and psychological 95 f/n.
- Tomlin, E. W. F.:
 —scathingly criticizes evolution 125-6
 —touches on “thematism” and its source 126
- Total Love:
 —without Total Logos in Total Control *is* the Most Dangerous Total Passion, exactly for the fact that it dresses as the Highest Virtue! 298
- Traditionalist refusing to deliver his valued old ideas to the fresh air is *no* good! 345
- Truth:
 —commitment to it of the “scientific” and “religious” authorities:
 —the Reader is asked to judge 221
 —fearing nothing contains no mystery! 351
 —has not here been either invented nor even “discover”, only uncovered 352
 —is that the Spirit *is* Master and shall resolve all matters according to Logos that is one with Justice and Love; since it is just to love only the lovable and worth loving only the just, that are *solely spiritual* matters 292-3
 —and we blaspheme ignoring the now *hard* evidence 292-3
- Truth and falsehood:
 —and the state of ethics and morality **85**
 —by way of “unfalsifiability”, *are* in effect declared co-equal! 91
 —the Churches, now (im)properly scared of the consequences, attempt further to distance themselves from Science proper, in order to salvage what faith in God still remains in prelates and faithful, and do *not* in humility face the problem squarely, for its being a *direct* attack against God (secretly the more so in the form of the Gödel and Tarski theorems, that, by undermining arithmetic, the foundation of all exact sciences, cast doubt on Logos, that is *both* the very nature of God *and* the intellectual tool by which *He* created the world) 279
 —their *conscious* blurring prevents the world from keeping Faith and Knowledge *intact and together*, and from clearing them both from *all* that in each of them is untrue 279
 —their distinction blurred by the modern *pseudoscientific* findings, which are solely due to the separation of Science from Religion 279
 —their ultimate stages **85**
- Turing, A. M. 278
- Ultimate blasphemy:
 —every effort suggesting that God is *il*Logical, *un*Just and *un*Loving 293
 —some current forms of it 293
- Ultimate Holiness *is* the Ultimate Objectivity 273
 —and the shame of all three monotheistic religions and all who pour acid and poison rather than balsam to

- our common wounds 273-4
- Uncertainty:
- due to the oscillatory nature of the electron, relates only to prediction of direction and velocity of particles flying off after an atomic or subatomic) collision 247-8
- Uncertainty principle
- and associated *real* practical concerns 236
 - and the refusal to explain how uncertainty, if it be true, brought about the certainty of the believed uncertainty principle! 237-8
 - (said to) forbid hidden variables and all laws controlling them 51
 - the ancient reason for rejecting the existence of certainty 238
- Unfalsifiability:
- and the absence of “faith” 86
 - and the pride of its practitioners 87
 - notion and origin of 82 et seq.
 - of all faiths:
 - atheistically inculcated and the damage done 87
 - “Unfalsifiable” beliefs:
 - stuck to for their being believed safe from disproof 83
- Universal expansion:
- and the law of conservation of (instantaneous) momentum 215-6
 - establishes a natural preferred frame of reference 216
 - is no longer mysterious 215
 - its deceleration is no other than the deceleration of the velocity of the first light 217
 - mandated by Newton’s law and verified by Hubble 215
 - refers solely to the *volume* of the universe, *not* to space! 215
 - requires the existence of a *static* center 216
 - too fundamental not to be treated as fundamental in any theory claiming universality 183
- Universal gravitational constant:
- its true nature 212 et seq.
 - relates to universal mass density and to time (the age of the universe) 212 et seq.
- Universe:
- a “thematic:” composition of Democritean atoms 126
 - its expansion per Hubble due to its structure 206
 - under Law, and the *constrained* way the professors examine it 125
- able to deliver its exact reaction to/at an exact address 229
 - different the ways of looking at it 209-10
 - the engineer’s view of it and its Laws 210
 - expands in agreement with the law of gravitation under constant G and M 214-5
 - expressions of its properties and current values 217
 - expression of its radius 217
 - how the Newton and Hubble laws coming together 211, 219
 - so says the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity 219
 - ignores *no* fact and *no* “detail” 111
 - its laws allow testing the hypothesis of a young earth 220
 - its size and our obligations as thinkers 263-4
 - are we to act as *citizens* of the universe or just as *peasants* ensconced in a yet smaller and narrower valley? 263-4
 - only *peasants*, moles and ants think narrowly of themselves 264
 - its static and dynamical features 210
 - its total mass found to be constant 214
 - of one and of many kinds of fundamental particles 224-7
 - of one and of many kinds of fundamental particles 224-7
 - Simplicity, Economy, Logic demand that it be the least that can serve its objective 264
 - the power of the findings cannot be refuted 220-1
 - where the least and the most come together under Law 212
 - with the *sufficient* command given, it proceeded according to Plan 220
- Value of Person and belief in God 84
- Vectors in space 188
- Velocity of light relative to observers 154-5
- Voltaire, (F. M. Arouet) 211
- Wars and their succession:
- all in pursuit of profit
 - the victor’s final bluff and how he,

