Philosophical Roast or (What I Think)

By Psychotic Logician

The following are simple observations I make in reference to certain religious, spiritual, and philosophical viewpoints that many people possess in the world. I possess a very limited understanding of many of these viewpoints and am merely going off what I do know about these existential standpoints. In this regard, I have fallen a long way short of what can be said about these viewpoints. What I intend to show is that if one possesses these certain world view’s, these are the consequences of what it means to hold these views. The paper is a mix of my roast of philosophical views, as well as a short introduction to my philosophy. I believe, in the sections in which I refer to my philosophical outlook on existence, that I have solved many of the problems of philosophy. At the very least I believe that I have shown how all existential problems, whatever they may be, can be solved. My main intention in writing this paper is to spread awareness to people and the world that real change can be enacted in the world if people simply exercise the freedom that they possess and don’t let their fundamental view of existence limit their understanding of truth and how reality is. The pen name I have chosen to represent myself in writing this paper (Psychotic Logician), stems from my mind state of mainly being mentally ill. Hence, the following is a simple take on reality, from a mentally ill point of view.

1 Why don’t they just have the final battle at somewhere other than Megiddo? Will everyone in the world be either on the Christ side or on the Antichrist’s side? How could the Megiddo place hold all the people that are supposed to be fighting each other? If it doesn’t have everyone present then what are the other believers in either the Christ or Antichrist side doing at that same time? If there are other places in which battle/war is taking place, will Jesus come along to the other areas of fighting and strike down the Antichrist’s followers and send them to hell? What if members of either world views are not doing anything (just sitting in their house)? When the battle at Megiddo is finished will the people who believed in Jesus, as well as the people who believed in Satan, immediately be transported to heaven or hell? What if a person who got the mark regretted it and then accepted Jesus as his savior?

1.1 THE MARK OF THE BEAST

Just forehead = Bible is false

Just right hand = Bible is false

Just left hand or left hand and forehead = Bible is false

No mark at all = Bible is false

1.2 The Bible says that the Antichrist will proclaim himself to be God at some specific location (the temple of God). What is so important about this specific place that he must say he is God their instead of at the many other locations he will be speaking at in the end times? All that the Antichrist must do is just not proclaim himself god at the specific location that the Bible says he will say it at, and instead at another location where he will speak or even every other location he speaks at except for the one he is supposedly prophesized to proclaim he is God at.

1.3 If a single person, either living on earth or an entity living in the spiritual world refuses to bow when in the presence of Jesus/not bow when Jesus commands them to, then the Bible’s claim as 100% true will immediately be refuted. The Bible says that even the people that are in hell will bow (according to a Christian). This makes no sense considering the alternative that could occur if the people in hell, or anyone else in existence for that matter would refuse to bow. This would mean that if you are someone burning in hell, and Jesus says that you must bow to him then there seems to be two possible scenarios that can occur: 1) the person in hell (or anyone being threatened with punishment that will happen to them if they don’t bow), bows to Jesus, thereby making the Bible still 100% true, and hence, keeping that person in hell for eternity. 2) the person in hell does not bow and hence, makes the Bible not 100% true and, at the very most, that person will still just have to spend eternity in hell. But what do they have to lose by not bowing? At the very least the Bible will be shown to be false, and hence, part of the Bible being disproven could very well mean that people don’t have to burn in hell anymore. This apparent flaw in the Bible’s truth value is especially made apparent if someone is being threatened by the Christian God saying that if you do not bow then you will go to hell. But if the person already knows that they are going to hell then whether they bow or not is a moot point, because if the person does not bow, then God’s word, the Bible, aka truth, will be shown to be incorrect, and hence, this would immediately cast doubt onto whatever the Christian God says. In other words: 1) bow = going to hell (almost definitely); 2) not bow = going to hell (highly doubtful). If someone refuses to bow and still goes to hell, then at the very least the Christian God will have been shown to not be 100% truth, and hence, not God.

1.4 A major event that has been prophesized in the Bible in relation to the end times is that a temple will be rebuilt. Two things become apparent in analyzing this prophecy. 1) if the temple has been destroyed/not complete for a very long time then why didn’t they just rebuild it immediately after it was first ruined? If people would have just gotten together hundreds (thousands?) of years ago and decided to rebuild it then, then the end times would have been shown to not be in 100% accordance with the facts because by the time the Antichrist were to rise, the temple would have already been complete. Christians, however, say that the fact that it has not been rebuilt yet is evidence of the end times because the end times are taking place currently (or very soon in the future, according to many Christians), and hence, there was a 0% chance that it could have been rebuilt up until the very near future with the rise of the Antichrist. This, however, can be shown to be flawed for the next apparent reason. 2) What is so important about the temple being rebuilt? Is anyone really going to be that upset that it will not get rebuilt? If so, then why are they just bringing this grievance that the temple must be rebuilt now instead of in the past? What is so different about the present time period that makes people want to rebuild the temple now, instead of in the past few decades at least? If the temple does not get rebuilt, then everything else in the end times prophecy could still come true, but it would have falsified. My main objection to this prophecy is that even if there exists a good reason why the temple must be rebuilt in the end times, this would be evidence for the Bible being true, and not against it, which is something that the antichrist may try and claim.

1.5 The final battle at Megiddo, supposedly, is supposed to be the climactic showdown between the Christ and Antichrist sides. It says in the Bible that the Christ side (Antichrist side to?) will fight with swords. Also there will be people riding horses in the final battle. Does this really sound like modern warfare that the Bible is describing? For example, swords vs machine guns, and horse’s vs tanks. If these battle weapons are going to be used in the final battle, then intuition tells us that there must have been a certain time and place in the end times that these weapons will have gone into effect. For example, modern warfare uses guns (and knives sometimes (which are different than swords)), tanks, bombs, and aircrafts. In primitive warfare, battles were fought with swords and people riding on horses. A person riding a horse on today’s battlefields would get shot down immediately. But if it is really true that there will be primitive weapons and primitive strategic warfare used in the final battle, then when exactly in the chronology of the end times prophecy taking place did swords and horses come into effect? Did it only start at the end times final battle, or were people fighting with these weapons for the last three and a half years of war leading up to the final battle?

1.6 There are two beings that are claiming to be God: Jesus (Christ) and Satan (Antichrist). The believers on each of these sides are fighting for the cause of the person who they believe is God. But if either one of these beings is really God, then why don’t they just end the battle/war immediately? Why do the authority figures on both sides of the conflict think the most rational way in which to solve the conflict between the two sides is through violence and evil (ex: killing)? If warfare and battle really is the only way to solve the conflict between the two sides, then that would mean (if either the Christ or the Antichrist is God) that neither of them can think of a more positive way to resolve the disagreement, and hence, really possess the same moral and ethical conduct in reference to its view of the opposing side. If it is true that the Christ side wins the final battle in the end, then why doesn’t Jesus just end the battle right away instead of having people die and kill other people? The same can be said about the Antichrist side in that if the Antichrist is God, then why doesn’t he just end the battle to begin with?

1.7 It says in the Bible that a person called the False Prophet will rise to fame and a position of influence in the world in the end times, much like the Antichrist. Apparently, the False Prophet’s job will be to get people to go along with what the Antichrist is saying. In order for people to trust in his judgement that the antichrist is the right person to follow, he will perform miracles and other supernatural phenomena. However, considering that the Antichrist is claiming to be God, what is so great about the powers that the False Prophet supposedly possesses in reference to the Antichrist? Couldn’t the antichrist do everything that the False Prophet can do, and much, much more? For example, if the False Prophet performs a miracle to the world to get people to go along with the Antichrist, couldn’t the Antichrist come along and do exactly what the False Prophet did, and much more, and hence, making the False Prophet’s powers obsolete? In order to get people to go along with what the Antichrist is saying, the False Prophet would have to show the world something that the Antichrist can’t, because if the False Prophet is getting followers for the Antichrist side, then there would be people who are only siding with the Antichrist side because of what the False Prophet has shown them, and not really what the Antichrist has shown them.

1.8 Many Christian’s believe that the archangel Michael will be in charge of commanding the Christ’s army in the end times battle (angel of war?). The question to ask is, is Michael’s command/leadership of the Christ’s side army more or less of a benefit for the Christ’s side army in reference to Jesus’s command and leadership? If Jesus is God then it is hard to imagine that Michael’s command is greater than his own. If this is the case, then Jesus, by leaving it up to Michael to command the army, is not really strategically doing the most that can be done to win the battle in the best/most rational way. However, if Michael is just receiving instructions from Jesus about how to win the battle, then it is not really less of a benefit for the Christ side in attempting to win the battle, but rather the same as Jesus commanding the army (because even Michael is under the command of Jesus).

1.9 The spread of the Bible’s teachings (the Bible, missionaries) are prohibited in some places in the world, like for example China. There are also in today’s world, primitive people’s that reside in remote places on earth, like for example, the Amazon rain forest. The Bible says that the end times will not happen until everyone in the world has heard of the word of God. This, however, seems highly unlikely to happen soon or ever, considering that if one single person (taking the Bible literally as saying *everyone*) does not hear about God’s word through the Bible, then the end times will not occur. But what this ultimately means is that Christian missionaries, if attempting to spread the Bible’s teachings to the people living in areas of the world that have never heard of the Bible, they are also themselves responsible for the end times prophecy coming true (if everyone in the world stopped being Christian (or Muslim for example) then those religions would be false).

1.10 In the end times prophecy of the rapture, it says that everyone who has accepted Jesus as their savior will be raptured up into heaven. Also, it says that children who have not yet matured to the point where they can understand the Bible and its teachings, will also be raptured up. This could very well be because they still possess a certain amount of innocence that would make it seem unjust for them to be left behind along with the people who have matured to a certain level of understanding (people that have knowingly rejected the Bible and its teachings). This brings up multiple questions: 1) What is the cut off age for someone to be raptured up? Is it not possible for a 9 year old to be just as innocent as a 4 year old? But if the 4 year old gets raptured up and the 9 year old does not, then what exactly is the standard by which someone is being judged as worthy of being in heaven? Would it really make sense that there must be a cut off age also when considering that a 9 year old (in some, maybe even a lot of cases) may be much more innocent then a 4 year old? If we take this argument further, then couldn’t it also be possible that an adult (for example someone with autism) may possess the same level of maturity and innocence that a child possesses? In the movie “Left Behind”, the rapture occurs and a pastor gets left behind (did not get raptured up). He says that the reason he gets left behind is because there is a difference between knowing something is true and believing something is true. Apparently he knew the Bible was true instead of believed it was true (having faith in it?) and hence, was not officially saved. But what exactly is the difference between knowledge and belief in reference to the Bible’s truth value? For example, take a 5 year old accepting Jesus as his savior vs a 30 year old accepting Jesus as his savior. Assuming that the 5 year old is more innocent and would have, if the rapture occurred, have been raptured up even if he did not accept Jesus (vs the 30 year old who would not have been raptured up if the rapture occurred), whose belief/knowledge of the Bible is more in alignment with how it should be properly viewed?

1.11 The Antichrist will rise to power and authority in the world through campaigning for peace. The peace on earth will then last for three and a half years and then war will break out across the world, breaking what the Antichrist promised. Although the Antichrist will bring peace on earth for three and a half years, is it not a sign of things to come in the world that he tries to make everyone get the mark? By doing this he is immediately putting side against side (people who follow him vs people who don’t). Wouldn’t people see that what appears to be peace is actually him alienating the world to either accord with his authority or not, and hence, set up an inevitable conflict between those who are for or against him? So, since he will break the peace treaty (governing between nations), why would the people who got the mark and were for him still follow him? He would have lied about the peace talks/agreement, and hence, would then be sending a new message to the world (his followers and non-followers), mainly, that the conflict/world situation cannot be solved by peace, but rather can only be solved by war. Furthermore, the Bible says that if one decides to get the mark of the beast, then they will go to hell. However, what if, when considering that the Antichrist is a liar and actually stands for war and not peace, someone who got the mark decided to accept Jesus as his savior and fight on the Christ side? Would the followers of Jesus on the Christ side accept him as a friend and ally?

1.12 Do the bodies of the people that have been cremated collect together again and form a body that goes to heaven? How are the bodies able be present in heaven, since heaven is spiritual and not physical? Will, once the end times happens, the angels that only existed in the spiritual, then get a physical body to live in the thousand year kingdom? Where is heaven now? Is it still where it has been for the first thousands (young earth creationists) or billions (old earth creationists) of years, or does it transfer to earth during the kingdom after the final battle?

1.13 What is mortal is not equivalent to what is immortal. Time is not equivalent to timelessness. Mortality with timelessness is a meaningless proposition, since, without time, everything is eternal. Mortality only exists in time, which, when seen through timelessness, describes nothing. Immortality, by not existing in time, is not referred to in time. Therefore, timelessness and immortality together are a fact, because without their existence, one cannot conceive of their opposites which do not exist, mainly, mortality and timelessness, and immortality and time.

1.14 People throughout history have claimed to know when the end times will occur and gather a following (obviously every time they have been wrong.).

1.15 Christians say that the Jews are God’s chosen people. But what exactly does this mean? Jesus was Jewish when he lived on earth, but is he still Jewish now? Jews don’t believe that Jesus is God. I watched a movie about the end times once and it showed the Antichrist speaking to a crowd of people. He said to the crowd that Jesus was not really the true messiah of the Jews (and hence not really God), and that, he (the Antichrist) is in fact the real messiah. This could be one potential way in which the Antichrist may try and play himself off to the world. If this happened, the Jews would then side with the Antichrist and go to hell, even though they are God’s chosen people. This also brings up a further point about how today’s world views possessed by people will react to the two sides of the conflict that are supposed to draw everyone together during the end times. First, is it a complete fact that everyone will either side with the Christ or Antichrist side? If someone refuses to get the mark, and thereby not side with the Antichrist, does this automatically make them a follower on the Christ side? What if they don’t want to get the mark, and also do not want to subscribe to the beliefs of the Christ side followers? Obviously, people who follow on either side of the conflict in the end times must admit that war and battle are the only way to resolve the conflict. What if a Buddhist, for example, does not think that the Christ or Antichrist sides are correct, and just wants to still practice Buddhism? Is that person then an enemy of the Christ or Antichrist side, just because he does not officially follow their practices and beliefs? In the most basic terms of what it comes down to in either siding with the Christ or Antichrist side is that they would both follow the same tenets of its authority figures, mainly, that you are either for them or against them (what Jesus said and probably what the Antichrist will say). Why is someone who is not doing anything to you (like a Buddhist who doesn’t want to side with the Christ or Antichrist side) automatically make them your enemy just because he doesn’t accept what you accept?

1.16 Christians (like a Christian I once knew not wanting to do Bible study with a Jewish kid) and other Christians (wearing a star of David necklace)) support/think Judaism is a good religion, when it actually practices different teachings (Christians: the God of the old testament is the same God as the God of the new testament. Jews: the God of the old testament is not the same God of the new testament.). Yes, Jesus was Jewish when he was alive on earth, but does it make sense to say that he is still Jewish? If he is Jewish then that would mean that he does believe that he is the Jewish messiah. This is clearly incorrect and so it would make more sense to say that he is now a Christian.

1.17 Christians view of heaven and eternity is measured in physical time (1,000 year kingdom on earth after the end times battle), rather than timelessness (eternal, never ending). But what would happen when the Sun (for example), died in the future (millions or billions of years)? Also what about the big crunch or the universe eventually cooling? Will the people that are living in the kingdom on earth after the end times live in buildings and houses on earth that are still standing after all the destruction that has occurred during the end times?

1.18 Cause and effect, as well as causality in general, can be shown to be illusions stemming from a flawed perception of one’s perception of experience. Subjective perception seems to indicate that when particle A, interacts with particle B, there exist two events. The first event 1, occurs when particle A hits particle B. The second event 2, occurs when particle B, after being hit by particle A at event 1, then reacts. This perception, however, stems from a major flaw. At the moment that particle A interacts with particle B, basic intuition seems to direct us to a further event, mainly, the event occurs at the exact moment in time when event 1 and event 2 occur. Assigning differing moments 1 and 2 occurring in space and time when particle A and particle B interact, fails to make the simple observation that if there was a difference in event moments 1 and 2, then this would mean that there would have to exist a third moment 3, lying between moment 1 and 2.

1.181 The reason this must be is because if there really was a difference between moment 1 and 2, then there must exist some lapse in time between when moment 1 occurs and moment 2 occurs. This not being the case, we can see that if there really is no difference between moment 1 and 2, then the interaction between particle A and particle B occurring at moment 3, must be simultaneous.

1.182 If cause and effect really are a simultaneous reaction in space time, then it would seem that a perception which occurs at the very same time as something else in the universe, transcends the space time boundaries which seem to govern perception, and rather operates through experiencing existence at a speed in which one perceives his or her experiences at the same time that they occur in space and time. This is because they observe existence at an equivalent rate in which existence actually occurs. In this perception, space and time no longer bound one’s perception (does not direct it to make it accord with it as a perception of cause and effect). Space, nor time, would inhibit one’s experiences to make it accord with the physical experiencing of a moment 1 and moment 2 distinction.

1.183 In a timeless perception, not governed by spacial laws, lies the door to complete freedom. To be present in the moment is a chance to experience a truer observation of existence.

1.19 Potentially: the Antichrist (as part of his deception to lead people into evil/untruth), says that the Bible actually either refers to himself (he is the messiah, not Jesus), or that the Bible, is complete deception (for example: it is actually Satan who wrote the Bible, and that it was him (dying on the cross, doing anything good, etc.) and the Bible (people who believe in it), are actually aligning with Satan.

1.20 What kind of life do angels have? Do they sleep, eat, drink, work, etc. Do they live in a Society comparable to American suburbia (what is the living situation, what are they doing on a time to time basis? What is in heaven? Is there buildings, etc.

1.21 If the Antichrist does exactly what the Bible says he will do (fulfills the Bible’s end times prophecy), then how exactly is he the one who is right? By fulfilling everything that the Bible says he will do, this is a testament to Jesus being right and not him (because everything he does accords with God’s word). If the Antichrist does everything that the Bible says he will do (and people see this), then the only thing that he can possibly tell people is that he will win the battle at Megiddo. But if this is true, then why doesn’t he just disprove the Bible earlier by doing a single thing in contradiction to what the Bible says (get mark on left hand, etc.)?

2 A main doctrine that Christians follow to back up their claim that homosexuality is a sin and that gay marriage should not be legal is their claim that there is no gay gene. But this makes no sense when you consider its opposite mainly, it makes no sense to talk about the existence of a gay gene, unless you say/know/think that there is a straight gene. A straight gene, just as a gay gene, has never been scientifically established. Wouldn’t it mean that in order to know whether or not being straight is natural and being gay is unnatural, there should be a gene in everyone’s DNA that is the same in reference to one’s sexual orientation? It makes no sense at all to say that there is no gay gene when there is no reference to a gene that makes someone straight or not, and hence, makes being gay not actually how the person is. If there really was a straight gene, then all one must do in order to find out whether or not someone is gay or not is to check the person’s genome (if this is even possible) to see whether or not they have that specific gene or not. If the gene is different from the straight gene, or the gene is absent from someone claiming to be gay, then that would mean that the person would be naturally not straight.

2.1 The antichrist will have "no regard for the desire of women". This must mean that he is either gay or asexual (will he make this apparent to everyone like it somehow matters? (will he have a boyfriend for example (be openly gay in public))).

2.2 Christians: homosexuality is a choice (why should it matter whether it’s a choice or not?) (The movie “Religulous”: these people (homosexuals) are really not complete in who they are.). Christian’s judge homosexuals as not being in accordance with the natural way in which God created humans. But what exactly is the difference in sexual attraction if someone really does honestly feel attracted to members of the same sex, in the exact same way that heterosexual people are honestly attracted to member of the opposite sex. Does the fact that how someone honestly judges how they perceive their sexual orientation to be in their subjectivity toward objectivity mean that they are not just referring to their own way of perceiving existence, but also a way that existence itself may be observed, and hence, one way in which reality really is in how it may present itself to oneself.

2.3 In reference to gay marriage, are these people really doing anything to you at all? Why should it matter what other people decide to do with their life that in no way directly affects you? If one has a problem with what other people do in their life, this enables a way in which anyone may say that they have a problem with what anyone does that is in contradiction to how they see the world. Just because one may think that gay marriage is immoral, doesn’t mean that it is, just because you are only referring to your own world view, with no reference at all to the perceptions and world views of others.

2.4 A Christian speaking in reference to homosexual behavior: “We cannot allow this perversion to exist in our society.” (Christian: God hates fags. “I don’t hate them, God hates them”. This is completely contradictory what the Bible says (the Bible says God loves everyone) Do, for example, straight people, do the same things that gay people do (anal sex, fisting, etc.)?

2.5 Homosexuality with animals (is it a choice as well?).

2.6 Christians believe that gay couples should not be allowed to raise and have children. This view, stems only from a preconceived notion that being gay is wrong to begin with, and not the fact that two people of the same sex can be just as good of parents as two people of the opposite sex. There is no evidence that same sex couples cannot be just as good of parents as heterosexual couples.

2.7 Is bisexuality and/or beastiality (some people really do find animals attractive) a choice? Does it make sense to say that you are naturally one way (straight), but also at the same time choose to become attracted to other things, as well as also be attracted to how you naturally feel?

2.8 Gender identity only refers to a physical form. A man may perceive that he is really a woman, yet this perception only refers to a nonphysical form of who they are. If they are referring to their nonphysical conscious self as being a different gender then their physical body, then why does this in any way relate to their physical gender? If a white person believes they are really black, then are they really black? How about a human who honestly believes he is a polar bear? Are they really a polar bear just because they think that is who they really are, in reference to their nonphysical body?

2.9 Many religious fundamentalists possess homophobia as well as a general viewpoint that being gay is wrong. For example: the Christian gay converters. If one wishes to convert a homosexual to heterosexuality, then this must mean that all the gay converter is doing is making the homosexual not to choose to be gay anymore. But if this is true then really the gay converter must also admit that the gay person must then choose to become heterosexual again. This makes no sense because the gay converter believes that it is being gay, not being heterosexual that is a choice.

3 Christian: “We must protect ourselves from God’s wrath” (so you are saying that the person who you believe in, trust in, and think is all good and perfect is someone you should protect yourself from?).

3.1 Fear is the product of the absence of one’s own self-denial of it. Salvation is the product of one’s of self-denial of fear. Therefore, salvation, by merely being the self-denial of the self-denial of itself, lies within.

3.2 Punishment (going to hell for not believing Jesus is God). Does God love people enough to go to hell for them? If so, why doesn’t he? The Christian God is not special in his love for humans to the point that he would die for them. Many, if not most people who love someone would die for the person that they love.

3.3 Why is it alright for God to kill people (like the flood, Sodom and Gomorrah), but it's not alright for people to kill?

3.4 In reference to God’s higher ways, Christians say something of the sort that, “it's like explaining to an ant how the internet works” (God's ways are much higher than ours). Response: maybe God’s ways are at most equal to ours (if you account for things your intuition tells you is fucked up).

3.5 The whole of anything that exists always occupies 100% of what it refers to. In no way does the whole refer to anything outside itself, since, as a rule, what exists outside itself is not contained within itself.

3.51 The part of a whole exists within the whole, such that it, along with other parts, makes up the complete whole. As a rule, a part may range in the makeup of a whole through occupying 1% or less of the whole, or 99% or more of the whole. This then means that in order for a whole to exist, there must exist at least two parts.

3.52 No matter how many parts exist within the whole, there must always exist a part of the whole which is contained within itself, as well as contained apart from the complete 100% makeup of the whole.

3.53 All the parts that makeup the whole must obey one simple rule: no matter how many parts exist in the makeup of the whole, if one single part, no matter how small it is in relation to the complete 100% makeup of the whole, contains the whole, then that part, within itself, completes the whole, in itself, and apart from itself. What this means is that there cannot exist a complete whole in existence, without the whole in some place occupying an existence within itself. This is seen through the fact that if the whole did not exist in a part or the parts of itself (the whole), then although the parts may make up 100% of the whole, the whole is still not complete in how it really is apart from the parts, because each part of the whole, together making up 100% of the whole, do not refer to anything outside of themselves, because apart from themselves, the whole is incomplete.

3.54 In reference to any part that may exist that makes up the whole, the 100% whole only refers to itself as a part of not just the other parts, but also the whole itself. This is why the whole, in itself, is a part making up itself. It makes no sense to say that the whole is merely a product of the parts alone making it up without any internal reference to itself, because if the whole did not exist within the parts making it up, as well as lie outside the parts that make it up and thereby possess a complete part that is just itself as a whole separate from the parts, then this would mean that the parts exist separate from the whole. But if the parts exist separate from the whole, then that would mean that the parts in no way relate to the complete part that ultimately makes up the 100% whole. The parts would only relate to the other parts that alongside it make up the whole. They would have no reference to the part that is the whole, making up the whole, and existing apart from the parts making up the whole. The following is a guideline to show the existence of the whole being made up of the parts, as well as the whole existing within the parts that make it up.

3.55 100% whole: the parts making up the whole together entail the existence of a part which is the whole, within the whole, mainly, the 100% whole part, which is made up by the parts lying within it, and hence, is a part made up of the other parts that lie within it.

3.551 1% – 99% parts: every part that exists within the whole can be reorganized into different parts that make up the same whole. For example, if one part makes up 31% of the whole, and another part makes up 10% of the whole, instead of the two parts existing separately together making up the whole, the parts can be reorganized such that a part may now be 41%, and exist as a single part. This reorganization can occur with all parts in the whole, such that the 31% can be combined with half of the 10% part of the whole, such that a part making up 36% exists. This is why the whole exists in the parts of the whole (what make it up), because the parts may be reorganized in such a way that any part that may exist within the whole, does exist within the whole. The only way that this is possible is if the whole existed within the parts, enabling the parts to possess a reference to what it is attempting to describe (make up).

3.552 Whole within parts: every possible part that exists in the whole can only exist because of its reference to what it is made up by. This reference must exist within itself, because its reference to what exists apart from itself, mainly, the other parts, are made up by different references to the other parts existing within the whole. If the whole did not exist within the parts, then it would be impossible for the parts to refer to what the complete whole is, since it would have no reference to other parts, due to the fact that the parts are made up of other parts that contain parts of the part, potentially being anything less than 100%.

3.553 Parts within whole: the parts that make up the whole, themselves, are wholes that are contained, through its reference to the other parts, within the complete whole. Any existing part made up of certain percentages which make up the whole, also, along with the other parts, are wholes existing apart from the other parts (which are also wholes if they exist independently of each other, and are only being described in relation to the other whole parts), and parts of a whole existing as a part of the other whole parts.

3.554 Whole within whole: the reason that there must exist a 100% whole that exists independently as a part of the complete whole, is because the 100% whole, just like all the parts that make it up, is a part made up of all percentages in which the parts 1%-99% can be related together within the complete whole. Therefore, the 100% whole is merely a part that is made up of all the other parts, thereby making itself a part of the whole. What this means is that since the 100% whole is a part, as well as a completed description of all parts that lie within itself, it is not only made up of all 100% of parts that lie within itself, but also lies within all the other parts making it up, because as a completed whole making up everything within itself, it also lies within all parts, since they are made up of it.

3.56 From here we can elucidate the resolution of the paradoxes which arise through a misunderstanding of how the parts and whole of some existing thing interact, through showing how they are contained, both through themselves, and within themselves. Both the liar paradox and Russell’s paradox suffer from the same misinterpretation of what it means for a part of something to contain itself, in reference to what it is contained within. If a 100% whole does not contain itself, then that would mean that it really is not the complete whole, apart from the parts that make it up. The complete whole, lying apart from the 100% whole part, is merely the makeup of itself independent of any part, and the makeup of itself through its parts, including the 100% whole part. The paradoxes stem from a misunderstanding of what is being referred to by what is supposedly contained within itself, and what is contained within the parts making it up. In Russell’s paradox, the misunderstanding stems from the failure to provide any distinction between the 100% whole and the complete whole. If we make no distinction between the 100% whole and the complete whole, then we can see that the 100% whole, unlike the complete whole, only refers to itself through the parts that make it up, and hence, just like the parts making it up, has no reference to its own part being contained within all the parts making it up. Only after realizing that the 100% whole, by not only containing the other parts within itself, also contains itself, through its own part within itself (thereby making it different from the complete whole (100% whole is a part making up all of the whole; complete whole is a whole making up the parts within the whole as well as the 100% whole)), we then see that what is really being referred to is the parts of the whole of the whole. What this means is that if no distinction is made between the parts making up the 100% whole, and the complete whole itself, which lies within the parts making up the 100% whole, then one is proposing an equivalent definition (saying two things are actually equal (the same thing) when really they are not) for both wholes. The paradox becomes resolved once a distinction is made between something that makes up a whole (a part that is the whole) is contained within itself (the complete whole), which also makes up the whole within the whole. In reference to the liar paradox, we see that the paradox becomes resolved once a correction has been made to what the false in “this sentence is false”, refers to outside of itself. In reference to what lies outside of itself that is determining the truth value of what the sentence is claiming, the truth value is claimed to be contained within the sentence that it is describing, rather than describing itself within the sentence, and apart from it.

3.57 From here, all paradoxes, especially one’s stemming from a misunderstanding of language and what is being semantically referred to in existence, becomes obsolete.

3.6 Many people have near death experiences and come into contact with the asshole, angry god who gets pissed at people for living sinful lives. There are different God’s that people come into contract with. If all the God’s that people come into contact with in the NDE’s are the same, then why don’t they act the same way (possess different qualities in reference to each other)? Why do people who have near death experiences not perceive/see the same things (they see different versions of heaven or angel’s having differing qualities (the angel’s having wings is supposedly in contradiction to the Bible (according to Christian’s)), about how the afterlife and spiritual life is?

3.7 Some Christian’s claim that hell is at the center of the earth. (Ken Ham/Young earth creationists response: “how do the fires of hell interact with the people in the spiritual realm?”) If hell is not physical then would that mean that the hell fires exist in the spiritual realm also? Also, do the fires of hell get transferred after the end times happens to being physical and not spiritual? If hell was and remains physical, then wouldn’t the people who went to hell, also have their physical body taken their, just like the Christian bodies that get taken up to heaven during the rapture?

3.8 “Sinners in the hands of an angry God” (believing in God for fear of punishment instead of for love). Christians believe that there are eternal consequences for a person’s actions on earth in their lifetime. Many say that if you disobey God’s laws, then he will punish you. Hence, a chief motivating factor that makes Christians be more in accordance with God’s commandments is that God will get upset and then act out in a vengeful way towards the world. People want to protect themselves from God lashing out at them, and so become better Christians, not because they possess a sense of love and joy in reference to God, but rather because they do not want to be punished.

3.9 Christian’s: God does not put people in hell, it’s people separating themselves from God (but how does God’s plan fit into the picture?).