- too, was caught in it 339
- We and the universe:
- we still need to comprehend our position: none than us more intelligent; from none in it do we expect any help; yet masters of it are we not! 337
 - we still must learn our lessons;
 - even from our animals 337-8
 - cats being proud animals do turn their backs, but surely we *can* reason better than they! yet, we *all* still have *not* learned the lesson! 338
 - caught up between Fluffy and God, are forced to consider how seriously He cannot but have taken it upon Himself *not* to prove lesser than we *would* think of Him seeing Him standing on the uppermost rung of Perfection! 338
- Weinberg, S. 15, 20, 198, 286
- admits an irreducible mystery that science will not eliminate as it cannot answer the “why?” 264
 - does *not* see that even Nature’s Laws *do* have a purpose relating to that “why?” 264
 - does not see that the only answer that surpasses all subjectivity is : “but for the sake of *Holiness*, *both* God’s *and* ours!”, being the extreme opposite of the *nihilism* he prefers *but is ever so careful as never to mention*, hiding behind the innocent-looking general atheistic assertion that “God does not exist; therefore, life is utterly meaningless” 269
 - and the atheists gambling maniacally on the very next Planck chronide 263
 - and the relations of Christians and Jews during the centuries 267-8
 - asking “what other standards can we use?” 267
 - but certainly *not* ours! 268
 - how little children teach 268-9
 - attacks God for the desire of men who by *blasphemous misconceptions said to be Holy Writ* attempt to maintain their grip on society, rather than solely advance the Cause of the Holy God; and fails to see that even vicious men think of God as of themselves 266-7
 - chooses to mention playwrights (Aeschylus and Euripides) and forgets the attack of Meletus against. Socrates 270
 - calls upon *dubious* past witnesses such as ancient playwrights in support of his thesis, but *forgets* the attack of Meletus against. Socrates 270
 - cannot* bring just one citation from Socrates, Plato or Aristotle stating the nonexistence of God 270
 - and forgets how Jesus Christ filled Palestine with *benevolent* miracles (*not* the *malevolent* miracles he concedes would be persuasive!), continuing to state that “there are no signs of benevolence that might have shown the hand of a designer” 270
 - does *not* attempt to define life quantum-mechanically but takes refuge behind “evolution” 265
 - does *not* examine the *common* quantum-mechanical significance of *low-grade* “inorganic” and high-grade “organic” matter, but attributes the former to a craftsman and the latter to “evolution”! 264-5
 - does *not* discuss how Law obtains in Nature **198 et seq.**
 - does *not* state whether he regards life beneficial 271
 - guesses that the hand of a designer should be in the fundamental principles, yet does *not* see that the Ultimate Simplicity of the Most Elegant Design demands *one only* force, operating under *the* Perfect Quantum Law on a *one only kind of fundamental Democritean particles* combining to bring about *all* “solutions”, *including* the human body! 265
 - his *supposedly* “reasoned” atheistic views examined **258 et seq.**
 - in discussing a Designer Universe, he calls “impersonal” laws that *are clearly products of mental processes* 261
 - rather than arguing from the data and the beginning, *he just supposes* 259, 261
 - and most tellingly, he does *not* undertake a very much sounder calculation of probabilities **261-3**
 - is asked to state:

- whether Holiness, including that of Christ, is nothing; while the million coming with the reward is something!; and
- whether Holiness *could* sprout better than in Hitler's concentration camps! 273
 - if it did not, was Hitler truly responsible, whom Weinberg correctly attacks for his crimes, though *conveniently* forgetting that he does so on God-pegged morality, without which, there can be *neither* immorality nor *any* crime? 273
 - and if the concentration camps produced just one only Saint, will Weinberg, the nihilist, dismiss him on grounds of too much waste in the midst of "meaninglessness"? 273
- is obviously incapable of the honesty and objectivity we need 271
- and offers himself as example of subjectivity:
 - dismissing belief in a God *he* supposes to demand blood, yet *is willing to believe in Him* were He to strike him down in retaliation for his unbelief! 266
- not* realizing that he thus offers obeisance to a God *publicly proving Himself evil*, even as he despises Him for being such, thus in context confessing that he does *not really* reject a *cruel* God, but *thinks* he produces a reasoned argument for refusing belief in a *Kind* God [the one self-offered *in Person*], Who would *not* be *Kind* unless He *also* dispensed *Perfect* Justice! 266
- sees nothing more about the human mind than about the weather 260-1
 - thus *forfeiting* the right of *all* Nobel laureates to the prize, that *must* be awarded to the "weather" for feeding the billions, that all Nobel laureates put together have *not* done! 260-1
 - would* be satisfied to find the "book of rules"; doubtless the more so the thinner the book, but does *not* say Who could have written it! 265
- Weinberg, Hawking and Co.:
 - attempt to devise a scheme of eliminating God, *without first proving eternal* the universe! 226
- Weyl, H. 283
 - discusses dubiously Gödelization" by means of $1 + x \neq y$ 283
- Wisdom:
 - questioned when based on axioms 96-7
- World History:
 - common possession of us all
 - we do not treat it with the utmost respect! 303
- World state and its connection to Ideas 11
- Young, T. 100