3.10 Is there light in Hell (the hell fires)? The Bible says God is light. If it is in fact true that the bodies of the people who are in hell do not turn into ash and erode away, then will there even be marks of burns on the people who are in the fires of hell? This could be the case in the spiritual realm, however, what about the physical bodies that exist in hell in the end times?

3.11 Christian: no imperfect thing could be in God’s sight. But what about when he was on earth (enemy territory) and lived among sinners?

3.12 WWJD (what would Jesus do): New Testament Jesus (love your neighbor as yourself, love your enemies, etc.). Old testament Jesus: wrath, punishment, fury, jealous, anger at the evil in the world (such that he acts with vengeance and in violent way).

3.13 The Bible says that most people will not make it to heaven and that there will be much more people in hell for eternity. If the Christian God knew that more negativity would be in existence when he created the universe then positivity, then why would he even create the world?

4 Atheists and skeptics claim that demon possession is just mental illness. They say that this is the most rational explanation for the people that are supposedly possessed. What makes no sense about this claim is that there is just as much evidence for this belief, then in the belief that it is a true phenomenon. A good argument for the belief that demon possession is a real phenomenon that has a real spiritual connection can be made that it is in many ways far more rational then the atheist viewpoint on the matter. For example, if demon possession really were just mental illness, then why is that once the exorcism has been completed the mental illness immediately goes away and the person that was so called possessed returns back to their normal self? If demon possession were really just a mental illness, then why would the person performing the exorcism be able to influence the person’s mind and essentially change the brain’s chemistry to completely cure the person? Furthermore, why does an exorcism cure not just one person, by many people worldwide (tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, if not millions)? Along with this fact that it seems highly unlikely that all these people are just suffering from mental illness and nothing else, there are other facts that seem to cast doubt on the atheists and skeptics explanations of demon possession. The movie, “The Exorcist”, as far as its depiction of the physical difference that people have when supposedly possessed by a demon, is not complete fiction. I heard a story from some woman who had to perform an exorcism on some girl. She said that she looked into the girls eyes and saw, “pure evil”. Just like in the previous case I discussed about the mental illness immediately going away, why does the physical abnormalities also immediately go away once the exorcism has been completed? Furthermore, there have been several (among potentially a lot) reports that I have heard in which the person who was possessed was speaking in fluent Latin to the people performing the exorcism. Latin, of course, being a language that the person who is supposedly just mentally ill has never heard before. Also, there have been reports of exorcisms in which the person’s body that is possessed levitates off the ground. These are a few reports of among many others showing how supernatural phenomenon exists in reference to a person who is either possessed or just mentally ill. All the atheist or skeptic can respond to the evidence just presented is that the people are either just making it up (lying for attention), or that they can’t explain it. This, however, seems much less rational then a belief in the supernatural phenomenon of demon possession.

4.1 "There is no evidence that near death experiences are anything more than hallucinations" Response: then why do some people report experiences that show evidence for disembodied consciousness (for example: floating into other rooms and hearing conversations which they report back to their friends with complete accuracy?" AND/OR for example: the book, “Proof of Heaven”. The author says that the person who guided him through the afterlife was his unborn brother or sister (someone he had never seen before).

4.2 The nonphysical spiritual existence in reality, if it exists, has its limit set through its interaction with the physical, materialistic world. If the spiritual realm existed first and exists in a timeless space within existence, then with the coming to existence of the physical world, especially the creation of time, changed the spiritual realms eternal standing, because the of the interaction existing between the physical and nonphysical. This is seen through the fact that the nonphysical spiritual realm, existing apart from the physical, must obey what exists within itself, mainly the physical world, because if it did not, then that would mean that the two in no way contradict one another. The physical not only sets the limitation through how the spiritual realm may be understood as existing in time, but also limits itself.

4.21 If we conceive of the interaction that takes place between materialism and spiritualism, one can see that the limitation within the spiritual world is a direct result of the fact that the material world exists in time, and the spiritual world, supposed to exist in timelessness, becomes what it is not in its truest form, mainly, eternal and unchanging.

4.3 Atheist’s say that if everyone were Atheist then the world would be a much better place without religion. Response: but wouldn’t the world be just as good a place if everyone believed in the same thing of whatever?

4.4 Some Atheists wanted to call themselves “The Bright’s” (Dan Dennett). Atheists and Christians are equally as arrogant (for example: Sam Harries said in “The Four Horsemen” that in response to people of religious belief that you “wasted your life”). Many, if not most Christian’s call atheists arrogant. This, however, makes no sense because of the fact that since they are calling the atheists arrogant then this means that they themselves possess a belief that makes them think that their viewpoint is less fundamental then the atheists. But by the very fact that they call the atheists arrogant means that their own belief is more fundamental, because they are judging the atheists belief from a standpoint that they claim is a higher, truer world view to possess. Therefore, anytime someone judges someone else as being arrogant in their world view, they are being just as arrogant because they are essentially claiming to know more about that person’s viewpoint in reference to its own. Christian’s and atheists, in this regard, are equally arrogant and fundamental in their world views.

4.5 There is a major flaw in the liberal stance on abortion. Ex: Joe Biden’s view. Many liberals claim that they do not want to push their beliefs onto people, and hence, they support a women’s right to choose. But what does this really mean? What they are essentially saying is that they believe abortion is wrong yet they do not want to push their belief onto others. So you are saying that you think abortion is murder but it is ok for others to do it? Also, the fact that some Christian’s have bombed abortion clinics just goes to show that they themselves possess just as low a view of the difference between right and wrong as the people that they judge as murdering unborn babies.

4.6 I read a NDE experience where a guy said that he saw at least 80 new colors in the spiritual world that were not in the physical world. Also, I have a friend who said that when he tripped LSD, he saw colors that were not in the physical world. The materialists claim that the physical world is the only reality and that there does not exist any phenomena in existence that does not exist in the physical world. The only response that the materialist can say in response to this claim of the people who have seen phenomenon that are in the spiritual realm and not in the physical realm are that these people are just lying. But what if they are not?

4.7 Big foot, lockness monster, moth man, chupacabra etc. There is video camera evidence and thousands (at least) of personal experiences/encounters with creatures. If the various evidence that has been presented showing the possibilities that some of these creatures exist are not authentic, then this would raise more questions as to the validity of eyewitness encounters, then it would raise if the evidence was authentic.

4.8 New age type beliefs about reality (“The Secret”, or, “What the Bleep do we Know?”), use, for example, quantum physics to justify their belief in how the mind/consciousness interacts with the physical world. Atheist deny/don’t think this is how the world works. However, it seems that the new age type world view is more in alignment with a scientific understanding of the world, since it at least comes up with a theory as to how consciousness operates.

4.9 Atheists claim that when you die (the biological brain stops) that is the end of your existence (no afterlife). They claim this is the most rational understanding of the world (but then they admit that they don’t know shit about consciousness and how it works).

4.10 Skeptics claim that the only knowledge that a person can possess about existence has to come from at least one of the five senses that people have. They deny that there exists a sixth sense in which you can gain knowledge about existence. They use Descartes famous quote, “I think, therefore I am” as a way to show that the only thing you can know for sure is that you yourself exists. The underlying flaw in this view of reality is that it misses the obvious point that Descartes quote itself relies on none of the five senses to obtain its certainty (pure thought/intellect). If this is the case, then this means that true knowledge about existence comes from a perception of reality that does in fact rely on none of the five senses like the skeptics claim people don’t possess (because they are saying that knowledge gained from any of the five senses can be doubted). Hence, there must exist a sixth sense to ones perception of reality, which, by itself, can be intuitively shown to be logically sound.

4.11 Mathematics only refers to something that exists. Pure logic, however, refers to everything that exists. Pure logic makes no reference to nonexistence, since, by definition, nonexistence doesn’t exist. In mathematics, nonexistence exists (the existence of the number zero). Therefore, if there exists multiple dimensions to reality, then pure logic takes precedence over mathematics.

4.12 Formal logic is the deduction of certain propositions about existing objects to accord with a valid form. In this regard, it is just like mathematics in that it only relates certain existing objects to other objects, without reference to the object’s existence within itself (how it truly is, and how the other objects truly are in themselves). Abstraction on the other hand, deals with metaphysical object’s which are related together through reference to the other object’s objectivity.

4.121 The thing in itself, existing in a timeless world where only one possessing pure awareness can perceive, is not, as some may think, incapable of being perceived. Through abstraction, by deducing particular to particular, possesses the ultimate goal of reaching how objects really are in themselves. Formal logic on the other hand, by only dealing with the objects relationship between oneself and another objective proposition, cannot make the same claim to the observation of pure awareness of an object.

4.122 In short, abstraction deduces objects through a reference within itself to the existence of how other objects are in themselves. In this way, there does exist any difference between validity and soundness. Formal logic on the other hand deals entirely with the formal relation of the objects to other objects, such that an argument can be valid without being sound.

4.13 The typical atheist response to evidence of an afterlife or soul is that people are either lying (trying to get attention/become famous), or they just don’t let it affect/challenge (let it test their fundamentalist beliefs) what they really think (and potentially (like Christians) want to believe is true).

4.14 Christian’s: Atheism is just a religion. If it is, then what exactly would that mean to you? What they are essentially saying is that it is a religion just like you believe in a religion, but if that were true then you are admitting that it is as fundamental a world view that you have (which they are pretty much saying is a bad thing, considering that they use this argument as a way to show that Atheism is not a good belief system), which is apparently ok in reference to Christianity, but flawed in reference to Atheism.

4.15 Atheists: there has been a lot of evil/negativity because of religion in the world (the crusades, Christians bombing abortion clinics, etc.). Christians: there has been more evil in the world because of Atheism (Hitler, Stalin, etc.). Response: the evil/negativity done in the name of Christianity (Christians who act this way) is done because of their neglect/abandonment of what they say they believe in (Christian/Bible morality and ethics). In that regard they are just as evil/bad as the Atheists (because they really are not practicing what they believe in), who they claim possess bad morals (but you possess just as bad a set of morals (if not worse)), because they deliberately disobey what you truly believe in, and hence, do what you say an Atheist would do.

5 If Satan knows he is defeated (is going to hell), then why doesn't he just accept Jesus as his savior? Or stop being evil?

5.1 Christian’s: Demons bow to Jesus (if they know they are going to hell (what do they have to lose by not bowing?)) Is it a curtsy type bow (like what Obama did), or a literal bowing type motion, or metaphorical? Does the Christian God threaten people as a way to bow, that if they do not bow then they will go to hell? People in hell are also said to bow. But what do they have to lose by not bowing? If they bow then they are acknowledging Jesus/Bible is correct and that they deserve to go to hell. But what if they didn’t bow? At the very least they will have disproven the Bible, and taken the chance that by them disproving it, they would not have to be in hell anymore. If they bow then must go to hell for eternity, if they don’t bow, there is a chance they might not have to stay in hell.

5.2 Jesus has evil (not all completely good) qualities. Ex: jealousy, wrath, punishment, etc. If one were to examine what is perfection apart from what the Bible says it is (apparently possessing these qualities is what being perfect is), then do the negative qualities of Jesus really align with one’s intuition of how ultimate good is?

5.21 There is nothing in existence, which necessitates the return of jealousy and superiority in the mind of another.

5.3 If something is potential then there is a chance that it might not exist. To possess actuality, is to possess a way in which anything is possible. We may then perceive of God, in the reference in which anything is possible, as pure actuality.

5.4 If we conceive of perfection, not as the observation of all subjective perception to accord with a single actual intangibility, but rather as the subjective perception of all observing actuality in tangibility, then perfection is beauty in its most absolute form.

5.5 Satan having lost the rebellion (the rebellion against god failed), decided to be completely evil, instead of picking and choosing which side he follows that is bad in reference to the Christian God, and which side he agreed with the Christian God about.

5.6 If Jesus and Satan agree on just one single thing, then that means that they both share qualities which would have to be either good or bad (hence, Jesus would possess bad and/or Satan would possess good). If this were the case, then Jesus could not be all good, and Satan could not be all evil.

5.7 Happiness, as it relates to personal freedom, comes from a subjective decision to stop perceiving what it doesn’t want. The law of attraction provides insight into this possibility.

5.71 Quantum physics, apart from observation, is meaningless. The law of attraction, and it’s relation to quantum physics, can be demonstrably shown.

5.72 Subjective perceptional focus on an existing thing, whatever it may be, must produce an objective physical outcome. But if the subjective perception does not exist, then the objective physical outcome does not exist. Determinism, especially Laplace’s Demon, cannot account for the fact that subjective observation, as far as what quantum mechanics shows, can predict an outcome just like what determinism can. Subjective observation then must take precedence over determinism, because, unlike determinism, subjective observation can make multiple predictions about the same future existence, whereas determinism can only make one prediction.

5.73 Therefore, as quantum physics and its connection to the law of attraction shows, is that if observation of a single physical phenomenon is determined to also be a product of determinism, then an existence without perception should create the same thing. However, without perception, physical change through observation does not exist.

5.74 Hence, Einstein was not totally incorrect in that God does not play dice, but rather did not fully understand the implications of how observations of physical phenomena effect reality. Anyone in the pursuit of complete happiness should understand that what you perceive, you experience, such that without yourself, existence would not be what it ultimately is, mainly, a state of mind.

5.8 Christianity: Black and white, yes or no, right or wrong; Jesus and Satan will never agree (according to the Bible), hence, there will never be a common ground (agreement, reconciliation, Jesus and Satan shaking hands (Kant (said something like this): they will realize the ridiculousness of their disagreement and then part as good friends)), meaning complete happiness (goodness) in existence will never be completely achieved (there will always be people in hell suffering (evil/bad). Are the people who go to heaven sad or upset or experience any kind of negative emotion, since they know that some (if not a lot) of their friends or family are burning in hell at the same time that they are completely happy in heaven? If one’s own perception or understanding of heaven proves to not be the same as what the real heaven, can they possibly be disappointed that it is not as good (potentially) as their own idealization of it? Is it impossible to sin or rise against God again? If no one in heaven can, then why was Satan allowed to?

5.9 Conflict arises through an egoistic perception of one’s own subjectivity in reference to everything else in existence. Objectivity, in its own sense, plays no favorites in terms of all subjectivity that lies within it. Therefore, peace, if it has a chance to exist anywhere existence, must stem from a subjective love, not egoistic love, but rather altruistic love for all subjective egos in existence. Absolute love, if it exists, transcends subjective egoism, and is experienced when there exists no distinction between one’s own subjective observation of objectivity, and objectivity itself. Hence, we may define love, not as a feeling directed toward another existing thing, but rather as an observation of existence that in no way refers to subjectivity, and only as an observation of complete freedom and happiness, seen through another existing thing.

5.10 In a sense, Jesus potentially aligns mostly with utilitarianism in that he is willing to sacrifice a single or multiple people (his plan for them) to go to hell, if that means that more people can be saved and go to heaven. This, however, uses people as a means to an end (sending someone to hell to send other people to heaven ), rather than as an ends to a mean (not using that person (the one going to hell) as an exploitation to accomplishing one own desires (unethical to use negativity as a way to accomplish positivity (only ethical to use positivity to accomplish positivity).

5.11 An argument arises through a non-existing perception between the two perceptions involved which makes one or both perceptions sympathize with another. The resolution of opposites, mainly, an antithesis and a thesis, comes from a perception of observing the opposite within one’s own observation. Not acknowledging the validity of the opposite is nothing more than a failure to synthesize the opposite within one’s own perception. The disagreement between good and evil, being the duality of what is ultimately morally right in existence, stems from the complete misunderstanding of how one, when seen through the right perception of existence, can use the other to compliment itself. This is done through the following way.

5.111 Logically speaking, we may show the duality of existence in reference to good and evil in the following way, enabling us to formally show its resolution. In terms of good, we may state the following proposition: A) good (good); (good only possesses a reference to itself, and hence, nothing outside itself); and B) evil (evil); (evil only possesses a reference to itself, and hence, nothing outside itself). In these two propositions, both good and evil exist as encompassing all or everything that exists in existence. What is good cannot perceive what is evil, and what is evil cannot perceive what is good. Now, if we take the following propositions as there opposites, mainly, C) good (evil); and D) evil (good), we get the following knowledge. First, for C, good no longer occupies a perception of good in reference to all of existence. What is good, now perceives what is evil, and hence, instead of all or every (∀), we get an existence (∃) that, within another existence, or the other existence within it (as in (D) as well), we get all or every (∀). This is different than A and B, because, the two (A and B) need one another in order to complete everything (all) in existence, because they themselves, rather than containing existing parts that make it up, they contain only wholes (all), which, what lies inside of themselves (good lies within good and evil lies within evil) describes nothing. C and D on the other hand, possess parts that, within themselves describe everything in existence through themselves, as well as everything in existence through the other. In other words, good (evil), within itself, describes a whole, mainly, evil perceived through goodness, in reference to all of existence. So does evil (good), in that it refers to all of existence through goodness being perceived through evil. However, although each perception individually is one description of reality, together, they form a complete whole where good is perceived through a reference to good (evil), as well as evil (good). Equivalently, evil is perceived through a reference to good (evil), as well as evil (good).

5.112 In terms of a complete unification of dualistic opposites are concerned, we may understand that in order to completely resolve any thesis – antithesis contradiction, and bring about a synthesis that is existentially valid and sound, all one must do is follow the steps shown above to completely deduce truth, in reference to any opposites which may exist.

5.113 If we conceive of evil as occupying a perception within itself (evil (evil)), as well as good occupying a perception within itself (good (good)), then in order to resolve the contradiction between the two, all one must do is synthesize the two through perceiving them within each other (good (evil); evil (good)). Once this is done, all contradictions can be resolved.

5.12 Heaven vs. hell (there are eternal consequences for actions on earth which really are not that big of a deal). If a person (just an example, but it is equivalent to comparing any two people, one who has sinned a lot, and one who has not sinned a lot.) sinned just once (only bad thing he did was lying to someone once (no matter how innocent the lie), then why must they suffer the same eternal consequence (if they both did not accept Jesus)? Although viewed as impossible by Christians, what if someone lived who never sinned? If that person did not accept Jesus would they then still go to hell, despite the fact that they were free of sin?

5.13 According to Christians, all sins are equal in the eyes of God. This means that telling a lie, however innocent the lie (lying that you didn’t steal a cookie from the cookie jar) is just as bad as murder in the eyes of God. If they really believe this then why do they themselves not also believe that and live in accordance with it? If this is truly how the God that you worship and believe in sees the world, then why do you think that someone who commits murder should have a worse legal punishment then someone who tells a lie or steals something? If there are two people who have only committed a single sin in their entire lives, one who murdered someone, and one who lied to someone, they will have the same eternal punishment (going to hell for eternity) as each other if they have not accepted Jesus. In the eyes of God this is ok, but the basic intuition of most if not all people (Christians as well) is that this is not justice.

5.14 Christianity uses the conflict between good and evil (dualism (spiritual battle)) as a way to not further intelligence and rationality (saying they must fight/battle, instead of using pure intelligence/rationality to come to an agreement).

5.141 If one wishes to bridge the gap between what is good and what is evil in the world, then humor is one of the best ways in which one can be shown to sympathize with the other.

5.15 Jesus and Satan making deals with each other (Job). So it is ok to make deals and even associate with someone you say is pure evil?

5.16 Christians: doing God’s will; Muslims: submission to Allah (what’s the difference?).

5.17 The Bible says to pray for people that persecute you and to love your enemies. Me: I prayed for Satan. A Christian: Why? Another Christian: Why do you feel compassion and sympathy for him?

5.171 Why would someone wish eternal damnation upon another person? For example, someone may believe that Hitler deserves to go to hell for eternity. But in the grand scheme of things, what is exactly considered justice? What if we take a just punishment to mean that Hitler must be in hell for a million years for every person that died under his rule? How about a trillion years for each person? However, a trillion years in comparison to eternity equates to almost nothing.

5.18 Christian: Hell is going to be full of these types of people (referring to murderers and people who do fucked up evil shit.) Response: It’s also going to be full of people who really aren’t evil or bad at all. Me: I don’t think hell is justifiable. Christian: There are people who put babies in microwaves and kill them. My Response: well then all that person must do is accept Jesus and will go to heaven, despite the fact that they did that fucked up shit.

5.19 Christians always say/the Bible says that it was Satan’s pride that made him rebel (he tried/thought that he was above God). But wouldn’t Jesus have more pride that Satan (or anyone) if he thought that he was above everyone and everything else (thought he was superior/better (more perfect)).

6 Bill O’reily said that the Islam version of heaven is insane, but Christianity version of heaven is somehow more rational. (Bill O’reily consideres going to heaven and worshipping Jesus for eternity (working, etc.), is more rational than getting 72 virgins for eternity. Furthermore, on the same level of rationality of the Islam ideal of heaven, doesn’t Jesus’s miracles also equate to the same level of irrationality?

6.1 Every religion invokes punishment if you do not follow that religion (ex: Christianity and Islam (hell); Buddhism (reincarnated into lesser person if you do not follow it); Scientology (will not rid yourself of whatever they say is wrong with you); etc.).

6.2 According to a lot (if not most) of Christians, God is complex. They say that God possesses a lot of characteristics, and hence, we cannot conceive of God’s infinite ways. This, I believe, is a complete misunderstanding of how God is. Complexity is nothing more than a copout of saying that one cannot understand God’s infinite way. Christian’s say it is impossible to understand completely God’s ways. It is like explaining to an ant, how the internet works. The reason this is flawed is because, God, in its purest form, is not something you perceive of in relation to how you think. God’s way, although lying apart from subjective perception, makes itself fully present to one’s self through the way in which one conceives of it. One subjectivity can conceive of God one way, and another, another way. If one truly pursues God in all one’s effort, then God, will reveal itself to oneself. Simplicity, in its most innocent form, is the culmination of the fact that anyone can see God, either in its complete form, or lesser form. Whatever it may be, to say God is complex is to state that one cannot know how God truly and completely is. If God is perfect and one sees this, then they have understood God’s way, and hence, have knowledge.

6.3 If true love, objectively speaking, is unconditional, then there must exist an actuality which, in reference to everything that exists, completely understands all subjectivity and its relation to objectivity. Conditional love stems from a misunderstanding in how God observes reality. If one loves something, and then does not love the same thing at a later point in time, then this is not how God understands existence. This love, if it is even right to call it that, is conditional upon the experience of a subjectivity in relation to another existing thing. That is not how true love is. True love, does not care about anything other than how it relates to another existing thing. In this sense, unconditional love is the understanding that nothing can harm another, whatever the other is.

6.4 The four gospels don’t match with exact accounts (Francis Collins in “Religulous”: Would you expect them to? Response: Since this is the authoritative word of God, then yes, I would expect them to match exactly.). What about the books left out of the Bible?

6.5 I saw an episode of “The Unexplained Files” on the Science Channel where the angel Michael commanded Satan to stop possessing a boy and he immediately did. In this sense, Catholics may have a good point in praying to the angels like Michael for example because obviously Jesus has them do his work for him (Other Christian Responses: Only pray to Jesus). Even Michael is clearly more powerful than Satan, if he is commanding Satan, and Satan obeys him.

6.6 Christians make things up to support their views (Ex: Ice globe surrounding earth; purgatory; the Bible is literal (100%) and not allegorical). How do you know what to take literally or metaphorically (why is it ok to say Adam and Eve are metaphorical but Jesus dying on the cross is not metaphorical)?

6.7 If every person on earth believed in the Bible or Koran, then those religions would not be true. This is sufficient to show that both religions truth is contingent upon the belief (free will) of its followers and without their belief, they would not be true. In reference to the absolute status of truth, which stands alone as reality regardless of how people perceive it, this is a serious underlying fallacy.

6.8 To gain a complete understanding of reality in its most absolute form (possess absolute, complete knowledge of everything in existence), one’s perception must align with the following guidelines. This, in its most basic form, is a brief understanding of the way in which language operates.

6.81 Subjective to subjective reference: when referring to oneself in relation to the rest of existence, the subject must speak in terms of how it perceives existence within its own mind. In other words, its perception must allow it to speak of itself, in reference to itself. Ex: “You need to stop talking to yourself.” This observation of oneself in reference to all of existence, refers to nothing outside itself, and hence, one understands everything about what they are talking about.

6.82 Subjective to objective reference: when referring to oneself in relation to what the subject perceives as objectivity, the subject speaks about existence in a way which conveys that it is knows more about existence then just its own self-reflection within it. Ex: “I need to stop talking to myself.” The difference between this way of referring to existence that differs from the subject to subject perception of existence, is that the subject in this perception, speaks about itself as a part of something which lies outside of itself, mainly, the objective world outside itself.

6.83 Objective to subjective reference: what is being referred to as the object that is relating itself to the subject in this semantic reference to all of existence, is that the object is contained within the subjective observation of existence when referring to itself. Ex: “This one needs to stop talking to himself.” In this linguistic interpretation of the subjective relation to objectivity, it is seen that the subject possesses a perception which allows himself to observe objectivity in a way that unifies the objectivity (what exists apart from oneself) within one’s own perception, resulting in a reference to existence which one can conceive of as having what lies apart from oneself, referring to what does lie within oneself.

6.84 Objective to objective reference: what is being referred to when speaking in this form of perception of all of existence, is the objectivity of all of existence, stating that it is a part of itself, in itself. Ex: “Oneself needs to stop talking to oneself.” In this semantic reference to existence, the object is stating that the subjectivity lies within itself, and hence, is a part of itself, which it recognizes through the fact that it is the exact opposite of the subjective to subjective reference to all of existence.

6.85 The final reference that must be made in order for a subjectivity to align with complete objectivity and hence, attain absolute knowledge of everything in existence is the following: Ex: “Oneself needs to stop talking to me.” As you can see, in this example of semantic reference between the subject and the object, the subject perceives of itself in relation to what the objectivity perceives of the subject, mainly it refers to itself as “oneself”, which is what an objective observation would refer to the subject as (a self (oneself combines the objective and subjective references to what is being referred to in existence (OBJECTIVE TO SUBJECTIVE REFERENCE)). Also, the reference of “oneself” to what it entails as the object of the sentence, mainly, “me” (SUBJECTIVE TO OBJECTIVE REFERENCE). As we can see, when combining these two references of one’s own subjectivity to everything else that exists in objectivity in existence, the subjective to subjective reference, as well as the objective to objective reference naturally follow, because the subject is perceiving itself as an existing thing apart from itself, as well as an existing thing as a part of itself.

6.86 One’s observation of a unification of these four simple observing references between oneself and the rest of existence, enables one to observe no distinction between ones internal existence, and the external existence apart from oneself. From here, all of existence is deduced (the subject and object are one and the same and hence, everything the subjectivity perceives is truth (objectivity)).

6.9 Why do people who have NDE’s come into contact with different deities (if there really was one “true” God, then wouldn’t every NDE report all be the same?). Christians and other spiritual belief sects use NDE’s as evidence for the existence of God. But if this were really true then why doesn’t every person who has a NDE come into contact with the exact same God, as well as the exact same account of heaven and other spiritual realms? For example, many people report seeing the light at the end of the tunnel and feeling a sense of love. Many people equate this to God. However, there have also been many reports of people coming into contact with an angry god, who tells people that they have lived sinful lives and, in roughly the same words as one NDE report I read, the God says, “you have lived a sorry excuse for a life.” There have been many different accounts of what heaven is like in the spiritual realm. But if there really was just one heaven, then why are there so many different versions of that heaven and what it is like?

6.10 Mormon’s believe in the Book of Mormon as well as the Bible (Mormon’s claim there are no contradictions. Response: there are: the Garden of Eden was in Missouri; God lives on Kolab; God had actual sex with Mary (had sex with his earthly mother)). I once knew a Mormon who I worked with. He told me that Mormon’s believe in and take to be true not only the Bible, but also the Book of Mormon. He claimed there were no contradictions between the Bible and Book of Mormon. This, I believe, is the stance that most if not all Mormon’s take as true. This, however, is a very irrational belief to hold considering that there does exist many contradictions between the Bible and the Book of Mormon. However, all that is required in order to show that the Bible and the Book of Mormon are not compatible in reference to complete truth is a single inconsistency. This one inconsistency that I will point out is that the Bible says the Garden of Eden was located in the Middle East. The Book of Mormon says that the Garden of Eden was located in Missouri. This shows that either Mormon’s are somehow completely ignorant of this single fact (and the many others that also exist between the two), or that they know about it (know that it is a contradiction) and do not for some reason let it challenge their faith or belief.

6.11 Different secs of Christianity believe different things and hence, believe in different ideals of what God is like (their perceptions are different (every person). Could be the reason why people come into contact with different God’s in their NDE’s, as well as seeing different aspects of the spirit world).

6.12 YEC’s (young earth creationists) start with the Bible and shape their views about the world around that (Ken Ham: there is no amount of evidence that you can give to me that would change my belief about Christianity (make the evidence of the outside world to accord with the Bible)). This is completely contradictory with science. Evidence of something should change your beliefs.

6.13 People who have NDE’s report different things from different religions such as a place where souls go to reincarnate. If Christianity is true and so is reincarnation, this is a pretty big thing that the Bible leaves out as far as saying what happens when you die.

6.14 Different sects in Christianity and Islam for example believe different and contradictory ideas. Christianity, at its most basic level of understanding, can be separated into three main sects that no matter what they believe, they must accord with one of these three groups. These groups are: young earth creationists, old earth creationists, and theistic evolutionists.

6.141 These three groups all possess differing ideas of how God is and hence, how truth is. If we take the young earth creationists view that the God of an old earth is not the God of Christianity, then this would also mean that every person who possesses a single differing viewpoint on how the God of the Bible is (however slightly), then everyone is believing in different Gods.

6.15 A subject acts benevolently when they possess some relation to what is ultimately true in existence.

6.151 A subject acts malevolently when they do not possess any relation to what is ultimately true in existence.

6.1511 God, in its most basic understanding, is the source of benevolence. Malevolence stems from a complete misunderstanding of what goodness is in its most absolute form, mainly, love.

6.1512 Therefore, we may say that God, rather than being the source of malevolence, is actually the awareness that even malevolence, through benevolence, can be shown to be good and loved.

6.152 The philosophical problem of identity can be solved through the following knowledge. Something can be shown to be preserved in its independence through the passage of time through its use of the way in which it attempts to define itself. A subject, whatever the current state it may find itself in in time, may attempt to actualize itself (put forth effort towards accomplishing a specific desire) toward accomplishing a further state in the future.

6.1521 In analyzing the relationship between a past or current state of being, and its reference to its state of being in the future, two things become apparent. First, whatever current state a subject may find itself in at any current state of time and place in existence, there always exists, within the subject, an innate sense of who it is, and how it stands in relation to what it desires to become in the future. Second, the relationship between the innate sense of how a subject identifies with who it truly is at any specific time and place in existence, and how the subject uses it’s innate sense of who it truly is to attempt to objectify itself in existence, is the ultimate determining factor through which a subject will eventually come to identify itself as through the process of the unfolding of what it attempts to actualize.

6.1522 There exist two fundamental ways in which a subject, at any state in the process of actualizing itself in existence either at a specific state of being, or in the process of becoming, may come to honestly judge oneself and how it is. A subject may come to a judgement within itself in which it identifies with what it considers to be an authentic state of being, or an inauthentic state of being. In either case, the subject will always be self-reflecting upon the identification of who it was, who it is, and who it wants to be.

6.1523 When a subject judges its current state of being as authentic, the subject has actualized through its existence a state of affairs in which it observes a reference of truth in relation to its past and present states of being, and how those two together align with the future state of being it attempts to align itself with. In the process of development of one state of being to another state of being, the subjects identity is preserved when it recognizes within itself an actuality which enables it to observe all three states of being within itself simultaneously, such that every potential way of being which it may internally possess, all relate to the same future state of being. What this means is that there does not exist within the subject’s perception a distinction between its past, present, and future identity, because every possible way of judging itself in relation to its past, present, and future state of being, all revolve around a single actuality, mainly, it’s authentic realization of who it has always observed itself to be. In this case, if the subject’s judgement of itself is honest and true to whom it authentically observes itself to be, then there does not exist anything that it can do which would inhibit the eventual becoming of itself in the process of any state of being. In this instance, one identifies with a single observation, which, through itself, and by itself, unifies the states of being and becoming into one constant state of existing in existence. Hence, the subject can actualize any potentiality within itself and remain who it truly is, because everything it does is authentic.

6.1524 When a subject judges its current state of being as inauthentic, there exists a discrepancy between its perception of how its past states of being, relate to its future state of being through its current state of being. The subject, although possessing an actuality within itself which enables it to become the future state, it is not a true and honest observation of who it is authentically. In this state, the subject’s perception of oneself is an idealization of what it wants to be to observe the future state, rather than a realization of itself to observe the future state. A subjectivity that identifies with this false perception of who it is, can never progress to the actualization of the future state of becoming, because its past and present states of being are a representation of a potential which has not been actualized, because that is not who the subject’s true actuality is, but is rather a false actuality, which in turn is just a potential potentiality. Therefore, the states of being and becoming cannot be unified, since there is nothing, as long as the subject identifies through a state of inauthenticity, which can actualize the subjects authentic realization of itself.

6.1525 Therefore, if we conceive of the essential characteristics of what it means for a subject to form a sense of identity of who it is, and how this identity perseveres through time and space, we may say that the authentic judgment of oneself through all states of being, equivocates every state as a process of becoming, such that there no longer becomes a difference between the two. On the other hand, the inauthentic judgment of oneself through all states of being separates the subject from its actualization of preserving its own state of becoming (who it is in its future state). In the latter case, the subject only possesses a false identity, whereas in the former case, the subject only possesses a true identity.

6.16 The giants (bones/skeletons) that are discovered are used by Christians as evidence of the Bible. However, the atheists/skeptics do not consider them as evidence (real?). Response: why hasn’t an official scientific research project been conducted on the supposed bones that have been discovered?

6.17 People who meditate say that they can have out of body experiences (astral travel; leave the physical body). Why hasn’t an official experiment been conducted to test whether or not they can leave the body or not? (Experiment: put a person meditating in a room, and then in a room right next to it, have the person meditate and leave the body. In the other room there will be something, and if, when the person meditating returns to the body, they should be able to say what exactly was in the room (this would be very close to proof (even more so if many people are able to do it.))

6.18 There have been reports of people (who meditate for example) that go days if not weeks without food or water. All skeptics say in response to this is that they don’t know how this is possible (todays scientific understanding of biology for example, is that humans can only go approximately 3 days without water.)

6.19 Christian: I’m a little skeptical about the book (“Heaven is for real”) because it says that the angels had wings (and apparently this person knows (off of Biblical evidence of whatever)), and it says in the Bible that the angels don’t have wings. If this is true, then wouldn’t the book actually be evidence against and not for the existence of God and heaven, because it stands in complete contradiction to what it would mean for the actual existence of heaven according to the Bible to exist as?

6.20 Christians act ecstatic when talking about God/Bible (ex: the lady in “Religulous”: “You need a holy ghost enema, right up your rear end”. They act in a way that conveys to people that they know the truth and that they are very excited about it (why get excited over billions of people burning in hell?)). There is something about a deep belief in Christianity makes people behave in euphoric, almost irrational state, almost like they are deeply infatuated with someone or something.

6.21 I once watched a video that had Christians calling Mormons a cult (“as long as you are a Mormon and I am a Christian we could never be brothers in Christ.”). Mormon’s think that Christian’s and themselves are worshipping the same Jesus, yet this makes no sense, as seen by the fact that Mormon’s faith in God is shaped not just by the Bible, but also by the Book of Mormon, which presents a vision of God which is not equivalent to the Christian view of God, since they just follow the Bible only.

6.22 Psychic’s like tarot card readers or astrology claim to know things about reality, but there is no real evidence that its true other than the subjective experiences of people (Darren Brown rationally describing how Psychic’s perform/operate).

6.221 Astrology, if it in some way describes reality, would show the existence of a set of guidelines through which one may tap into subjective thought and action in relation to objectivity. If this were the case, skeptic’s view of this phenomenon would actually stand in contrast to what is true, and hence, themselves would stand under scrutiny of possessing what appears as more evidence that astrology is false, when actually it would present more evidence that its own view is false.

6.23 Christian: Because Jesus rose from the dead, that means he really was who he said he was (is God). Response: why does it mean he is God if he rose from the dead?

6.24 Lusting after women is adultery (what if the person you are lusting after is your wife? Is it okay to get horny? Is it ok to masturbate (to your wife?)? You should not masturbate (because of lusting (porn for example)). What about a man lusting after another man, even though the Bible only says it is adultery when a man lusts after a woman?

6.25 Followers of religions behave/act in a way that they know is wrong, but do it anyway. Ex: Ted Haggard, priests who molest children, break 10 commandments intentionally, etc. Christian: the Bible says that people that are in a position of influence (pastors, ministers, etc.) will be judged more than ordinary people. Response: The only judgement that really matters, no matter who you are, is whether you have accepted Jesus.

6.26 Christians say that they get their morality/ethics from God/Bible, and without either of those, people (everyone) would not be able to tell right from wrong. So you are saying that if the Bible didn’t exist, you really would believe that killing is ok? Furthermore, if the Bible said that killing was ok, would you then seize to believe in it?

6.27 Pro-life people supporting the death penalty. Flaw: they want a fetus to be referred to as a “person”. But the people that they know for sure is a person (the person who did whatever bad thing they may have done, to warrant them being potentially put to death), they think deserves to die (even though he’s a “person”).

6.28 Catholics are against birth control (probably against masturbation also). Flaw: the sperm is going to die anyways (if you don’t have an orgasm and cum).

6.281 Is sex merely a creation by God only to procreate, or is it also a way of expressing love between two people?

6.29 If there is life on other planets (somewhere in the universe (the Bible does not say anything for or against this)), then that would mean at least: a) did Adam and Eve fuck up the entire universe by sinning (not only did sin/evil now exist in the world (earth), but also the entire universe/existence. B) if there was now sin in the entire universe, then wouldn’t Jesus have to go to the other planets, and 1) wouldn’t the life on the other planets also have to atone for the sins they have committed. 2) If this was the case (that sin now exists everywhere in the universe), then wouldn’t there have to be a way in which Jesus conveyed to these other life forms the truth (if not, how could they go to heaven, and hence, would go to hell (potentially transferred to hell at the center of the earth). Does Satan occupy influence in the other worlds such that what the aliens (other life forms in the universe) believe/think is true, is really Satan’s deception (are the other planets also enemy territory for Jesus?). Is there a Bible type book for the life forms on every planet other than earth?

6.30 Salvation: Christianity says that salvation is achieved through Jesus (alone, only). If that were the case, then why do Christians (a lot, if not most) fear god (the person who taught you/showed you how to not be afraid of anything (as long as you believe/have faith in him), possess fear through someone who should protect yourself from (wrath, punishment, etc.)/make you not fear anything?

7 Muslim: Jihad won’t stop until the flag of Islam is flying outside of the white house. Most religions will not stop the spread of their belief and their fundamentalist viewpoints to the world until they get exactly what they want, mainly, the complete indoctrination of every person that they possibly can to believe in what they believe. This is seen through people like missionaries who, believing that they themselves possess the truth of existence, attempt to spread their beliefs to other people in the world who have never heard of what they are being converted to, yet at the same time, in a lot (if not most) cases, already possess world views themselves. The spread of fundamentalist ideas to other areas of the world that are completely fine with living their lives how they are living them and believing what they like to believe in, is an invasion of one’s personal ambition to pursue what one believes is right in the world. Furthermore, the spread of fundamentalist ideas to other areas of the world that do not believe what you believe, is made even more further destructive by the use of threats and violence to attempt to get people to accord with what one believes is true (threats: accept Christian God or go to hell; violence: accept Islam God or be killed).

7.1 What if someone (some country for example) gained control of (for example during a war) Mecca and forbid Muslims to go to the rock? Would the fact that no one can make the pilgrimage to Mecca, mean that it is not true? Or, even more so, does any example of religion that bases its belief on the free will of its followers, account also for the free will of those who do not follow it? If religion bases its truth to be contingent upon people’s free will (what makes the religion true), then doesn’t that also mean that it bases its truth (that its truth is contingent upon) upon what the free will of unbelievers (it requires people to follow it (or else it’s not true (if no one believed in the Bible then it would be false)), to do/ act/behave (if the people who don’t believe in the Bible do what the Bible says they shouldn’t do, or, more importantly, what the Bible says is not possible (it is impossible for the end times to come true (example: the antichrist will proclaim he is God at a certain time and place, but, what if he did it at some other place?)), then the religion would be falsified, all because it required of people (made it’s truth contingent upon) to make it true (incorrect: in order for something to be absolutely true, this would require, for example, that no matter what they do, the truth will not only stand as correct in itself (as it exists independent of any mind/observer), but also be correct in reference to all beliefs about it (it’s truth depends on nothing, other than the minds/observers who make it up (subjectively), who will always (no matter what they do to falsify it) objectively not (even with their free will) do anything to falsify the truth, because there does not exist anything (any potentiality) that the objectivity does not already have (because it has everything).

7.2 Muslims vs. Muslims (one Muslim sect (fundamentalist) vs. another (potentially a lot of fundamentalist Muslim world views). (Like Christianity (but not any religion that practices nonviolence and inner peace)). These different sects rage war/jihad against any sect/differing (even slightly) in ideas or world views. What this means is that both Islamic sects, believe that if you differ on a single (absolute miniumum, on anything else that they can be in 99% agreement) issue (contradiction in how you interpret the same thing (Koran, Bible)), then you are essentially worshipping different Gods (Christianity would be exactly the same, if it was as violent (or at least as violent as Islamic sects)). Response: so if you are not in 100% agreement with every single thing that the religious book (Koran, Bible, ect. (even 99.9999…) says, then you are worshipping different Gods? What this means is that there can only exist one possible way in which people can come to know completely 100% what is true. Hence, the two differing world views will believe in different God’s because they worship their God in differing ways (do not agree on the specifics of God, the Bible, truth, etc.), and hence, they do not refer to the same thing (maybe why one NDE could talk to one god (nice), and another talk to a completely different god (mean) It’s their own perception (subjectively), which they objectify to have different afterlife experiences.

8 Wouldn't the fish’s stomach acid fuck with Jonah’s skin or eyes? (Or any open wounds?)

8.1 What would keep Jonah from being digested by the big fish?

8.2 How much oxygen is there in the fish’s stomach?

8.3 The Bible doesn’t say whale but a lot of Christians do (could it have potentially been another type fish?)

8.4 Was Jonah dehydrated/hungry when the whale threw him up?

8.5 Was it hard/difficult to stay in a position, such that (with everything going on around him (for example, other things that the fish eats or drinks)), he would not come close to death (ex: all I can think of that would prevent him from going into the fishes digestive tract (protect himself from harmful things/objects, etc.), is that he had something (a grappling hook for example) to keep him from everything that may have potentially harmed him/made him die/get very sick.

9 Why did the dinosaurs go extinct instead of kangaroos for example? And why do geologists/scientists only find fossils of each group of animal in specific locations such that it perfectly explains evolution/old earth?

9.1 Some Christian’s claim that there was an ice globe surrounding the earth (no biblical or scientific evidence to support this in any way) when the earth was created. Christian’s that subscribe to this belief say that when the ice globe melted, that is what caused the flood. This must mean that the flood waters encompassed the earth throughout hundreds, if not thousands of years. Hence, subscribers to this belief must then also admit that life on earth from creation to the beginning of the flood was in some way always covered in water. This is a necessary outcome of this hypothesis, since from the beginning of creation the ice globe was being melted by the sun. If one who subscribes to this belief claims that the flood waters did in fact come all at once, then this must mean that God himself melted the ice globe, and not the sun.

9.11 The hand of God enacting change and effects in the world plays a major role in the belief in most world views subscribing to the existence of God (especially the three monotheistic religions). This, however, seemingly to the believers in the hand of God hypothesis (fact to the believers), seems more rational then a scientific understanding and explanation in how certain things in the world came to be (irrational through a scientific outlook of the world).

9.2 How could the ark hold all the animals, as well as all the food (plants), as well as the maintenance of all the animals (cleaning up there shit, etc.)? Were all the animals calm (did any break out of their cages, etc.). Were they freaking out? If there were indeed only a few thousand animals on the ark from which all the life on earth then came from (I believe the rough estimate is somewhere around 7,000 species), and the ark was only a few hundred feet in length and width, then this would mean that all the species together resided in very close living quarters for the entirety of the flood. One could mathematically show how small the average place in which the animals must have lived in, but I believe it is sufficient to simply show that it seems too unbelievable to even have to justify it by virtue of that.

9.3 In order to explain the fossil record, creationists say that when Noah’s flood occurred the animals that are buried below each other were not able to go up to higher ground, and the animals that are buried above other animals were able to run up to higher ground to escape the flood waters. This view of the fossil record can be shown to be flawed in many ways. First, there is no reason why many of the animals that were supposedly not able to run up to higher ground in reference to other animals that were able to, were also not capable of running up to higher ground. Why were dinosaurs like the T-Rex not able to run up to just as high a ground as humans? Not a single fossil has been found anywhere in the world in which any dinosaur was able to run up to as high a ground as humans. Furthermore, what about the fossil’s found on flat land? If there were no mountains or hills around, then why are dinosaurs still buried below humans? The ultimate falsehood however can be seen that even if certain animals were able to go up to higher ground in relation to other animals buried below them, this in no way applies to the fossil record, because all the animals would have been buried in the same layer of ground (the top layer), no matter how high up they went in elevation.

9.4 Where did the water go after the flood? (Christian response: God somehow made the water go away (typical Christian cop-out (if they can’t explain it rationally, then they just say God somehow did it))). It would be a mistake to say that the flood waters receded by virtue of the fact that the continents separated (tectonic plates shifting) and the waters would thereby be evenly distributed around the land. The reason this is a mistake is because if indeed the continents did separate after the flood, there would still be land that would rise as the continents separated and the land went down. Therefore, there would be no displacement of water going down after the flood, because the same amount of land mass is still present at the surface of the earth.

9.5 Brothers and sister (people in your immediate family) were allowed to marry each other and have sex (everyone in the world came from Noah’s family in the flood). This would have to mean that the people in Noah’s family possessed within their genome, the entire DNA possibilities for every race on earth.

9.51 Some Christians say that in order to explain how black people came from white people, that in Africa, for example, or in any place on earth exposed to a lot of sunlight, that within a few generations of living in that area on earth, the people’s skin color would then darken and turn to black. This, or course, leaves out the possibility that Noah’s family on the ark were themselves black, since a black person living in a place where there is not a lot of sunlight, will probably not turn white after a few generations.

9.6 If the flood did indeed occur, then that would mean that fish living in the fresh water would be mixed with the fish in the salt water. This would mean two things: 1) the salt water from the ocean, after the flood waters receded, are what made up the lakes in the entire earth. But then how did fresh water fish come to be in the lakes after the flood? 2) how are there even fresh water fish to begin with, since they would have died out when the fresh water mixed with the salt water? If the flood waters were made up of fresh water, then how did the salt water fish survive?

9.7 What would the animals eat after they got off the ark? All the plants would be dead because they did not have sunlight during the flood. The earth would be barren of all life, including the plants. How long after the flood did animals begin to start eating each other? There would have to be a period in which the animals had time to procreate and increase in population before they started to eat each other and make their population decline.

10 The black eyed children and aliens (Christianity: they are demons) Response: so demons can exist in the spiritual realm with no physical body, yet also exist in the physical? (Black eyed child: “My mom wants me home. *He’s* really worried about me.”) How exactly do beings in the spiritual realm interact with beings in the physical? If beings in the spiritual realm really do possess some level of influence to effect change in the physical world, then why don’t demons or angels do everything in their power to create good or evil in the physical?

10.1 Skeptics claim that people who report being abducted by aliens are just hallucinating. This of course brings up a few objections that can be shown to shed doubt on this theory. First, why exactly do most of these people that are claiming to be abducted have similar accounts of what happened to them when they got abducted? For example, why do many people report having been operated on (similar experiments that the aliens performed on them) in similar ways, as well as similar, if not exact accounts of what the aliens looked like? If abductions really were just mental illness, then why are people’s subjective accounts almost in exact accordance with the subjective accounts of others who have claimed to witness something similar? If something is objectively true, then it would make sense that people’s subjective experiences were similar, and if something is only subjectively true, then it would seem strange that many other’s report experiences similar to one’s own. Second, I heard through a source a statistic that 90 to 95 percent of UFO sighting can be explained. This of course, should then bring up the obvious question, what about the other 5 to 10 percent? Aside from the millions of sightings seen worldwide by people across the world of UFO’s, there have been countless encounters that multiple people have had reporting seeing the same thing. The skeptic’s only response to this is that people are just hallucinating, or that there is some rational explanation for what was witnessed that does not involve aliens. The subjective accounts of people reporting being abducted or seeing UFO’s, become more objectively valid with every other subjective account reporting the same thing, and in this regard, it seems more highly probable that the skeptic’s viewpoint on the matter of UFO’s and alien abductions, should be that they are skeptical that they do not exist.

10.2 People having combined trips when taking drugs (like a guy who did mushrooms and had a combined trip with his friend who took DMT). If time is able to be perceived as drastically faster or slower than it ordinarily is by the majority of people in the physical world, then wouldn’t this be evidence of a reality that coexists along with the physical? For example, there have been reports by people who, when taking a psychedelic drug like DMT, have lived for what feels to them like hundreds or thousands of years, yet in the physical realm they have really only been tripping for a few minutes. There have been many reports by people who claim that they have had combined trips with friends, in that in the mental or spiritual realm, they have lived together, just like how they live together in the physical world. This is clearly evidence that consciousness has an influence not just in the physical world, but also in the immaterial world.

10.3 Some people have had bad experiences when abducted or during hallucinatory experiences (being raped in a NDE or DMT trip; the aliens experimenting on them.). This shows that in the nonmaterial (mental) realm, as well as in the material (physical) realm, there exist not good/evil entities which attempt to take advantage of people that enter into those realms. Dualism (the division of good and evil in existence), as it stands firm in the definition it puts on the world, clearly occupies a place in existence which, whether or not the nonmaterial spiritual realm apart from subjective mental observation exists, encapsulates all of existence, whether the nonmaterial realm is just subjective or objective.

10.4 Shadow people and demons; millions and millions of people in the world have had unexplained ghost stories happen to them (Ouija board (Atheist: can be rationally explained by the people moving the piece of wood. Response: what if (like some people say) they did not touch the piece of wood, and it is moving by itself?)

10.5 In the book, “Communion” by Whitley Strieber, he believed, much like a lot of Christians believe, that the aliens are demons. Response: but what if they aren’t demons (are they good or bad? Whose side are they on (Jesus or Satan’s side))?

10.6 In the book, “Apocalypse Soon” the author said that, the Antichrist will have to come up with a convincing story to tell the world about what happened to all the people that disappeared in the rapture. One thing he might say is that they were abducted by aliens. What this ultimately means is that the Antichrist would then be willing to lie to the world by telling them that the people who were raptured up were not indeed taken to heaven, but were rather taken to some other place. If this were the case, then that would be one example of the Antichrist not saying exactly what the Bible says is truth, since he is supposed to accord with everything else that the Bible prophesized. Why then would people believe his false story about what happened to the people who disappeared, if he would just be fulfilling the Bible’s truth, which says that they were raptured into heaven? In other words, with every bit of prophecy that gets fulfilled by the Antichrist, it gets more and more believable, not that he is correct, but rather that the Bible’s explanation of where the people disappeared to is correct.

11 I once wrote a message to answers.com and Answers in Genesis in which I asked about a cover to one of their magazines which said roughly the following: “The God of an old earth is not the God of Christianity”. The message I wrote was an attempt to show how this Christian world view is completely flawed and not in accordance with what the Bible really says. My message was roughly the following: “What if when you died and went to heaven and met Jesus and he told you that the earth and universe is actually billions of years old and not thousands like you believed. Would you really be prepared to say to him that you were really not worshipping him (the real Jesus), because you were only worshipping/believing in the Jesus of a universe that is thousands of years old? Shouldn’t one’s salvation and belief in Jesus rest upon him dying on the cross, instead of how old the earth and universe are?” The first message I received back said that my question is illogical and that there is no way, absolutely 0% chance that the earth and universe are older than 6,000 years old. The second message I received back was just as fundamental a view as the first, it said roughly the following: “What if when you died you went to heaven and talked to Jesus and he said that Islam is true and that you should have been a Muslim to get saved. You’re question makes no sense because it is not in accordance with God’s word.” There is really nothing you can say in response to the first message, these people cannot be reasoned with and no amount of evidence to the contrary of what they believe would change their belief in young earth creationism being a fact. The second message, in my opinion, was exactly the same point I was trying to make with the message that I sent them, mainly, according to them, if the universe was billions of years old then they are not really believing in the real Jesus, and if Islam is true, then they are also not believing in the real Jesus. Both of them said nothing about how true faith in Jesus should be based on him dying on the cross, instead of how old they think the universe is.

11.1 In analyzing the ongoing debate between evolutionism and creationism it is important to understand that creationists don’t know evolutionary theory very well (but claim they do), and evolutionists know creationism just as well as creationists do. Creationists try and refute evolution by bringing up points in the theory that in no way are what evolutionary theory even attempts to describe, or what it concludes. For example, a major refutation that many creationists say in response to evolution, is that if evolution is true, then why is it not happening today? Or, even more ignorant, if evolution is true, then we would be seeing species combinations of different animals and organisms that are alive today, like for example, a kangaroo mixed with a turtle, or a cheetah mixed with a deer. They also say that evolution is a flawed theory because it doesn’t say where life came from. In reference to the first two attacks on evolution by creationists, these views on evolutionary theory are completely flawed and are only held and asked by creationists because of a complete ignorance of what the theory says. In reference to the last supposed refutation of evolution, for some reason creationists think that evolution is a theory that attempts to describe where life came from, and this is not the case. I went to a young earth creationist convention when I was a kid and my mom bought me a tee shirt. The shirt had a picture of a man and a picture of a monkey/ape. Out of both of their heads was a thought bubble. In the man’s thought bubble it said, “I can drive cars, fly airplanes, build buildings, etc. What can you do (referring to the monkey)?” In the monkey/ape’s thought bubble was a picture of a banana. What this shirt failed to understand is that the man’s intellect and the monkey’s intellect are separated by millions of years of evolution. A major flaw in the creationists perspective on how life formed and where it came from, is that (and no creationist will ever admit this) if the Bible said that evolution is true, then every Christian would believe in evolution. This is because without the Bible saying that life started with Adam and Eve, there is absolutely no evidence that it did start with Adam and Eve.

11.2 Young earth creationists claim that the Bible is more reliable than empirical evidence obtained through scientific study and inquiry. Any evidence to the contrary of what the Bible tells them is true, even scientific evidence that is essentially fact, will not shake their belief and world view. Young earth creationists like Ken Ham say that the people that believe that the earth is billions of years old instead of thousands of years old are rebelling against God. Considering that some people form philosophical and scientific world views about existence apart from the Bible (because they have not ever heard of the Bible or the Christian God, like Buddha), this rebellion against the Christian God may of course be completely unintentional. There exists a certain malevolent view that Christian’s have of not only evolutionary theory, but also Darwin himself. When I was younger my mom got me a tee shirt that said, “Darwin is dead, Jesus is alive.” This vindictive attitude about Darwin ultimately stems from its attack on what Creationists believe. This supposed attack of course, being completely unintentional (it’s not like the theory of evolution was thought up in order to come up with a way to bring doubt to the Adam and Eve story. Darwin was merely just doing what he thought was true and in better accordance with how evidence of the world is). Of course, evolution could just be Satan’s deception, which, considering that Christians say that Satan is mostly in control of the world (Jesus came down to enemy territory), may or may not be true.

11.3 "A day is like 1,000 years to God" (a day is like 1,000 years, not billions of years) One Christian interpretation: this is evidence that a day can mean millions of years and not just the literal one day. Another Christian interpretation: all this means is that God is outside of time/perceives time differently. The young earth creationist’s view that God perceives time differently is taken by them to be the literal translation of the Bible. But why exactly is the old earth creationist’s interpretation of a day being potentially a prolonged period of time (1,000 years instead of a single 24 hour day), any less literal then the young earth creationist’s interpretation?

11.4 Both young earth creationists and old earth creationists come up with arguments that say that if the universe is not thousands of years old, or on the contrary, the universe is not billions of years old, then God created the universe in a deceptive way. Old earth creationists use evidence that if the universe were really just thousands of years old and not billions, then God must have made the light from stars to earth in transit. They say that this is a deceptive way in creating the universe. Young earth creationists say that if the six days in Genesis are not literal, then that would be a deceptive way to account how the universe was created. What is obvious is that the young earth creationists are more fundamental (and arrogant to) in their viewpoints then the old earth creationists. A lot of young earth creationists go so far as to say that different Gods are being worshipped in reference to one’s belief about how old the universe is. Old earth creationists at least have the humility to say that there could potentially be a chance that their world view that the universe is billions of years old is not true. It ultimately comes down to a certain level of rationality that is completely missing from the young earth creationists, and is at least somewhat apparent in the old earth creationists argument (because they are in accordance with the scientific evidence of how old the universe is). Just like with evolution, if the Bible said that the universe was billions of years old and not thousands, every young earth creationist would be an old earth creationist (although, of course, none of them would admit this), even the ones that apparently use scientific evidence to show how the universe and earth are actually thousands of years old (which if you ask any old earth creationist Christian or secular scientists of the like, they will tell you that this scientific interpretation of evidence is completely flawed).

11.5 Old earth creationists suffer from a major flaw in their interpretation of the Bible’s metaphorical account of the days of creation, with the scientific evidence of an old earth. They say that they can explain the fossil record through stating that on the day that God created humans and animals (land animals?), he created the animals at a time earlier in the day before the human(s) (Adam and Eve). This lapse in time between the creation of animal and human in a single day of creation can be measured in time lasting up to millions if not billions of years. There are two major Biblical facts that are missing from the old earth creationist’s viewpoint of their belief in the Bible according with scientific evidence. First, even if you believe that the earth is billions of years old, you must still admit that humans (starting with Adam and Eve), have only existed for thousands of years. This is because of the Bible’s genealogy record starting with Adam and Eve. Also, it makes no sense to claim that the dinosaurs or other animals and organisms that supposedly lived millions of years ago died out and that explains the fossil record. The reason why this is a misinterpretation of the Bible’s account of creation (and the events that happened after), is because old earth creationists still must admit that the dinosaurs and other animals that supposedly lived millions of years before humans, must have been on Noah’s ark. In that regard, old earth creationists must possess the same belief that young earth creationists possess to explain the fossil record. This explanation, of course, is completely in contradiction to the facts, as well as completely unscientific.

11.6 Young earth creationist: The universe couldn’t have started with the big bang because there would be chaos. So is your main argument against the big bang occurring that it would be chaotic and not orderly, or is it that you just don’t think that it accords with how the Bible says the universe came into being? Furthermore, if the Bible clearly stated that the universe was billions of years old and not thousands, would you then believe in the big bang theory, even though when you thought it was thousands you believed that there was not sufficient evidence for it?

11.7 Old earth creationists say that the Bible perfectly predicts the beginning of the universe with the big bang (they claim that that was the beginning of existence (“the earth was a formless void.”) even though if there was a God then there must have been existence forever.). However, if it turns out that the universe is 6,000 years old, then the big bang did not happen. Michio Kaku: “we can even see the place where the big bang happened, I know a lot of people don’t believe in that, but we can actually see it.”

11.8 Those who take the Bible literally, as well as those who take the Bible metaphorically, suffer from underlying willful ignorance of Biblical facts that they think should or shouldn’t be incorporated into their beliefs. Theistic evolutionists take the story of Adam and Eve as metaphorical. But what should be taken metaphorically or literally in reference to the Bible’s account of history? If Adam and Eve are to be taken metaphorical then the entire genealogical account of human history is essentially meaningless to them. And if that is the case, then why should we not view Jesus dying on the cross as metaphorical? In other words, you can’t pick and choose what you believe is metaphorical or literal because the Bible doesn’t give any reference by which to go by in how you should form your belief about what it says. The young earth creationists pride themselves on being the Christian sect that interprets the Bible correctly in how it should be interpreted, mainly, literally. But, just like the Christian’s who interpret some of the Bible metaphorically, the young earth creationists also pick and choose what they think is the most believable to them, and hence, what they think is correct. For example, it says in the Bible that gay people (two men sleeping next to each other) should be stoned. Then why exactly do Christian’s not attempt to stone gay people in our society today? The obvious answer is because they honestly believe that that is really fucked up.

11.9 Young earth creationists don’t trust scientific principles (such as dating methods (carbon dating)) Their response to evolution: it makes sense that there is a tree structure type organization of species (human genome projects findings). The creationist response to the human genome project’s findings are a perfect example of how they twist scientific facts to accord with what they want to believe is true. You would think that the human genome projects findings would instill a sense of doubt in the creationists minds such that the tree structure organization of life would be considered deception (because it accords so perfectly with evolution), much like the light in transit theory of deception that old earth creationists use against young earth creationists, but they don’t let it challenge their fundamentalist belief about reality.

11.10 Ken Ham/Bill Nye debate. Ken Ham claiming that the Bible is a good source for scientific knowledge. Bill Nye response: does the Bible make a single scientific prediction? Ken Ham (this is roughly what he said): “I want scientists to know that there is a God who loves them. I think this will impact how they do science.”). But Ken Ham’s view (young earth creationist) is unscientific. It doesn’t matter how much scientists believe that God loves them, if they think the universe is roughly 6,000 years old, then they are not being scientific.

11.11 The pope said that evolution is true. The only question is where in time (in the process of evolution), did the injection of the human soul come into place. Response: what about the genealogy? If the Adam and Eve story of creation is in fact metaphorical (and really anything in the Bible that Christians take as metaphorical and not literal) and not literal, then how exactly does that as a metaphor relate to evolution? What exactly is the metaphor referring to in relation to evolution? If evolution was never discovered would Christian’s still believe the Adam and Eve story was metaphorical?

12 Dictatorship (Christianity): instilling fear inside of people that if they do not follow you they will be punished (Jesus: follow me or go to hell; Satan: follow me (get mark) or you will be killed, not be able to buy or sell, etc.). Jesus said that you are either for him or against him. Interestingly enough, this is exactly what the Antichrist will say. What is so important to these two world views is that they attempt to enact a view of reality that says if you are not for a single belief, then you are against that single belief, even though the belief you may hold may in no way refer to that single belief that you are supposedly 100% against. Furthermore, what Jesus and Satan are ultimately saying, is that if you are not for Jesus, then you are for Satan, and if you are not for Satan, then you are for Jesus. This world view fails to make the simple observation that someone may possess a belief in reference to reality that in no way relates to either two parties that consider themselves as being the only ones in existence, and hence, possesses a belief in a third understanding of reality, which, taken in its most basic form of understanding, is one of among an infinite amount of other beliefs that exist that in no way subscribe to either the Jesus or Satan world views.

12.1 Freedom (deontological anarchism): do absolutely whatever you want, just as long as what you do does not infringe upon the rights of others.

12.11 What a person says is ok by them is how that person should be treated (as well as how that person wants to be treated). If someone says it's ok to kill them, then if someone kills that person then they have not infringed upon anyone's rights (nobody is being harmed)).

12.2 Worship (Christianity): Jesus and Satan want to be worshipped (consider themselves as above/greater (perfect) than everyone else. Superiority complex.

12.21 The desire to be exalted above other minds stems from an egoistic mind state that perceives existence as nothing more than a means to accomplish one’s own way. This mind uses existence as a way to glorify oneself, instead of using existence to glorify existence and everything in it, through oneself.

12.3 In terms of personal responsibility, servitude and submission are equivalent perceptions of a single authoritative rule. If possessing no personal responsibility refers not to the rejection of a single authoritative rule, but rather the acceptance of all authoritative rule, then freedom is merely the rejection of authoritative servitude and submission in reference to one’s own perception of it.

12.4 Heaven: worshipping Jesus for eternity; Some Christians: I think we will work in heaven. Other Christian: “It’s not that sex isn’t allowed in Heaven, it’s that it’s just not done. People that are married on earth are not married in heaven.” Doing God’s will is synonymous with potentially thinking in a way that may seem completely not in alignment with what one thinks true freedom and happiness (paradise) is.

12.5 The illuminati (potentially wanting end times to come true). Authority: taking orders from Satan/Jesus. The illuminati, whether it exists or not, is about controlling society and the people that live in it. It would then make sense that the top governing authority on earth would be taking orders from a further authority that itself desires to control people and direct how they live their lives, mainly, Jesus and/or Satan.

12.6 New world order (ex: 9/11 was an inside job). People in high positions of authority or power are puppets (like Obama or Bush) to the desires and wishes of the top governing authorities. The development and potential enactment in the world of the new world order has the end times prophecy written all over it.

12.7 What if someone disobeys the Christian God in heaven? Response: they can’t and they won’t (do they still have free will in heaven? Why was Satan allowed to disobey the Christian God in heaven and no one else is?).

12.8 Nationalism/hardcore patriotism. USA: “a Christian nation.” Middle East countries: “Islamic states.” Using God as a way to further their own view of what is right/correct in the world. This foundation of the basis of how a state or nation may be potentially formed suffers from a defect in which two or more nations may be at war and yet both claim to have God on their side (even those nations which claim to have a Christian or Islamic basis for how it runs itself). A good quote to demonstrate this point comes from a movie called, “Cold Mountain”, about the American Civil War. When talking about the division between the northern and southern states, one character says, “I think God is weary of being called down on both sides of an argument.” This is just one way of understanding that there can be two opposing sides against one another, yet both claim to have God on their side.

12.9 NDE’s (near death experiences): I read one report where the person said that it was communicated to him that “there is nothing that you could do that would be wrong (they are completely loved unconditionally). This is removed from Christianity which says that you can do wrong (sin).

13 Sye Ten Brugengate, a presuppositional apologetic, uses the following quote in every debate he has against anyone claiming to doubt the existence of God, as a way to demonstrate that knowledge is only possible through God: “Is it possible to be wrong about everything you know?” He uses this argument to show that if you say yes (which, for some reason most of the people he debates do say yes), then you cannot know anything for sure apart from God’s existence. Response: No, I know there is existence (existence exists (which he must believe to)).

13.1 Epistemology and metaphysics, from a foundational standpoint, arise out of an equivalent basis of reality. This foundation stems entirely from perception, and not from characteristics of a world apart from what seems distinct from perception, but rather is a product of it.

13.111 The rationality that can be given as to the proposition of why 1 + 1 = 2, is the same rationality that can be given as to the proposition of why 1 + 1 = 3. The basis of all rationality then, we may say, stems entirely from a judgement which lies within the awareness of the perceiver.

13.112 If one perceives that 1 + 1 = 2, and they are certain of it, then they could rationally show you how the proposition is true. However, upon closer inspection, it is pure reason, rather than empirical verification that provides the proof of the proposition. One who perceives that 1 + 1 = 2, honestly to the absolute core of their observation of the world, believes that 1 + 1 = 2. It is this complete honesty with oneself and how they really see the world as being, that creates the perception. However, if one who perceives that 1 + 1 = 3, also, just like the one who perceives that 1 + 1 = 2, honestly, to the absolute core of his being, believes that 1 + 1 = 3, then why would this perception not be just as valid?

13.113 The mathematician says that if you believe that 1 + 1 = 3, then you are just objectively wrong. In no universe does 1 + 1 = 3. If we take an individual’s honest judgement of his or her perception of the rationality of existence as a benchmark through which all other knowledge of the world must accord, then one begins to peer more deeply into how subjectivity interacts with objectivity. In this sense, it would seem that the mathematician is incorrect in his deduction that 1 + 1 can only equal 2 and nothing else. This is because as far as how one’s perception of existence relates (how one makes sense of the world in which they are experiencing) to everything else that they observe in the world, we see that the perception that 1 + 1 = 3 is just as rational and correct as the perception that 1 + 1 = 2.

13.114 To the perceiver of the 1 + 1 = 3 judgement, perceiving that 1 + 1 = 2 does not make sense, and seen through his observation of the world, that is objectively wrong. The same can be said regarding the perceiver of 1 + 1 = 2 in relation to the perception that 1 + 1 = 3. If, however, the perceiver of 1 + 1 = 2 could somehow glimpse into the perception of the 1 + 1 = 3 observer, would that perceiver then not come to see and understand exactly how the 1 + 1 = 3 perceiver sees the world?

13.115 If you count one tree and another tree in your experience of the world and add them together then the perceiver of 1 + 1 = 2 would get a total of two trees. However, would not the perceiver of 1 + 1 = 3 who experiences the same reality, just in a different way, add up the trees to equal three?

13.116 What one honestly perceives (100% honesty, without any reference to himself being potentially incorrect) about how the world and their place in it is, is how they will ultimately experience reality. Objects must conform to subjective perception, in the same way that observation must conform to experience.

13.117 If one cannot conceive of something in existence, then the basis of that experience being governed by a higher understanding that makes it accord with its own definition that it puts on reality, becomes completely meaningless to the perceiver. If a Christian who cannot conceive that Christianity is not true dies, and it turns out that Islam is true, and hence, gets sent to hell, how can he possibly understand or perceive that he is not in heaven? If no reference exists in the conception of a perceiver which is able to form beliefs about the world that enables him or her to understand that their judgement of reality is incorrect, then that supposed way in which reality is as given through a proposition such as, “Islam is true”, becomes completely meaningless.

13.118 Like Kant believed, the mind contains structures which impose itself onto the world and define it to be a certain way. Minds that are constituted to perceive existence in one specific way are a reflection of what that mind will experience.

13.119 All mental structures are different. Anyone claiming to possess an exact equivalent perception towards one thing in existence as someone else, we may point to the following refutation: In reference to an equivalent existing object in existence, for example, a blue chair, some may claim that they perceive the object in the exact same way, and hence, possess equivalent beliefs about the chair. This, however, does not account for each mind’s own individual perception in existence through which they observed the blue chair. If the blue chair lies at point A in the physical world, and perceiver 1 observes it from point B, and perceiver 2 observes it from point C, then two different observations regarding the same existing object have been seen. Through differing vantage points of observation of the same existing object, differing judgements become constituted in the mind, and begin to alter and shape how the mind perceives the world and their place in it.

13.120 There exist different levels of reliability in reference to the attainment of knowledge which one may experience. The belief in the reliability of the five senses to attain knowledge of the world comes from empiricism and the notion that one must put the world to test to verify if certain theories and hypothesis’s are correct. But, as discussed above, this way of verifying knowledge of how the world works, only goes so far, since empirical observation only relies on the constituted mental structures of the one’s performing the scientific tests. Some scientists may claim to possess equivalent beliefs about a single scientific theory, but then when seen through the other’s perception, they may come to realize that this belief shared between the two actually relies and is the product of a much different way of perceiving the world.

13.121 There is a difference between certainty and inconceivability. If someone possesses a perception of certainty about some existing thing, then they also must be able to conceive of the opposite of what they are certain about, mainly, they are certain of the affirmation of what they believe in, as well as certain about the negation of the negation of the affirmation that they believe in. Inconceivability on the other hand, is an observation of the world which makes one incapable of perceiving the opposite of what it believes in. To this mind, there only exists one possibility and the opposite of that possibility is not perceived. We may say that true a priori knowledge stems from the intersection where certainty meets inconceivability regarding some existing knowable thing in existence. Residing completely apart from experience of the world, if the knowledge gained a priori was shown to be valid empirically, this in no way would strengthen the perceivers belief in it, since the knowledge gained about that certain object, was perceived through a more reliable way of forming beliefs about existence. Knowledge gained through none of the five senses can be conceived of as possessing an opposite belief about reality, however, the difference is that the sixth sense provides certainty and inconceivability in relation to the fact that the opposite of the correct belief can be demonstrably shown, through pure logic and reason, to be false.

13.122 A priori knowledge forms higher forms of perception which relate to objective truth, more than a posteriori knowledge.

13.123 Awareness, in its purest form, provides the insight into the full attainment of absolute knowledge.

13.2 In the physical world, biologically speaking, evolution is run by natural selection. There, however, exists a further way in which biology, as well as subjective consciousness evolves over time. Subjective consciousness, through itself, evolves over time by means of resolving internal contradictions within itself, and hence, once a synthesis is reached within the internal consciousness, newer and better ways of perceiving truth is attained. In reference to biology, this law also is a way in which organisms can evolve over time, and get more equipped to deal with the other species that inhabit the earth (which it competes with for survival). This is seen through the following understanding: biological evolution states that organisms get better equipped to deal with the life around itself, such that it is more able to survive (survival of the fittest). What nobody has realized yet, just like survival of the fittest, is that organisms adapt to their environment to better survive, through resolving flaws within itself, in relation to the rest of the organisms on earth. What this means is that if an organism is presented with something that is different than oneself, then in order to better equip itself to survive in that environment or just on the earth in general, then the organism must resolve the conflict that exists between the antithesis that is presented apart from the organism within nature, through its thesis of what it is going to take to survive. In this way, the organism evolves, not through the survival of whether or not it is fit enough, but rather through its own way of resolving the internal contradiction that exists in reference to the external world. Nature, as the governing habitation in which all organisms inhabit in the world, is therefore ruled by how the organism internally interacts with the external world, merely through an observation that it must resolve the difference between how the external world is, and how it may impact its own existence. If a synthesis is reached through the organism changing itself to better accord with how the world is that ultimately better suits the organism to survive better, then the organism has evolved subjectively and objectively.

13.21 Fuzzy logic has a definite relation and can be compared to evolution. The height of a person growing up, starting in infancy, will be almost equivalent to each other each day that you measure the person. The question then becomes, at what point do we consider a person to grow from being short to grow to being tall? If we examine certain mental states, the resolution to this problem immediately becomes clear. First, in order to change from one state of being to another, there has to be at least some change that occurs, however small that change may be. Whatever the smallest possible change is that occurs when something goes from being one specific way (the height of someone), to another specific way (a higher height), is all that must be examined in order to show what change to a complete other type is.

13.22 The modern view of mathematics as it relates to change within the universe is that in order for something to go from being in one state to another, it must pass through an infinite number of states. This, however, can be shown to be incorrect through the following knowledge: the universe, itself, only contains a finite amount of physical particles, which, by the fact that they are what make up the entirety of physical states, are themselves not what makes up the complete transformation of one state to another. This is because if the universe did just consist of physical particles and nothing else (no empty space), then the change of one single thing in the universe would change everything else in the universe (because there would exist no empty space between the particles, and hence, the change of one single thing would completely change the placement of everything else (all other physical particles) in the universe), such that one single physical state 1, would be completely different then the resulting physical state 2. If this were the case, then that would mean that the physical change in the universe that occurred between physical state 1 and physical state 2, would be finite, because it only changed a finite amount of physical space in the universe.

13.23 The universe, since it only consists of a finite amount of physical space, cannot be the only reality in existence, because existence as a whole cannot be finite, because any amount of space that exists in existence, must be infinite in extent, in relation to the physical space, because it is not measured by the relation that is shares between itself and the physical space, but is rather measured by the relation that it shares between all of existence and itself. What this means is that it is meaningless to talk about the physical world being the only reality in existence, because if that were true, then everything that occurs in the universe would be infinite since it would make up the complete total of everything that exists. This, however, cannot be true because the physical world exists in relation to something that makes it possible for change to occur within it. How can a physical particle in the universe exist unless there exists something within the physical particle that exists within existence? In other words, if the physical particle is all that exists, then there would be nothing that it exists within, which, would mean that there is nonexistence. If there was nonexistence (nothing) that the physical particle exists within, then the physical particle itself could not exist, because there would be nothing for it to exist within (since there is no existence, the physical particle itself could not exist within it, because there is nothing there). Therefore, the physical world, by itself, does not refer to all of existence (and rather only a part), because there must exist something within itself that makes up not just itself, but also everything else that is not physical in existence.

13.24 What has a beginning is not eternal, and hence, is finite in extent in comparison to all of existence. It is meaningless to say that all of existence itself is infinite, unless it is in comparison to something finite. We may then say that the universe is finite, in the sense that there exists something else which encapsulates the entirety of the universe, within itself, and apart from itself. This bare existence which makes up the raw material through which everything may possibly exist, I will call “awareness”.

13.25 The empty space within the universe (the space which does not have physical space (particles) existing within itself) is composed of an entirety of existence within itself. Within itself, there does not exist anything which limits its causality in comparison to the other space which is composed of physical space (particles) within themselves. In other words, nothing acts upon it, and hence, it directs everything that exists within itself, and through itself. The empty space that is composed of physical particles (materialists believe that only the physical particle exists and not the empty space which makes it up), and hence, not empty in comparison to other empty space that is not composed of physical particles, is responsible for the causation that occurs in the physical universe.

13.26 I call this empty space (or universal ether), “awareness” because of the following properties that it possesses: In order for there to be a physical change within the universe, there must exist something which causes the physical movement of the physical material (particle; whatever is the smallest possible unit of physical existence that exists (quark?)), from one physical state to another physical state. In order for the physical makeup of the universe to go from one physical state A, to another physical state B (the physical universes makeup can range from either 99.9999% same, to 99.9999% different (or equivalently, 0.00001% same, to 0.00001% different), there must exist something which possesses within itself an actuality which relates the physical state A to physical state B difference (whether very similar or very different). If this actuality did not exist, then there would exist no way in which the physical world could change from one state to another, because the nonexistence of a relation between physical state A and physical state B, would mean that no way existed through which the universes physical makeup could go from one state to another. We must grant this empty space as having some element of intelligence, or awareness (observation), because without an awareness of the relation between physical state A and physical state B, the physical material makeup of the universe would not possess an actuality through which the physical state A can act upon the empty space separated from itself (the empty space which will possess a physical makeup after the change from state A to state B), which is what the universal makeup will be at state B. In other words, the awareness (empty space, ether), must already possess within itself the existence of the possibility of any physical change from state A to state B, because if it did not, then that physical state’s actual possibility, would not exist, and hence, the universes material makeup could not possibly be that way. We may then say that the empty space underlying all physical existence is “aware”, in that it possesses the actuality of all potentialities within itself, as a part of the physical material existence, and apart from the physical material existence (how it is by itself; the essential qualities that it is made up of). Therefore, the physical material of the universe must come from this awareness ether, because the ether itself, already possesses the actuality of all possible physical states, and hence, the physical existence comes from the ether in that the physical existence is merely the potentiality that has become actualized through the directing of the awareness within itself.

13.27 It is meaningless to speak of existence in itself unless there is something being observed. The realization of potentialities cannot exist unless there exists something which is aware of what is contained within itself (being), and what it is capable of actualizing (becoming). If no awareness existed, then there would exist no distinction between potentialities and actualities, because there would not exist anything which could discern the difference between the two.

13.28 Physical existence is nothing more than just the actualization of potentials contained within the awareness either of the universe. Hence, rather than having to go through an infinite amount of points in space to get from one physical state to another, whenever there exists a single finite difference to anything in the physical universe, this represents a change in one potential state to accord with a single actual potential state. Therefore, fuzzy logic, and its relation to evolution, possesses validity in reference to describing the change of one physical state to another through the process of containing all potential actualities within a single actuality potential. For example, a person growing up everyday, although appearing to be the same height each day that they are measured, must go through a finite change in height at some point in order to grow taller. This change, as shown above, moves through a finite point in going from one actualization (a specific height) to another (a taller height). We may then say that an existing thing evolves from one state to another when the actualization of finite states of existence follows a specific potential actualization of what it might become. Therefore, the person who grows in height goes from being short, to being tall, once a single actual potential becomes realized through the succession of the previous actualization of potentialities.

13.29 With every finite actualization of a potentiality in existence, there then becomes more specific potential actualities of what that existing thing may become. A person who is of height 1, possesses potentials of what it might grow into at height 2. Once height 2 has been actualized, the person will then possess different potentials for the future heights 3, 4, 5, etc. then he possessed at height 1, because of the direction in which the person growing (evolving), has actualized certain potentials within itself. Hence, with every finite step of the actualization of potentials contained within the existing thing, a more specific direction (process of evolution) of what it may become will be realized, merely through the actualization of finite potential steps taken in relation to other finite potential steps that were not actualized in relation to it (if another one of the potential steps were to be actualized, then this would have created a different process of evolution of finite potential steps to follow leading up to a future potential actualization of what it may become). Biologically speaking, this can be seen through the fact that what one random mutation makes in an organism will open up other possible future states of what that organism may evolve into, which would be different than another random mutation which may have occurred which would have opened up other different possible future states in which the organism may evolve into.

13.3 What Sye Ten and other extreme Christian apologist’s misunderstand about how reality/existence really is, is that they take God existing (Christian God) and all the characteristics that go along with being that God, as somehow more actual (in actuality), then the existence (actuality) that is supposed to be equivalent to himself (because before the big bang the only existence that there was, was God (no universe)). However, it is actually separate from himself (because he has characteristics).

14 Garden of Eden tree of knowledge of good and evil (why was it even there?). Will all the generations of people who live afterwards also follow the command not to eat from the tree, seeing as that it failed after the first two people on earth existed?

14.1 If there was no death before the fall then why was there plant and cell (microorganism) death (Christian: plants don’t have souls. Response: I thought animals didn’t have souls either (just humans)). Humans and animals (all organisms and species) are made up of other life forms, and part of living those lives entails the death of the simpler organisms that make it up. Therefore, we may say that the creation of humans and animals to only eat plants at the start of history made no sense at all, since life itself in order to exist, necessitates the death of other life.

14.2 Was there any negativity before the fall (did farts smell bad before the fall?) Would there ever be cold weather since Adam and Eve were naked and might get cold?

14.3 Satan was created as the most beautiful angel (Jesus playing favorites and creating people as higher or lower than others). This is a bad set up. Why does God create people to have to eat to survive? What if Adam and Eve never ate anything, would they die (according to God the only way they will die is if they ate from the knowledge tree. Hence, if they never ate from the knowledge tree,  then technically, they never would have had to eat anything because they would not ever die)?

14.4 What exactly was the disagreement/contradiction that started everything to get fucked up? Why did they feel the only way to settle the disagreement was war? Why couldn’t Jesus, as God, show Satan that he is wrong, and resolve the dispute, without battle?

14.5 Space and time, although to some appearing to be infinite in its extent, can be shown to be finite, in reference to a more absolute reality. A major flaw in the scientific understanding of the universe is that time possesses no boundaries in reference to how it interacts with space. If space is finite in extent, then so is time. The big bang, as far as its validity can be deduced through empirical observation and scientific theory, becomes a meaningless proposition in reference to one’s own ability to seek an existence previous to it (ex: the laws of mathematics and physics break down the closer in time one goes toward the moment of the big bang).

14.51 The universe, if it was the creation of existence itself, can be understood as possessing all the qualities that go along with what lies within itself, since nothing exists apart from itself. In this theory, time and space are absolute facts of existence and to speak of timelessness or infinite spacial qualities is meaningless if time had a beginning. Even if the universe went on forever, it can never reach infinite in extent, because although it is the only thing that exists, its limit is set through the creation of itself in time.

14.52 The laws of the universe break down when attempting to deduce the moment of the big bang. Even the laws of mathematics become useless when attempting to describe this moment. If mathematics had a beginning, then it could not even begin to attempt to describe how absolute reality is, because it is shown to be finite in extent at the creation of the universe.

14.53 If we assign the passing of physical moments to describe the observation of space and time, then there must have existed a first actual moment in which the universe came into being right after whatever theory one might ascribe to how it came to be (theists say God existed before, materialists say nothing existed before, etc.). In this case, space and time, together, must have come into existence through an interaction with some further existence. The reason why this must be a fact, is because at the very first, most minute, universal moment that existed in the universe, going back a further moment in the past is meaningless (not possible). This first moment must, by rule, have been equivalent with the coming into existence of the universe.

14.54 In this first moment, it is pointless to think of space and time before it, and pointless to think of space and time after it. The coming into being of the universe is equivalent with whatever the initial conditions may have been at moment one. Moment one, as it relates to existence before and after the big bang, is equivalent to both ways of observing the same thing, because as a simultaneous existing event, it connects one state of affairs of existence, to another. This would then mean that there must have existed some specific reference to time and space which causally necessitated the interaction it had at the moment of the existence of the universe.

14.55 Causality, as it is understood as a universal force interacting within the universe, can be shown to bridge the gap in understanding between how time and space interact. Any observation of the universe must conform to some relationship shared between time and space. The only ways of relating time and space to observation are: 1) observation of time before observation of space; 2) observation of time at the same moment as observation of space; 3) observation of time after the observation of space. Observations 1 and 3 occur through a separation in one’s perception of how they experience the world. These two observations, only differ in how they interact within the world that has already been established, and not how they interact with the moment of the big bang.

14.56 Observation 2, in its most simple meaning, is the establishment of the moment one in which the universe potentially came into existence. This, however, must not have only been the necessary conditions under which the universe came into being at the beginning, but also describes necessary conditions under which one may observe, in existence, a beginning to possess the actualization of any experience. Since, at moment one, the universe was officially in existence, the laws governing the initial state at the beginning, in reference to observation 2, would still apply to the universe today and for however long it is in existence.

14.57 Observation 2 and the moment one event are two ways of describing the same thing. What is important to note however, is that the relationship between moment one and observation 2, is that in order for there to be a moment one, there must be an observation. This can be seen through the following way: any perceiver, who possesses an observation 2 within existence, is no longer bound by space and time, since they experience existence at the same rate that they observe it. Anything they perceive, will at the same time be materialized. These are the exact same rules that an observer must follow whenever they attempt to actualize any experience. Through observation 2, the observer, by instantaneously actualizing experiences within space and time, itself, lies apart from space and time.

14.58 Since observation 2 lies outside of space and time, the perceiver is not bound by space and time, yet is able to actualize any experience to accord with anything in space and time. The simultaneousness of causality refers to a universe which cannot exist apart from observation. If there does not exist an observer at moment one, then there does not exist anything that exists outside of space and time, and if nothing exists outside of space and time, then moment one would not exist, and would rather follow observations 1 and 3.

14.59 The same rule which governs the beginning of the universe, governs all observations within existence, in that the exact same thing is being perceived, mainly, observation 2. This we may call a first cause or first mover, since nothing in the universe is acting on it to make it accord with it. Rather, it acts on everything, and through it, all potentialities become actualized. Through this insight, one can see that it makes no sense to speak of an infinite regress to causality in the universe, because the first causation (prime movement) lies outside of the causal laws of the universe, and hence, are not governed by the same understanding (since it lies outside of space and time (and what is capable of being observed within space and time, mainly, observations 1 and 3)) of existence.

14.591 First causation is the pure actualization of all and any potentialities in existence. This is the equivalent to the fundamental law that governs everything, mainly, God. Therefore, God exists.

14.6 Why did 1/3 of the angels (now demons, apparently) join with Satan (obviously this means that 1/3 of the angels, to begin with were not, in agreement (thought that the Christian God was wrong))? Would one of the other angels, have rebelled if Satan did not (maybe? Or did they join with Satan because they thought he was a good leader/role model (after having rebelled against/questioned their previous leader (Christian God))? In other words, they swapped one leader for another? (If one of the demons of Satan, or, one of the loyal angels of the Christian God did not/does not completely agree with all the fundamentalist world view of either of them, then that means: A) they are not acting authentically (true/honest) to who they are and are not living completely happy/content; B) they possess another world view that is in opposition to the complete Christian God/Satan way of seeing the world.

14.7 There has always been existence. Existence cannot come from nonexistence, because if nothing exists, then nonexistence would not encompass 100% of what exists, but rather would not even exist. Physicists say that before the big bang there was nothing and that somehow the universe (existence), came to be from that nonexistence. This, however, makes no sense because by the very fact that they are claiming that there was nothing, they are also at the same time admitting that there was something that existed, mainly, nothing. Instead of assigning a mathematical way of understanding the complete scope of existence through attempting to understand it as infinite or finite, it is much simpler to realize that existence, because it exists, must be eternal in its magnitude. If existence is finite, then that would mean that there exists nonexistence, which, as we just showed, is impossible, since there would then be existence. If existence is infinite, then that would mean that no matter how minute existence may be, it will still encompass 100% of everything that exists, and hence, cannot get larger or smaller, because this would mean that it possesses existing size in relation to something that exists outside itself, mainly, nonexistence. Therefore, the universe, whether it is a representation of everything that exists, must always operate in accordance with what exists, within itself, and apart from itself. The universe is, in terms of existence, meaningless to ascribe a certain percentage to of what exists in existence, because, by putting a label on how much exists, you automatically refer to something that doesn’t exist, since anything less than 100% of existence, immediately limits how much of existence exists, which is absurd. Existence then, is eternal in that possesses no reference to anything outside itself, and hence, obeys nothing that isn’t contained within itself, and apart of itself.

14.71 In reality, reason, love and perfection equate to absolute truth, which governs all of existence.

14.8 The meaning to life, if we may define it, simply consists in the way in which a mind adheres to the way in which it wants to achieve its conception of what is true in reality.

14.81 A conception of reality achieves validity through the way in which it follows certain guidelines that enable it to observe its relation between itself and the rest of existence. This can be shown through a version of the ontological argument, which will demonstrate the existence of a possibility through which one may conceive of truth.

14.811 I conceive that there is existence.

14.812 This conception of existence, must exist, because if it didn’t, then that would mean that there does not exist anything through which I may conceive.

14.813 Within this conception of existence, I conceive that there is a meaning to life.

14.814 My conception of the meaning to life is merely the complete understanding of what it means to exist in existence. Hence, if I cannot conceive of anything other than a complete understanding of my own conception of what it means to exist in existence, then my conception is true.

14.815 A conception is capable of being conceived in reality, when it exists within a single mind, or all minds.

14.816 My conception cannot refer to nonexistence, because that would mean that my conception would not refer to anything. But it does refer to something, mainly, my conception of everything that does exist, because I cannot conceive of myself apart from existence (because if I did then that would mean that I could not possibly conceive of anything).

14.817 Hence, my conception of existence refers to everything that does exist, because my conception of my own existence cannot exist unless existence exists.

14.818 Since existence exists, and my conception of existence exists, then means that my conception of existence exists within existence.

14.819 If one conceives of everything in existence as existing within their own conception, then whatever one conceives of in existence must be true, since it refers to everything that does exist.

14.820 In a conception of existence, anything is possible, because nothing can be conceived of that does not exist (otherwise one’s conception would refer to something that does not exist, which is impossible).

14.821 The conception of something being impossible in existence makes nonexistence exist. However, this nonexistence only refers to the conception, which really, does not exist (it is impossible to conceive of something as impossible, because the very act of conceiving the impossibility, makes the impossibility exist (possible))

14.822 So, all one must do in order to conceive of everything in existence, is to simply conceive of nothing as impossible, and everything as possible (thereby forming a conception in which everything exists, and nonexistence doesn’t exist).

14.823 A conception which refers to existence in itself, by itself, and through itself, refers to the actualization of the conception. This is done by conceiving all of existence as made possible in oneself, by oneself, and through oneself.

14.824 The conception of existence is actualized once the conceiver refers to oneself as the conceiver of all conceptions.

14.825 One who conceives of all conceptions refers to oneself in relation to everything that can possibly exist, and hence, can only conceive of what exists (what is true).

14.826 The conception of truth is actualized once all of existence is conceived through a single conception, which is just one actualization of all potential actualizations in which truth can be conceived.

14.827 Therefore, the complete conception of truth, and hence, God’s conception of existence, is actualized once one conceives of a single existing thing as having only one existing potentiality within their conception. This single existing potentiality, by being the only thing that the conceiver can conceive of, must be the way in which existence is, because everything in existence is being referred to through the conception, by the fact that there only exists a single potential thing which may be actualized, and nothing else can be conceived of as not existing (not being potential), thereby meaning that only possibility can be actualized and not impossibility.

14.828 Hence, the meaning of life is found once God’s conception of existence is actualized, which, as it relates to absolute truth, is nothing more than the recognition within oneself that they themselves possess a single potential actualization through which God can exist in existence. This conception is the quintessential personification through which God can become self-aware within existence.

14.829 This conception exists within everyone and everything. It exists through one’s own personification of it in existence. It is through this complete realization of the true nature of reality, that the meaning of life is found. Mainly: freedom.

15 Hear no evil, see no evil, speak no evil.