+

+

FALSEHOODS

389

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

+

+

THE FALL OF FALSEHOODS

BY: GEORGE P. STAVROPOULOS

The double Chinese wish (or is it a curse?) “may you live in interesting times!” and “ don’t wish it too much, or it may befall you!” seems to be particularly apt in this “era of globalization”, that we still treat as incorrigible peasants rather than as upstanding Citizens of the World! Otherwise, we would *not* have set aflame the globe in our *mad* pursuit of constant “development”. Nietzsche’s message of the *supposed* Death of God has *not* been well learned, or else *we would have assumed the full responsibilities* of the master! As nothing truly is farther from our minds, the accusation of incorrigible peasantry *cannot* be shaken!: Rather than assuming them, even some Nobel Laureates, purporting to guide us all, have undertaken to make us believe that all is for nothing, as all, though only to them, seems meaningless—except that is, the *fat* check that accompanies the reward; by spending which, they only fan even hotter the flames!!!

To them, as indeed to the most of us all, it means nothing that the Greeks called the World Κόσμον [meaning an “orderly and thus totally pleasing arrangement”] and Σύμπαν [meaning “all-inclusive”] while the Romans called it *Uni*-verse, “a single poem-story”, that uncouth peasants, used only to counting bushels and heads of cattle, think they can ignore!

It has all been the result of *rude* farmers who thought they could make the farm their own, *if* they put away the Heir! So much so that they proclaimed *themselves*, rather than *The One*, “fathers” and “shepherds”, that is to say sole owners of sheep and souls! Faced with that *blasphemous and faithless*, not just unseemly expropriation, those opposed to that sort of “cut to one’s own measure theology” cut their own, which they called “Science”! Fools fully equal to those others, they never understood that mathematics is a *pure product of mind*, not just of matter! Nor did they understand that ultimately, differential calculus *is useless* unless it integrates *correctly* the Σύμπαν and makes a Κόσμον and a *Uni*-verse of *all* that is.

This book exposes that double-faced blasphemy! What the Greeks and the Romans united, and the foundations they set, upon which later comers may add their well shaped bricks, may *not*, shall *not* be forgotten! The lesson of meaninglessness shall *not* pass! The usurpers shall seek their holes to hide from light! But from the heat coming up from beneath, ah, from that, *escape* they shall *not*!

As this is a book like no other ever written before, the Reader will find its General Index a particularly useful tool to help him obtain an introductory grasp of the *many* faces of the problem we call the “World”. How it all ties together, and how the falsehoods evaporate can only be gotten by a careful study of the body of the work, that during its writing never allowed forgetting, as Plato has amply warned us, the consequences of *every single* statement, almost of *every* word. No!: The claim of infallibility is *not* here made! *All* are welcome to do their best! The Truth is *not* afraid of every and *all* imaginable bisections! As long as they are guided not just by “Reason”, but by *Logos* Himself! Indeed, one can invent “reasons” aplenty! Only *Logos cannot* be invented! For HE alone IS! With Him, what here is set down can only become better still, all the more devastating of the falsehoods that for so long have been taught as “truths”!

The Reader is forewarned: He *must* be willing to re-examine his roots! His beliefs! His reasons! His hopes! To bisect all his set ideas, to reweave his mind, his heart, the very depths of his soul! The reading will *not* be easy! But it *shall* be rewarding! Because, despite all that so far has been thought as true but is not, despite all the teachings of falsehoods coming to us even, especially, from the highest chairs, there IS a tomorrow! And today, each of us has his last *opportunity* [not just his last *chance*, as this is *no* longer gambling!], to seed and reap the everlasting fruit of eternity! Reader! Use your time well! You sought to become master! By the standards fitting the masters shall you be judged! By the Master! None other!

ISBN: 978-960-85044-4-8

Price: